The Loss of MID in English

Rongkun Liu

PhD

University of York

Language and Linguistic Science

May 2022
Abstract

The thesis investigates the loss of MID in English through quantitative methods using historical corpus data. The research covers the period from the 10th century (the late Old English period) to the 14th century when MID became extinct in most Middle English literature. With the help of logistic regression analysis, the origin of the loss was identified in the 12th-century East Midlands due to the intense Anglo-Scandinavian contact. Language shift and dialect mixing may have occurred in the historical Anglo-Scandinavian community, leading to the semantic gain of WÍÐ (originally an oppositional preposition) and a linguistic bias against MID. Detailed textual discussions of MID and WÍÐ were made on the late Old English period and on each Middle English dialectal region. Multiple sociolinguistic factors such as immigrant society, the class of free peasantry, style and register concern are also involved in the historical change.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background and Questions

Old English (hereafter OE) is an ancient Germanic language spoken by three Germanic tribes (Angles, Saxons and Jutes) migrating to Britain from their homeland in Northwestern Europe. According to Freeborn (1992, p. 5), in the year AD 443 two Germanic warriors Hengest and Horsa were invited to Britain by a Romano-British leader Vortigern to fight off the northern Picts. Realizing the weakness of the locals and the fertility of the land, more and more Germanic settlers came and took over lands from the Britons. These settlers were a mixed group of Germanic people, constituted by the Saxons, the Angles and the Jutes. To put it simply, the Jutes mostly occupied Kent, and the Saxons resided in areas of Essex, Sussex and Wessex, while the Angles controlled the broad Midlands and the North. Many kingdoms were established in Anglo-Saxon England and three of them were particularly prominent: the kingdom of Northumbria in the north, the kingdom of Mercia across Midlands and the kingdom of Wessex in the south, from which three branches of Old English dialects were derived, the West Saxon dialect, the Mercian dialect and the Northumbrian dialect (the latter two dialects were both related to the Angles).

A few hundred years later, another Germanic group again came with force to the island, the Danish and Norwegian Vikings. Vikings were bands of Scandinavian military groups plundering across Europe from the late 8th to the 11th centuries. They fiercely attacked the eastern and northern parts of England, creating a large area of independent colonies called the Danelaw (as in being run by “Danish law”). They devastated the kingdom of Northumbria and parts of Mercia before being stopped by the Wessex army led by King Alfred. A truce was reached dividing England into the Anglo-Saxon part and the Viking part. During this period, some northern and eastern varieties of English were exposed to a significant Scandinavian influence. However, peace was short-lived before another shift of power. In 1066, the Normans, descendants of Vikings in France, crossed the channel and conquered England. This officially ends the Anglo-Saxon rule in Britain and the period of Old English. The variety of English arising under the Norman rule is called Middle English (hereafter ME), covering a period from the 11th to the 15th centuries. Middle English saw various degrees of degradation in morphology and syntax compared to Old English.
Old English, being Germanic in nature, shares a common word stock with its continental siblings\(^1\), in which many grammatical words are cognate to each other. The subject under discussion in the current thesis is one of the most frequently-used Germanic prepositions, MID (‘with’). This preposition gradually went into disuse in the Middle English period, but it still widely exists in a series of modern Germanic languages, such as German (mit), Dutch (met) and different Scandinavian languages (Danish/Norwegian/Swedish med and Icelandic með).

The aim of the thesis is to investigate the loss of MID in English with a quantitative approach using historical data. The research questions are as follows:

- Why did the loss of MID occur? What were the possible reasons?
- How was MID gradually replaced by WID (originally meaning ‘against’ in OE, ancestor to Modern English with) in the course of the ME period?
- When did the replacement first take place? Did the replacement proceed incrementally or suddenly?
- Where did the replacement first take place? Did the change take place in all the different dialect areas at the same time?

The research makes use of the historical corpus data from the 10\(^{th}\) century to the 14\(^{th}\) century when MID became obsolete in the written language. The thesis is organized as follows: an overview in Chapter 1, a semantic discussion in Chapter 2, a series of logistic regressions in Chapter 3, a discussion of late Old English variation in Chapter 4, a discussion of the eastern, western, southern and northern ME data from Chapter 5 to 8 and a discussion of the broader Germanic variation in Chapter 9. A conclusion is presented in Chapter 10. The study aims to show that the loss of MID in English was linked to the Anglo-Scandinavian contact.

---

\(^1\) Old English’s related Germanic siblings include Old Saxon and Old Frisian and Old Norse (hereafter ON).
1.2 Introduction of MID and WIÐ

The current study mainly concerns two prepositions, MID and its later substitute WIÐ. Both prepositions have a broad range of meanings listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter OED). I summarize some of the main ones below (“mid” & “with”, OED) in Table 1.1 and Table 1.2:

Table 1.1: Summary of MID’s meanings from the OED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings of MID</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Accompaniment</td>
<td>Æþelhelm ealdorman gefeaht wið þa Deniscan on Port <em>mid</em> Dorsætum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Æthelhelm alderman fought against the Danes at port with Dorsetmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Aethelhelm the Ealdorman fought against the Danes with Dorset men at port.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</em>, OED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In the same direction as a</td>
<td><em>Pa wende þæt fyr forð mid þam winde to anum þære huse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stream/wind</td>
<td>then moved the fire forth along the wind to one of the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Then the fire moved with the wind to one of the houses.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>Ælfric Lives of Saints:Julius</em>, OED)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Accompanying condition/demeanor | \textit{Hi syððan leofodon mid sibbe betwux him}  
they since lived with peace between them  
‘Ever since they lived in peace with each other.’  
\textit{(Ælfric Old English Hexateuch: Josh, OED)} |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 4 | Instrumentality               | \textit{Forþon he him gewit forgeaf and mid his handum gesceop, halig drihten}.  
For he them wisdom gave and with his hands created holy lord  
‘For he, the Holy Lord, gave them wisdom and created (them) with his hands.’  
\textit{(Genesis B: 251, OED)} |
| 5 | In respect of/ to             | \textit{Ac lat me speke mid my broþer}.  
but let me speak to my brother  
‘But let me speak to my brother’  
\textit{(Chron. Robert of Gloucester: 5859, OED)} |
| 6 | Association                   | \textit{Pæs sie ælmihtig, [drihtna] drihten, dema mid unc twiðh the be almighty lord’s lord judge of us two}  
‘May the Almighty King of Kings, be judge between us two.’  
\textit{(Genesis A: 2255, OED)} |
<p>| 7 | like, in the same way          | \textit{Drynke but myd þe doke} |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning of WIÐ</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Against (spatial) | *Sætt se hælend wið ðæs dores*  
Sat the savior against the treasury  
‘And Jesus sat against the treasury’  
*(Lindisfarne Gospels: Mark 12.41, OED)* |
| 2 Against (confrontation/rivalry/defense) | *Grendel wan hwile wið Hroþgar*  
Grendel strived while against Hrothgar  
‘Grendel fought against Hrothgar for a while.’  
*(Beowulf:152, OED)* |
<p>| 3 Payment for, in exchange of | <em>Eage wið eagan, tôþ wiþ teð</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | eye for eye-DAT  tooth for tooth-DAT  | ‘An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.’  
**(Ælfric Exodus xxii: 24, OED)** |
| 4 | Towards |  
**Pa wende  he hine west wið  Exanceastres**  
than traveled he him west towards Exeter  
‘Then he traveled west towards Exeter himself.’  
**(Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, OED)** |
| 5 | Near/close to |  
**Pa  he  þæt seow  sum feoll wið  þæne weg**  
when he that sowed some fell near the road  
‘While he sowed, some (seeds) fell beside the way.’  
| 6 | Communication |  
**Ne  muð  hasaph, ne  wiþ  monnum spræc**  
NEG mouth has NEG with man speaks  
‘(It) has no mouth and speaks not with man.’  
**(OE Riddle 39, OED)** |
| 7 | By |  
**Pe  pepil  was  i-pleased wiþ  his faire speche**  
the people was pleased by his fair speech  
‘The people were pleased by his fair speech.’  
**(Polychron. (Rolls) VIII. 149, OED)** |
| 8 | For (causal) |  
**Wit  þis  was  born  an  hali  child...**  
for this was born a holy child  
‘For this, a holy child was born...’  
**(Cursor Mundi: 1203, OED)** |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 | till | *wið helle ofdune gestigdes ðu*
till hell down descend you
‘You shall go down till into hell.’
*(Lindisfarne Gospels: Matthew 11.23, OED)* |
| 10 | Accompaniment | *Faraon wiþþ all hiss ferd comm afterrward.*Pharaoh with all his army came afterwards
‘Pharaoh with all his army came afterwards’
*(Ormulum: 14792, OED)* |
| 11 | In the same direction as a stream/ wind | *If it be with the streame or with the hill...*
‘If it were in the direction of the stream or the hill...’
*(Of Coulers Good & Euill, OED)* |
| 12 | Accompanying condition/demeanor | *A very learned Man with an erect Solemn Air.*
‘A very learned man with an upright solemn air.’
*(Spectator No. 438, OED)* |
| 13 | Instrumentality | *I schal vndo this temple maad with hondis*
I shall destroy this temple made by hands
‘I will destroy this Temple that is made with hands.’
*(Wycliffe Bible Mark xiv. 58, OED)* |
| 14 | In respect of/ to | *He swore, Þat he sholde with him halde*
he swore that he should to him support |
More semantic discussions will come in Chapter 3.

1.3 Literature Reviews

Past literature on this topic includes Dekeyser (1990), Groussier (2001) and Rhee (2002, 2004). I will briefly introduce them in the following sections.

1.3.1 Dekeyser (1990)

Dekeyser (1990) connects the loss of MID to a prepositional shift, involving two other prepositions, WID and AGAINST (‘against’). Dekeyser (1990, p.35) claims that MID prototypically denotes a sense of PROXIMITY, varying from spatial proximity to comitativeness, and AGAINST prototypically expresses OPPOSITION, while Old English WID sits in a vague intermediate territory showing a dual nature of PROXIMITY/OPPOSITION. In order to clarify the semantic boundary between them, a chain movement occurred with WID pushing into MID’s original semantics, leaving AGAINST to fill the oppositional gap. The reorganization of the triplet would create a more clear-cut and stable system, at the expense of MID’s loss in the English language.
According to Dekeyser (1990, p.40), examples of WID expressing instrumentality “do not seem to be attested for the Old English period” and it is the first of MID’s semantics to be absorbed by WID, after its “gradual loss of the concept of OPPOSITION in all its dimensions”. WID’s original sense of opposition “seems to have receded into the background, while mere interaction is foregrounded” (Dekeyser, 1990, p.40), as can be reflected in many Modern English examples:

1. Strong opposition: *The police are fighting against the crime gang.*
2. Weak opposition: *The kids are fighting with each other.*
3. Interactional: *British soldiers fought with French against the Nazi.*

WID’s weakened oppositional semantics led to what Dekeyser (1990, p.42) describes as “the full development of the potential of ongean (AGAINST)” in a “quantitative rather than a qualitative” manner. Meanwhile, MID and WID co-occurred as semantic equivalents for a long time in the ME period:

Me charged þre hondret schippes... þer wyþ & mid al oþer god

men loaded three hundred ships … there with with all other goods
‘One loaded three hundred ships… and with all other goods’

(cited in Dekeyser, 1990, p.42)
Several other factors are also mentioned by Dekeyser (1990, pp.45-46), such as the phonological similarity between MID and WID, as well as WID’s historical contact with the Scandinavian cognate which “might have contributed to the semantic shift and accelerated its diffusion in Late Old and Early Middle English”. In terms of why MID rather than WID was ousted in the shift, Dekeyser (1990) gives the reason that WID “was the dynamic member...it was the semantic structure of this preposition that was on the move” (p.44).

Dekeyser’s (1990) proposal primarily views the change as an internal optimization of the prepositional system. Although logically self-consistent, his claim lacks historical data support.

1.3.2 Groussier (2001)
Another scholar Groussier (2001) derives the loss of MID from its historical loss of spatial sense. She (2001, p.22) observes that OE MID originally had a spatial meaning derived from the Indo-European stem *medʰi ‘among’, while WID also had a meaning of separation from the Indo-European stem *wi-tero (cf. Sanskrit vitaram ‘apart’ and German wider ‘against’ or wieder ‘again’), see (3) and (4).

(3)
7 ne bið ðær nænig ealo gebrowen mid Estum ac þær bið medo genoh
and NEG is there not-any ale brewed among Estonians but there is mead enough
‘No ale is brewed among the Estonians, but there is enough mead.’
(cited in Groussier, 2001, pp.22-23)

(4)
Hwonne se dag cume ðe he sceole wið ðæm lichoman hine gedælæn...
when the day comes that he shall from the body him separate
‘When the day comes when he must part from his body...’
(cited in Groussier, 2001, p.23)
Groussier (2001, p.33) claims that spatial sense was vital to prepositional development, citing the localist hypothesis from John Lyons\(^2\) (1977), in a way that any non-spatial prepositional use was essentially derived from its spatial use by a metaphorical process. It is then understandable that the loss of spatial use in MID might cause its ultimate loss of productivity. The survival of WID was then due to its retention of spatial sense especially under the ON contact.

The Old Norse cognates of með (MID) and við (WID) had a very productive spatial sense:

\[(5)\]

**ON spatial MID and WID**

\[\text{Þat var þa } \text{siðr } \text{með } \text{kaupmonnum}\]

it was then custom among merchants

\[\text{‘It was then the custom among merchants...’}\]

(cited in Groussier, 2001, p.31)

\[\text{Stoð } \text{maðr } \text{við } \text{siglu}\]

stood man near sail

\[\text{‘A man stood by the sail’}\]

(cited in Groussier, 2001, p.31)

Groussier (2001, p.32) points out that the ON pair of með and við was semantically much more similar to each other than their OE counterparts, since both of them in ON can govern comitative, instrumental, temporal and locational semantics, see Table 1.3:

---

\(^2\)Lyons (1977) claims that “spatial expressions are linguistically more basic…in that they serve as templates, as it were for other expressions…it is plausibly suggested by psychologists that spatial organization is of central importance in human cognition” (p.718).
Table 1.3: Similarity between the ON *með* and *við*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th><em>með</em></th>
<th><em>við</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Comitative     | *Þeir ræddu með ser*  
‘They discussed with REFL’  
(quoted in Groussier, 2001, p.32) | *Konungrinn kom til stefnu þeira við sinnum her*  
‘The queen came to summons their with her husband’  
(quoted in Groussier, 2001, p.32) |
| Instrumental   | *verja dik með vapnum*  
‘Defend oneself with weapons’  
(Buckhurst, 1925, p.60) | *Eigi fellr tre við it fursta hogg*  
‘A tree does not fall at the first stroke.’  
(quoted in Groussier, 2001, p.32) |
Despite the close resemblance, the ON pair did not merge in the historical development, contrary to what Dekeyser’s theory (1990) would have expected. Groussier (2001, p.32) sees this as evidence of support to her claim on prepositional productivity and spatial usage. According to her theory, the OE WİÐ came into contact with the ON cognate við and added to itself a stronger spatial attribute as well as the non-native instrumental use. On the other
hand, OE MID’s contact with the ON cognate *með* was not enough to save it, since MID was already *une vieille préposition* (‘an old preposition’) in Groussier’s term (2001, p.35).

To summarize, Groussier (2001) states that there is a cognitive basis behind the survival of a preposition and its spatial usage and the loss of MID was due to its loss of spatial sense. Her theory draws on the localist hypothesis, but does not explain well why MID’s spatial sense was not saved from the same ON contact. She also does not make use of any historical corpus data in a quantitative manner.

1.3.3 Rhee (2002, 2004)

Rhee (2002, pp.566-568) also recognizes the fact that grammatical concepts “are inherently spatial” and most prepositions, encapsulating highly grammatical concepts, “are derived from spatial concepts”. He (2002) illustrates the transformation from spatial to non-spatial grammatical concepts through the antonymous semantic shift of AGAINST from an oppositional preposition to an associative preposition, similar to the historical development of WÍÐ. Four cognitive processes are involved for such an antonymous transformation: metaphor, generalization, subjectification and the frame-of-focus schema.

**Table 1.4: Cognitive processes in Rhee (2002)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Processes</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metaphor</strong> expands the original meanings by making metaphorical association from the spatial to the temporal domain</td>
<td>SPATIAL &gt; TEMPORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On a dai, agenes the eue.</em></td>
<td>‘On a day, against the eve.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cited in Rhee, 2002, p.569)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Generalization** seeks to establish a common ground between different semantic domains in order to transfer a related usage.

**TANGIBLE > LESS TANGIBLE**

*Theire hyghe saylles, alle spred abrede ayenst the wyndes*

‘Their high sails, all spread wide open against the winds.’

(cited in Rhee, 2002, p.570)

*The most damnable vice, and most against injustice, is ingratitude.*

(cited in Rhee, 2002, p.571)

**OPPOSITION > VICINITY/ASSOCIATION**

*I met him against the pond.*

‘I met him near the pond.’
Subjectification transforms meanings associated with the external world into the internal world either by anthropocentricity ("human-centeredness") or egocentricity ("speaker-centeredness").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTHROPOCENTRICITY</th>
<th>EGOCENTRICITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>He has a few pounds put by against a ‘rainy day’.</em></td>
<td><em>Far visible against the clear blue sky...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last of all, the Frame-of-Focus schema could facilitate an antonymous semantic change by a change of focus and perspective, as shown in Figure 1.2.
As Figure 1.2 shows, the reading of AGAINST can shift due to the change of schema. The first schema represents a focus-free apposition of two objects leading to a neutral reading of ‘against’. The second schema focuses on the direction of both objects, inducing a ‘towards’ reading. The third schema focuses on the force dynamics (similar to the physical force analysis of action and reaction) of the participants, creating an interactive ‘opposite’ reading. The last schema employs a telescopic perspective, under which any movement would be minimized to a locational reading of ‘near, adjoining’ against the grand backdrop. Through the four schemata, the original oppositional sense in AGAINST can be transformed into an associative reading of ‘towards’ or ‘adjoining’.

Along the same line, Rhee (2004) proposes that WIÐ may also have undergone an antonymic movement from OPPOSITION to ASSOCIATION and further to ACCOMPANIMENT by a gradual semantic extension. This brings his idea closer to Dekeyser’s proposal (1990). Rhee (2004, p.162) assumes the diachronic evolution of WIÐ to be as in Figure 1.3.
As Figure 1.3 shows, the semantics of WID evolves from the original OPPOSITION to the ultimate ACCOMPANIMENT through the mediation of RECIPROCITY, motivated “by the human understanding of the force dynamics in the physical world” (p.161). In more detail, we can see that the dynamic readings in OPPOSITION (such as resistance, conflict and direction etc.) are inherently related to RECIPROCITY, see Figure 1.4.

After the primary transition into RECIPROCITY, the subsequent progressions into ASSOCIATION and ACCOMPANIMENT are much more straightforwardly, since
RECIPROCITY is internally a relation between two associated objects, and ACCOMPANIMENT is a specialized case in an association relationship.

Through this theory, Rhee (2004) successfully bridges the semantic gap between OPPOSITION and ACCOMPANIMENT and creates a solution to an otherwise impossible antonymic semantic change via multiple intermediate steps. His theory is persuasive, but still lacks diachronic data support.

1.3.4 Some Other Accounts

There are some other alternative accounts on the topic.

Hittle (1901) relates the loss of MID to the need of eliminating excessive expression and redundant synonymy in English. According to her account (1901, pp.166-178), WIÐ gradually developed into a “reciprocal-associative” and “intra-locational” preposition via some common collocations with MID as semantic contact points. Her view, however, is mostly restricted to data from the Old English period.

Dance (2003) also briefly touches on the issue in his study of Norse loans in the Southwest Midlands. He (2003) tends to view it as an endogenous development, based on the fact that “given the relative lateness of the Norse sources it is hard to rule out a parallel evolution within English” (pp.458-459).

OED also offers a helpful insight on the possible cause of MID’s loss and WIÐ’s later development:

> The most remarkable development in the signification of *with* consists in its having taken over in the Middle English period the chief senses belonging properly to Old English *mid* (cognate with Greek μετά). These senses are mainly those denoting association, combination or union, instrumentality or means, and attendant circumstance. These are all important senses of Old Norse *við*, to which fact their currency and ultimate predominance in the English word are partly due...
range of meanings in general has no doubt been enlarged by association with Latin *cum*.

(“with”, OED)

1.3.5 Evaluation

Among the varieties of explanations offered, some common ground can be reached. First, both Dekeyser (1990) and Groussier (2001) notice *WID*’s gradual loss of overt oppositional sense to *AGAINST* and its sudden gain of instrumental semantics in the early Middle English period. Second, they both propose that *WID* was a more “dynamic” or “rejuvenated” preposition than *MID* in the historical change (Dekeyser, 1990, p.44; Groussier, 2001, p.35). Third, all three scholars (Dekeyser, Groussier and Rhee) start the discussion from the prototypical or archetypical semantics of the prepositions.

However, their accounts also diverge greatly. First, Dekeyser (1990) does not view the Scandinavian influence as vital in the semantic change, claiming that “contacts with the Scandinavian community may have contributed to the semantic shift and accelerated its diffusion in Late Old and Early Middle English, but they *did not trigger* the change” (p.45). This is partly shared by Dance (2003), Hittle (1901) and perhaps Rhee (2002, 2004), who look for an internal explanation. On the contrary, Groussier (2001, p.35) views the Old Norse contact as the vital rescue for *WID*’s spatial sense as well as its later survival. This is also partly supported by the view from the OED. The actual role of Scandinavian contact is certainly a focal point of contention.

Since all the above studies are qualitative rather than quantitative, my thesis can fill the gap by contributing a data-oriented approach to the issue. In the next section, I will introduce the use of corpus data and the dataset overview.
1.4 Corpus, Method and Dataset Overview

The current study makes use of three historical English corpora: PPCME2 (Kroch, Taylor & Santorini, 2000-), PCMEP (Zimmermann, 2014-) and LAEME (Laing, 2013-). PPCME2 is the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, covering Middle English texts from 1150 to 1500. PCMEP is the Parsed Corpus of Middle English Poetry with an exclusive focus on ME verse from 1150 to 1420. LAEME is A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English collecting multiple dialectal manuscripts from 1150 to 1325. For the current study, I mark the 10th century as the beginning phase of the change and the 14th century as the final phase of the change, since MID use beyond this century became extremely rare. Texts are not compounded if there is an overlap between different corpora, but are used as a supplement to each other if there is any content discrepancy. Late Old English texts or other ME texts unavailable from the above three corpora were supplied from other sources, such as the Dictionary of Old English Corpus (A. P. Healey et al, 2007), the Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse (University of Michigan, 2000-), or supplied individually as e-texts from the supervisor.

I collect tokens of MID and WIÐ first and foremost from texts with a dual presence of both prepositions, but whenever there is a necessary data gap to be filled, I also open up, with discretion, to texts with only one preposition. One examiner expresses caution over the potential bias towards WIÐ in the inclusion of such texts; however, these texts were carefully sampled and meant to truthfully represent an advanced trend in the historical data. Inclusion of outlying (or ahead-lying) texts is not an uncommon practice in historical linguistics.

Non-prepositional tokens of MID and WIÐ are not included in the count, such as the clausal use of wið ða hwile (‘until’) or mið þy (‘when’). Also, for a more transparent semantic discussion, I only collect tokens from a verbal-prepositional construction, namely Verb+MID/ WIÐ. Tokens from either a Noun+MID/ WIÐ or an Adjective+MID/ WIÐ construction are excluded from the general discussion, but they are still used as an index to judge the total loss of MID in some historical texts.

The written forms of WIÐ and MID can vary a lot in different historical texts, creating trouble for the corpus search. The vowel of both prepositions is mostly realized as i but also sometimes as y. The ending consonant of WIÐ can sometimes be written as ð, ṭ, d, or even t
before the introduction of the digraph *th*. The use of the Anglo-Saxon letter *wyn* is sometimes seen in the LAEME texts. A summary of the orthographic variants is listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID</th>
<th>WID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mid, mit, myt, myd, mide, mið/ð</td>
<td>wið, wid, wyd, wyt, wit, wiþ(þ), pið, pit, pid, with, wyth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metadata (such as genre, period and region) are also collected and tagged to each token in the dataset. They are treated as different independent variables in the later logistic regression.

Genre consists of three categories: gloss, poem and prose. The genre information is often given in the text description of the corpora.

Period spans from the 10th to the 14th centuries, with a gap in the 11th century due to the social and political turbulence after the Norman Conquest in 1066, creating an inevitable historical hiatus in the English writing (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, pp.267-269). The 10th and 12th centuries represent the transition period between the late Old English and the early Middle English, while the 13th and 14th centuries represent the late Middle English periods. The period information is given by each corpus, albeit in varying formats. For example, PPCME2 and PCMEEP approximate a specific year for each text, while LAEME only gives a period bloc in formats like C12a1 (the first quarter of the 12th century), C12a2 (the second quarter of the 12th century), C12b1 (the third quarter of the 12th century) and C12b2 (the fourth quarter of the 12th century). In order to unify the formats, I code the period data in two forms, the first of which makes use of a century tag (such as C10, C12, C13 and C14) transforming period data into categorical data, the second of which consists of an approximate year either from the corpora or by taking the medium of the period bloc in LAEME (for example, assigning the medium year 1212 to all the texts from C13a1, namely 1200-1225, in LAEME). The second form gives us the numerical data for the later regression analysis, while the first form can be used in the data visualization.
Region-wise, LAEME offers a very detailed location for each text, sometimes specific to the county or even the city level, such as Central Worcs, NW Essex or Salisbury (Wils) etc. On the other hand, PPCME2 only locates texts to a broad region, such as Kentish, Northern, East Midlands and West Midlands etc. In order to better concentrate the regional data for the later regression, I follow the practice of PPCME2 to group the data into different big regions, following the Middle English dialectal delimitation used by Trips (2001, p.34):

![Middle English dialectal division](image)

Figure 1.5: Middle English dialectal division

Trips (2001, p.34)

According to Figure 1.5, medieval England can be divided into five dialectal regions: Northern, East Midlands, West Midlands, Southern and Kentish regions. Each text is subsumed under a region. For example, LAEME texts from Hereford, Gloucester, Worcester, Shropshire and Cheshire are grouped into the West Midlands region. Those from Yorkshire and Northumbria are grouped into the Northern region. Texts from East Anglia (Norfolk and Suffolk), Lincolnshire and Peterborough are grouped into the East Midlands region, while
texts from Kent are subsumed into the Kentish region. It is noteworthy that LAEME texts from Somerset, London and especially Essex are grouped into the Southern region. Although Essex is situated on the fringe of East Midlands, however, philological evidence shows that its local dialect had more of a southern characteristic (see Warner, 2017, p.318, pp.321-332). Given this rationale, the Essex data are labeled as Southern in this study.

The complete list of texts forming my dataset is in Table 1.6, comprising token counts, relative percentages and metadata. Some extremely lengthy texts were sampled (marked by *) in order to avoid skewing the whole dataset.

Table 1.6: Complete list of texts in the dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name (LAEME Num.)</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindisfarne Gospel</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91.63%</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth Gospel</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Ritual</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84.17%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Saxon Gospel</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.88%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ælfric's Lives of the Saints</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87.39%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late OE Poems</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77.46%</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentish Homilies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough Chronicle final continuation (149)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Homilies, hand A (1200)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.72%</td>
<td>17.28%</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trinity Homilies, hand B</em> (1300)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80.82%</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Ormulum</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pater Noster</em></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.94%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lambeth Homilies hand A lang 1</em> (2000)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83.51%</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lambeth Homilies hand A lang</em> (2001)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poema Morale (5)</em></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Body and Soul (172)</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.48%</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poema Morale (8)</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vices and Virtues, hand A</em> (64)*</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98.15%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vices and Virtues, hand B</em> (65)*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.48%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 2 (157)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On Ureison of Ure Loverde</em> (189)*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ancrene Riule</em> (245)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92.52%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Language</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Katherine</strong> (260)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Juliana</strong> (261)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Margaret</strong> (262)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancrene Riwle</strong> (273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hali Meiehad, Sawles Warde</strong> (1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wooing group Four Prayers</strong> (1800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancrene Riwle T1</strong> (118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrections to <strong>Ancrene Riwle</strong>, hand B (275)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wohunge of ure Lauerd</strong> (122)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancrene Riwle T2</strong> (119)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 1 (156)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (6)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.42%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (7)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somer is comen (234)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meidan Maregrete</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College B.14.39, hand A, Lord One God etc. (246)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
<td>90.38%</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College B.14.39, hand B: verses (247)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College B.14.39 (323), hand C (248)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College 43 (B.1.45) and BL Cotton Cleopatra C vi, Scribe D (1700)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph and Jacob (158)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.11%</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extracts from Ancrene Riwle (276)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazamon A, hand A (277)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>94.35%</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazamon A, hand B (278)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.94%</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lazamon B</em> (280)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95.63%</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Proverbs of Alfred</em> (249)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>West Midland Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Love Ron</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lyric on the vanity of the world</em> (228)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Text language not placed from Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fragments of Floris and Blancheflur</em> (271)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ancrene Wisse</em> (272)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>94.07%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>West Midland Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kentish Sermons</em> (142)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Kentish Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dame Sirith</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Owl and the Nightingale</em> (2,3)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Bestiary</em> (150)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>East Midland Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sayings of St Bernard</em> (160)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>East Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Doomsday</em> (241)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Text language not placed. Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>% Chinese</td>
<td>% Latin</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Latemest Day (242)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Text language not placed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury St Edmunds documents (1400)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86.96%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>East Midland Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digby 86: Fox/Eustace/Harrow/Thrush (2002)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43.14%</td>
<td>56.86%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV Signs before Doomsday (161)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate between the Body and the Soul (282)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>East Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Estorie del Euangelie (182)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>East Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Christ, Infancy of Christ, South English Legendary (1600)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>93.84%</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Southern Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Legend of Frideswide</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havelok the Dane (285)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>East Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Book of Thorney 2, fol. 372: Kingsdelf (186)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>East Midland Prose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cursor mundi (Cotton Vespasian A.iii)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>Northern Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Metrical Treatise on Dreams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>West Midland Poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Syllables</td>
<td>OE %</td>
<td>CE %</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayenbite of Inwyt</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88.33%</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of Saint Marina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Ramsey Abbey, hand A (133)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Ramsey Abbey, hand B (134)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment of Ramsey Register (135)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library Arundel 248: 4 lyrics (137)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton Ms.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Davy’s Five Dreams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mirror of St. Edmund (Vernon Ms.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyng Alisaunder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>99.10%</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Cleges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a sampled text; ( ) contains the LAEME text number.

In total, the dataset has 82 texts from the late 10th to the late 14th centuries, spanning from the late Old English to the late Middle English period. 4286 raw tokens of MID and 3710 raw tokens of WID are collected. We can visualize the WID percentages of each text depending on different colored variables (period, genre and region), see Figure 1.6 to Figure 1.8.

Figure 1.6: Ranking of texts by period
Figure 1.6 shows that later texts tend to have a higher WID percentage than earlier texts. Figure 1.7 shows that gloss tends to have a lower WID percentage than other genres.
(probably due to being early). Figure 1.8 indicates that East Midlands texts tend to have a higher WID percentage than other regions, and Kentish texts tend to have a lower WID percentage than average.

We can further collapse the data by each one hundred years:

Table 1.7: Diachronic MID and WID data by each century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Num. MID</th>
<th>Num. WID</th>
<th>MID%</th>
<th>WID%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>88.36%</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>64.33%</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>50.87%</td>
<td>49.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
<td>88.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.7 shows a gradual shift from a MID-dominant percentage to a WID-dominant percentage. By the 14th century, MID and WID’s percentage ratio had completely reversed from that in the 10th century, see Figure 1.9 and 1.10.

Figure 1.9: MID and WID’s diachronic percentages in a bar chart
Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10 show that the change was slow in the first two centuries but progressed much faster after the 13th century. MID and WID’s percentages reached an equilibrium (almost half and half) in the 13th century, implying an intense competition between the two before WID came out on top in the 14th century.

After trimming tokens from unknown or mixed regions, we can further split the diachronic data by regions:

Table 1.8: Diachronic MID and WID data by region and period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Num. MID</th>
<th>Num. WID</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90.25%</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88.95%</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>86.90%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>56.77%</td>
<td>43.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57.24%</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>46.55%</td>
<td>53.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95.22%</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>1.80%</th>
<th>98.20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>91.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
<td>90.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
<td>96.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88.33%</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** shows data gaps (slots with 0 tokens) in the 10th-century Kent, 10th-century West Midlands, and the 12th- and 13th-century North. These gaps are regretfully unavoidable due to a lack of available historical materials in the corpora. We can visualize the data distribution as follow:
Figure 1.11 indicates that the diachronic shift from MID to WID proceeds at a different pace within different regions. In the 10th century, all regions shared a similar percentage of MID and WID (roughly 90% MID versus 10% WID). However, the regional uniformity was broken in the 12th century, with East Midlands pioneering the increase of the WID use from a previous 11% to a high 43%. In the 13th century, West Midlands caught up with the trend by increasing its use of WID to 53%, more than the share of MID the first time in the dataset. In the 14th century, the increasing use of WID became unstoppable even in the Southern and the resurfaced Northern data (both at a high 96% to 98%). Only the Kentish data remain resistant to the shift throughout, with a low WID rate fluctuating between 6% and 30%.

To conclude, the data overview reveals East Midlands to be the locus of the change. The trend was picked up by the West Midlands in the next century and then by the South and the North. Kent remained resistant to the change throughout. The diachronic effect is very strong in the prepositional shift, with more WID tokens appearing after each century. More quantitative analyses will be provided in Chapter 3.

Figure 1.11: Diachronic MID and WID data by region
1.5 Conclusion

This chapter introduces the historical background of Old English and the basic semantics of MID and WIÐ. The core research question concerns the loss of MID in the Middle English period. Previous literature attempted to seek explanation from either a semantic or a cognitive perspective, without any data support. The current thesis aims to offer a new quantitative approach to investigate why, how, when and where the loss of MID occurred with the corpora data. The tokens were extracted from electronic texts in PPCME2, PCMEP and LAEME etc., each tagged with the metadata of genre, period and region. A primary overview of the dataset identifies a strong diachronic effect and indicates the 12th-century East Midlands to be the origin of the change.
Chapter 2. Semantic Change

2.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the diachronic semantic change of both prepositions. By establishing a set of common semantic categories for each token in the historical data, we can easily compare and visualize the historical semantic merger of MID and WID. This merger led to a fierce synonimic competition in the late ME period.

2.2 Semantic Categorization

As mentioned in Chapter 1, both MID and WID have a range of fine-grained semantic meanings. In this section, I further group their different meanings into six major semantic relations: Parallel, Interactional, Spatial, Manner, Opposition and Instrumental. Some vague meanings (such as ‘association’ and ‘like’) are to be discarded under the label of Others. The categorization standard is as follows, with examples quoted from multiple sources:\(^3\):

---

3 *Bosworth-Toller’s Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (hereafter BTASD); *Middle English Dictionary* (hereafter MED); *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Association, accompaniment</td>
<td>Parallel (in physical action)</td>
<td><em>Hic læddon hi of þære byrig mid eallum hire magum</em>&lt;br&gt;they led them of the city with all their children&lt;br&gt;‘They led themselves out of the city with all their kinsmen.’&lt;br&gt;<em>(Jos. 6, 23, BTASD)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional (in metaphysical action)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ic sang uhtsang mid gebroðrum</em>&lt;br&gt;I sang nocturn with brothers&lt;br&gt;‘I sang my night with my brothers.’&lt;br&gt;<em>(Coll. Monast. Th. 33, 25, BTASD)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In the same direction as a stream, wind</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td><em>Þa wende þæt fyr forð mid þam winde to anum þære huse</em>&lt;br&gt;then moved the fire forth along the wind to one of the house&lt;br&gt;‘Then the fire moved with the wind to one of the houses.’&lt;br&gt;<em>(Ælfric Lives of Saints:Julius, OED)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Accompanying condition or demeanor | Manner | Mid godum willan fæstan  
with good will fast  
‘To fast with good will’ |
|---|------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| 3 | Instrumentality | Instrumental | Ne canst þu huntian buton mid nettum  
NEG can you hunt without with net  
‘Can’t you hunt without using a net?’ |
| 4 | Interactional | Interactional | He wolde mid his freondum spræce and  
geþæht habban  
he would with his friends talk and consultation have  
‘He wished to talk to and consult his friends.’ |
| 5 | In respect of/ to | Interactional | (Bd. 2, 13, BTASD) |
| 6 | Association | Others | |
| 7 | Like, in the same way | Others | |

(Blickl. Homl. 37, 27, BTASD)
As Table 2.1 shows, parallel relation denotes a physical comitative relation between two participants, while interactional relation denotes a metaphysical/interactive comitative relation between two participants. They are further split from the previous unified ‘accompaniment’ meaning, according to different contexts. For example, if there is a comitative relation in an actional event, such as go/come/ride MID someone, it is classified as a parallel relation; but if it concerns an interactional event, as in sing/share/make peace MID somebody, it is categorized as an interactional relation. Such a treatment helps differentiate a more refined semantic distinction within the broad comitative meaning. The meaning of ‘in respect to’ frequently appears in an interactive event, as in hold MID someone (‘support someone’) or speak MID somebody, therefore it is also counted as an interactional relation.

Manner relation denotes the way or demeanor in which something is done, as in act MID joy/care/eagerness. Instrumental relation denotes the relation between the tool and the executor, as in fight MID a weapon. Spatial relation generalizes all space-related relations, such as ‘among’, ‘towards’ or ‘in the direction of’. The meanings of ‘association’ and ‘like’ are rather marginal and vague, hence to be excluded from further discussions.

The same grouping also applies to WID’s semantic meanings, with the addition of a new relation, Opposition, which denotes a sense of confrontation, rivalry or defence, see Table 2.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Among</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ic hæfde ðe mid ðam fyrmestan ðe minum hyrede folgodon</em></td>
<td>I had you among the first that my company followed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I held you among the first who followed my company.’</td>
<td><em>(Ors. 1, 1, BTASD)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | Against (spatial)       | Spatial            | *Sætt se hælend wīð ǣs dores*  
                                          sat the savior against the treasury  
                                          ‘And Jesus sat against the treasury...’  
                                          *(Lindisfarne Gospels: Mark 12.41, OED)* |
| 2 | Against (confrontation/rivalry/defence) | Opposition | *Hie gefuhtun wīþ Walum*  
                                          they fought against Welsh  
                                          ‘They fought against the Welsh.’  
                                          *(Erl. 14, 11, BTASD)* |
| 3 | Towards (spatial)       | Spatial            | *Heo sæt wīþ ðæs Hælendes fet*  
                                          she sat near the Lord’s feet  
                                          ‘She sat at the feet of Lord.’  
                                          *(Lk. Skt. 10, 39, BTASD)* |
| 4 | Near/close to           |                   |                                                                           |
| 5 | Communication           | Interactional      | *ne muð hæfæþ, ne wīþ monnum spærc*  
                                          NEG mouth has NEG with man speaks  
                                          ‘(It) has no mouth and speaks not with man.’  
                                          *(OE Riddle 39, OED)* |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Payment for, in exchange of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>By</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For(causal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Until</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Association, accompaniment</td>
<td>Parallel (in physical collocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In the same direction as a stream, wind</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Accompanying condition or demeanor</td>
<td>Manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ferde sum man wiþ hine**
travelled some man with him
‘Some man travelled with him.’

*(Lk. Skt. 10, 33, BTASD)*

**He swore þat he sholde wiþ him halde.**
he swore that he should with him hold
‘He swore that he should side with him.’

*(Havelok 2308, MED)*

**If it be with the streame or with the hill...**
‘If it were in the direction of the stream or the hill...’

*(Of Coulers Good & Euill, OED)*

**A very learned Man with an erect Solemn Air.**
‘A very learned man with an upright solemn air.’
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td><strong>I schal vndo this temple maad with hondis</strong>&lt;br&gt;I shall destroy this temple made by hands&lt;br&gt;‘I shall destroy this Temple that is made by hands’&lt;br&gt;<em>(Wycliffe Bible Mark xiv. 58, OED)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In respect of/to</td>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td><strong>Drihten wiþ Abrahame sprac</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lord to Abraham spoke&lt;br&gt;‘The Lord spoke with/to Abraham.’&lt;br&gt;<em>(Gen. 2303, BTASD)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As before, some marginal meanings such as ‘payment, in exchange of’, ‘by’, ‘association’ and ‘for’ are labelled as *Others* and excluded. The definitions of other semantic categories remain the same as MID’s. As for the oppositional sense, I notice a distinction between the spatial ‘against’ (*sit against something*) and the confrontational ‘against’ (*fight against someone*). The former is subsumed under the spatial relation, which also includes meanings such as ‘towards’ or ‘near’. The latter is subsumed into the oppositional relation. The meaning of ‘communication’ in WID is labelled as an interactional relation, since it concerns an interactive event.

These six relations (Parallel, Interactional, Manner, Instrumental, Spatial and Opposition) comprehensively represent the semantics of MID and WID. Each token in the dataset is then
tagged with either one of the semantic categories. In this way, the historical semantic change can be quantified.

2.3 Diachronic Semantics

Following the above-mentioned semantic categorization, a semantic sheet can be generated as follows, see Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1: Semantic relation in the dataset](image)

After removing tokens of *Others*, I get a diachronic semantic chart like Table 2.3 and Table 2.4.

**Table 2.3: MID’s diachronic semantic tokens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Relation</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4: WID’s diachronic semantic tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Relation</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>1801</strong></td>
<td><strong>1391</strong></td>
<td><strong>3631</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each semantic percentage can then be calculated based on the raw tokens, see Table 2.5 and Table 2.6:

Table 2.5: MID’s diachronic semantic percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic %</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>17.87%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>29.66%</td>
<td>31.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>27.05%</td>
<td>41.50%</td>
<td>45.71%</td>
<td>37.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td>16.48%</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6: WID’s diachronic semantic percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>27.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>14.88%</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>34.80%</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
<td>36.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>63.68%</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>18.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 and 2.6 show each semantic relation with their respective usage percentages in the corresponding century. The data can be visualized by a line graph, as in Figure 2.2 and 2.3.

Figure 2.2: MID’s diachronic semantic change in a line graph
As Figure 2.2 shows, MID’s spatial and oppositional relations remained very low in percentage throughout all periods (<2.5%), and its use of the parallel relation sharply declined during the OE-ME transition period (10th-12th century) but remained steady ever since. On the other hand, MID’s instrumental and manner relations rose sharply in percentage in the 12th century and remained robust in the 13th and 14th centuries. These two relations continued to be productive for MID throughout the rest of ME period. The drop in the parallel and interactional relation may suggest MID’s shrinking use in comitative contexts. MID’s spatial relation invariably remained flat on the ground, indicating a very poor productivity.

![Figure 2.3: WID’s diachronic semantic change in a line graph](image)

In terms of WID, the figure shows that its oppositional relation suffered a great drop in percentage by over 40% between the 10th and the 12th centuries, and continued to decline in the last two centuries. Its spatial relation started off high at 15%, but was in sharp decline after the OE period. Its manner and instrumental relations saw a steady rise in the 12th and 13th centuries and remained steady at 36% and 27% in the 13th and 14th centuries. The interactional relation, one of WID’s core semantics, was in stable use throughout all four periods. WID’s parallel use peaked in the last century, reaching almost 19%.
To summarize, WID experienced a rapid semantic bleaching in the oppositional sense and saw a gradual semantic extension in the classic fields of MID, namely the parallel, manner and instrumental relations. WID’s spatial relation was very robust in the 10\textsuperscript{th} century but did not last into the later periods, meanwhile MID’s spatial relation always remained marginal. Throughout the ME period, MID saw a gradual drop in all relations except in the manner and instrumental relations. Judging from the diachronic pattern, we can conclude that MID’s and WID’s semantics must have become very similar towards the end of the change, rendering them highly synonymic. This lays the semantic foundation for WID to ultimately replace MID.

More detailed discussions on each relation are offered in the following section.

2.4 Relation Analysis

In this section, I compare the diachronic percentages of each semantic relation of MID and WID in detail.

2.4.1 Instrumental

Instrumental relation is one of the core semantics of MID. It only came to be governed by WID in the early ME period (12\textsuperscript{th} century). Table 2.7 shows the diachronic change in the instrumental relation of both MID and WID, while Figure 2.4 shows the change in a diachronic line graph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>17.87%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>29.66%</td>
<td>31.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>17.18%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>27.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: Diachronic instrumental percentages
According to the data, MID had an increase in instrumental use from 17% to 32% between the 10th and 12th century, while WID saw a ground-breaking jump from almost zero instrumental use to 17% in the 12th century and further to 28% in the late ME period. The rapid gain of the instrumental semantics in WID matches Groussier’s account (2001, pp.29-32) that instrumental WID was not a natural development from the OE cognate but a product out of Norse contact.

It is worth noticing that there is one token of vague instrumental use in the OE Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*, but its meaning is open to multiple interpretations, see (1):

(1)

\[ \text{Se man } \text{he wile his synna bewepan · 7 wið god gebetan} \]

the man who desires his sins weep and with good improve

‘The man who desires to weep for his sins, and make satisfaction for them with good…’

(*Ælfric’s Lives of Saints, Ash-Wednesday* 159)

In (1), the quality of being good seems to be treated as a tool to make satisfaction for the sins man has done. This could arguably imply an instrumental reading, as the above translation
from Skeat (1881, p.273) implies. However, it is an unusual way to view a moral quality as a tool, not to mention that *wið god gebetan* can be open for alternative readings such as “(make satisfaction for sins) in exchange of good”. Therefore, this token should be treated with caution. Any full-fledged instrumental *wið* can only be found the earliest in *Ormulum* dating to the 12th century, right after the critical Viking contact.

2.4.2 Spatial

Another semantic relation of great concern is the spatial relation, whose diachronic percentages are attached in Table 2.8 and visualized in Figure 2.5.

Table 2.8: Diachronic spatial percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing diachronic spatial percentage change](image)

Figure 2.5: Diachronic spatial percentage change in a line graph

We can observe from Figure 2.5 that spatial *wið* dropped sharply from 15% to almost nil during the OE-ME transition period and remained very low since then, while MID’s spatial
use always stayed low. Apparently, after the 10th century, the spatial relation became extremely low in productivity (<1%) for both prepositions.

The strong spatial use in OE WID was pushed up by the large number of tokens in the *West Saxon Gospels* (see Chapter 4). Groussier’s (2001) claim on the survival advantage of spatial prepositions might in fact receive some support, but only from the tokens in the 10th century. The later spatial development does not significantly differentiate between the two prepositions (tested by Fisher Exact Test).

2.4.3 Opposition

Due to the semantic restriction, the oppositional tokens fall almost exclusively on WID’s side. Its diachronic distribution is as follows:

Table 2.9: Diachronic opposition percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>63.68%</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.6: Diachronic oppositional percentage change in a line graph
As Table 2.9 indicates, there is still one token of oppositional MID, found in the 10th-century Northumbrian gloss to the Durham Ritual (hereafter DR), see (2):

(2)

LATIN: *et angeli eius proeliabantur cum dracone*

*DR: & ðegnas his gifvyhton mið/við ðæm dræcce*

disciples his fought with the dragon

‘His angels fought with the dragon’

(Durham Ritual 70.12)

This is a rather controversial case, since it appears in the double gloss of *mið/við*. Pons-Sanz’s study (2016) shows that the Northumbrian glossator Aldred tends to place the interpretamentum (a direct translation) of the Latin in the first place of the double gloss and then submit a more native form in the second place. This can explain the use of *mið* here, corresponding to the Latin original CUM (for more details of Latin-OE correspondence, see Chapter 4). However, the use of MID semantically conflicts with the confrontational context, implied by the Latin verb *proeliabantur* (from *proelior*, ‘to battle’). Therefore, the glossator added *við* as a second gloss. This reflects the internal struggle between being truthful to the Latin original words and being coherent in meaning. I adopt both tokens of MID and WIÐ into the dataset to reflect this internal struggle, but except for this token, there exist no more cases of oppositional MID in the dataset.

Figure 2.6 shows the drop of oppositional WIÐ from 63% to 19% in the OE-ME transition period, before reaching a new low of only 1.6% in the 14th century. The loss of opposition is a prominent semantic development of WIÐ in the ME period.

2.4.4 Parallel

Parallel relation is another prototypical semantics of Old English MID. It was gradually absorbed by WIÐ in the ME period. Its diachronic data are as follows:
Table 2.10: Diachronic parallel percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td>16.48%</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>18.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.7: Diachronic parallel percentage change in a line graph

As can be seen from Table 2.10, MID’s parallel percentage started high at 37% in the late OE period, as opposed to a mere 4% of WID’s. However, the percentage gap between them narrowed century by century and in the 14th century WID eventually overpassed MID in the parallel percentage. This reflects the gradual semantic expansion of WID into MID’s another semantic territory.

2.4.5 Manner

Manner is a highly frequently-used semantics for MID and later for WID. Its diachronic percentages are listed as follows:
As the data show, both MID and WID saw a surge in the use of manner after the 10th century, peaking in the 13th century at 45% and 39% respectively. The percentage gap between both prepositions started off rather wide, but gradually narrowed from the 12th century onward. In the 14th century, both prepositions had the manner use at almost the same percentage, another indication of their highly homogeneous semantics in the late ME period.

2.4.6 Interactional

Lastly, we look at the interactional relation. This is a rather stable semantic field for both prepositions, see Table 2.12 and Figure 2.9:
### Table 2.12: Diachronic interactional percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>15.53%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![INTERACTIONAL](image)

Figure 2.9: Diachronic interactional percentage change in a line graph

From the above figure, we can observe that both MID and WID had an almost equal share of the interactional use beginning from the late OE period, at 15% and 13% respectively. Although there was a mild drop of interactional MID in the 12th and 13th centuries, the 14th century saw its rise back again to the same level of WID’s. In general, there was no much diachronic change in the interactional relation.

### 2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the categorization of different semantic relations enables us to compare diachronic semantic change quantitatively. As previously mentioned, Dekeyser (1990) suggests that there existed a semantic shift for WID to gradually replace MID. This is indeed
borne out by the semantic data, in which both prepositions saw a gradual merger in all relations (summarized and juxtaposed in Figure 2.10).

Figure 2.10: Diachronic merger in all semantic relations
As Figure 2.10 demonstrates, in all semantic relations, MID and WID became more and more identical with a gradual collapse of semantic composition. A fierce synonymic competition must have occurred between MID and WID during the ME period as Dekeyser (1990, p. 41) predicts. In the end, WID won out in the competition and was able to replace MID in all of its original semantics.

The semantic transformation of WID from an oppositional preposition to a versatile preposition like MID was a gradual but steady process, especially prominent between the 10th and 12th centuries. WID’s sudden gain of the instrumental semantics is a marked development, which will be further analyzed in the regression chapter.
Chapter 3. Logistic Regression

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I firstly visualize the current dataset by different plots and charts before putting it to a logistic regression. The regression result shows East Midlands to be highly predictive towards WID and a much faster replacement rate of MID by WID in the instrumental relation, which violates the Constant Rate Effect. This is evidence of a potential Norse impact behind the historical loss of MID in English.

3.2 Visualizing the Dataset

As previously mentioned, the current dataset has a total of 4286 MID tokens and 3710 WID tokens, with each token tagged with the metadata of period, region, genre and semantic relation. After removing tokens from unknown regions or labelled as others, the dataset is left with 4163 remaining tokens of MID and 3549 remaining tokens of WID. This cleaned dataset would then be quantitatively studied in this chapter.

Visualization is a helpful way for us to get to know the general picture of the dataset before the logistic regression. Here I use three methods of visualization: the pie chart, the mosaic plot and the association plot.

3.2.1 Pie Chart

A pie chart visually represents the proportion of each category in the whole body by projecting them to different shares of a circular graph. Since the dataset was coded by four variables (region, period, genre and semantic relation), we can generate four pie charts based on each variable, see Figure 3.1-3.4.
Figure 3.1 is a pie chart of the dataset split by five regions. The figure shows that the bulk of the tokens (up to 42%) comes from the West Midlands area, followed by the South (28%) and the East Midlands (18%). These areas produced much of the ME literature, contributing a great many available tokens. Since the Kentish data are geographically limited to Kent only, therefore its proportion is very small (2%) in the pool. The Northern data are also restricted in proportion (10%) due to its data gap in the 12th and 13th centuries.
Figure 3.2 shows the dataset split by four different centuries, except for the 11th century which is missing due to the political upheaval after the Norman Conquest. As we can see from Figure 3.2, the biggest share of tokens (up to 46%) comes from the 13th century when the vernacular English writing was booming after the Norman conversion to English-speaking. According to Thomason & Kaufman (1988, pp.268-269), the Norman nobility “to a great extent began learning English and interacting with monolingual English speakers” in the 13th century. The 10th and the 14th centuries also offer a sizable share of tokens (at 25% and 20% respectively), due to the fully available late OE and late ME texts. The 12th century represents only 8% of the data, due to the slow recovery of English writing in the early Norman rule.
As for genre, Figure 3.3 shows that around 53% of the prepositional tokens were collected from prose, as opposed to 34% from verse and 13% from gloss. This is a reasonable proportion given the greater length of prose writings than verse writings. Since the gloss tokens are restricted to the late OE period, it only takes up 13% of the total.
Figure 3.4 is a pie chart split by six semantic relations (with tokens of *others* discarded). The manner and instrumental relations take up the lion’s share, accounting for 37% and 25% of overall tokens. The parallel and interactional relations follow suit at 19% and 13% respectively, while the opposition and spatial relations remain marginal at below 5%.

To sum up from all four pie charts, the overall data distribution shows that the biggest part of data comes from the region of West Midlands, the period of the 13th century, the genre of prose and the relations of manner/instrumental. This gives us an overall impression of the dataset composition.

3.2.2 Mosaic Plot

Mosaic plot is commonly used to illustrate the distribution of data by representing them in various rectangular mosaic blocks. Different sizes of the rectangles represent different proportions of data branches, with the color indicating either a positive (blue) or a negative
(red) residual value. A positive residual value indicates an above-average level of distribution (an over-representation), while a negative one indicates a below-average level (an under-representation). The intensity of the color shade indicates the degree of deviance of a residual from the default baseline, namely the degree of over- or under-representation of a data branch from the overall average. The white color indicates a normal distribution.

Since there are four variables in the current study, we can make mosaic plots combining at least two of them (since mosaic plots with more than two layers are hard to read). Below are the results.

Figure 3.5: Mosaic plot of relation×period

Figure 3.5 is a mosaic plot combining semantic relation and period. According to the distribution of the rectangular rows, MID (on the left) has a concentration of data in the 10th and 13th centuries, while WID (on the right) has the thickest part of data in the 13th and 14th centuries. This represents different periodical contributions: the majority of MID data comes
from the 10th and 13th centuries, while the majority of WID’s comes from the 13th and 14th centuries.

As for the color, MID’s first two rows of data are mostly blue (interspersed with some white slots), indicating an over-representation of MID in most semantics in the early data. The dark blue ones (the highly-overrepresented ones) include the 10th-century interactional, manner, parallel and spatial relations, as well as the 12th-century instrumental relation. Similarly, the last two rows of WID mostly see the blue color, especially the 13th-century opposition and the overall 14th-century semantics. This indicates its over-representation in the later data. To conclude, early data tend to overuse MID in most semantics (except for opposition), while later data tend to overuse WID instead.

The red rectangles, indicating an under-representation, tend to appear late in the MID block and early in the WID block. In the 13th-century row, MID was flagging red in the interactional, parallel and spatial relations, not to mention its overall underuse in the 14th century. WID, on the other hand, saw an underuse in the 10th-century instrumental, interactional, manner and parallel relations. The distribution of red rectangles from MID to WID looks almost inverted, indicative of an inverted dynamics between the two across time.

In both blocks, there are areas of blue islands interspersed in a predominantly red row, such as WID’s oppositional and spatial relations in the 10th century or MID’s instrumental and manner relations in the 13th century. These represent the semantic relations most attached to a preposition despite the general bias against it. To put it simply, these blue islands should represent the prototypical semantics of the preposition. Therefore, WID’s oppositional relation and MID’s instrumental and manner relations belong to their core semantics, and hence are more resistant to the change in the mosaic plot.

Other mosaic plots include a crossover between semantics and genre or semantics and region, as in Figure 3.6 and 3.7.
Figure 3.6 combines the variable of semantic relation and genre. It shows that prose data are the biggest contributor to both prepositions, while WID’s poem data take up a more prominent share than MID’s. This may be skewed by some lengthy Middle English poems, such as *Ormulum* and *Havelok the Dane*, that only produce WID tokens. They are particularly added in the dataset to fill an unavoidable data gap. In terms of the gloss data, MID’s has a bigger proportion than WID’s.

The color shade shows that MID’s poem data are red in most semantics, a sign of being under-represented, while WID’s poem data are mostly blue, hence over-represented, especially in the relations of instrumental, interactional, manner and parallel. In the prose section, MID’s manner and parallel relations are mildly blue (over-represented) as opposed to its red interactional and spatial relations, while WID’s interactional, spatial and oppositional relations are over-represented (blue) compared to its parallel relation (red). The prose environment does not bias for either preposition in the instrumental relation. Lastly, the gloss data, being early, unsurprisingly over-represent MID in all relations except for the manner
and the instrumental. Gloss also highly biases against WID except in the oppositional relation.

Figure 3.7 shows a mosaic plot distributed across different regions and semantics. The figure shows that the largest proportion of data comes from the West Midlands and the South, with the least to be found in Kent. This is in line with the observation (Figure 3.1) from the regional pie chart.

![Figure 3.7: Mosaic plot of relation×region](image)

Judging from the mosaic color, we can see that the southern data have a strong tendency to over-represent MID in multiple relations, and to under-represent WID in all relations except for the opposition and the spatial. This is roughly the same for the northern and Kentish data. They stand in sharp contrast to the West Midlands and East Midlands rows where WID tends to be more over-represented than MID. Both Midlands represent the most advanced regions in the prepositional shift.
To sum up, the mosaic plots show a strong diachronic shift from MID to WID across centuries, a bias towards WID in the verse context and an advanced trend coming from both East and West Midlands.

3.2.3 Association Plot

The third way to visualize the data is by the association plot. The association plot is rather similar to the mosaic plot by employing bars in different colors, shapes and directions to indicate the data preference. In the current study, if a bar is blue and rising, it indicates an over-representation of MID in that part of data. Otherwise, if a bar is red and falling, it indicates an under-representation of MID or an over-representation of WID in that part of data. The height of a bar stands for “the value of the corresponding Pearson residual” and the width represents “the square root of the expected value in the cell” (Levshina, 2015, p.233).

For each of the four variables, a separate association plot can be produced:

![Association plot of semantic relation](image-url)

Figure 3.8: Association plot of semantic relation
Figure 3.8 is an association plot of semantic relations. The figure indicates that the instrumental, manner and spatial relations are all neutral in their prepositional preference, not over-representing either of the two. However, the oppositional relation is shown to be strongly biased for WID and against MID due to its falling direction and red color. The interactional relation is also mildly so. The parallel relation is strongly biased for MID given its blue color and upward direction. To conclude, parallel is shown to highly prefer MID by the association plot, while opposition and interactional are shown to be biased for WID.

Figure 3.9: Association plot of genre

As for the genre effect, Figure 3.9 shows that prose does not show any prepositional bias, while poem shows a preference for WID. As mentioned, this may be due to the tokens from some of the advanced ME poems like *Ormulum*. On the other hand, being early in time, gloss shows a strong preference for MID instead.
In terms of period, Figure 3.10 shows that the 12th and 13th centuries do not yield any significant bias, while the 10th and 14th centuries significantly diverge with the former over-representing MID and the latter over-representing WID. It is in line with the incremental diachronic shift from MID-dominance to WID-dominance. If we look at the figure from left to right, the plot looks like a gradually falling trend for MID, but a gradually rising one for WID. Both patterns are symmetrically opposite, indicating a reversed diachronic productivity.
Last but not least, Figure 3.11 is an association plot of different regions. It contrasts both Midlands against the others in their association effect. As the color and the shape show, both Midlands regions over-represent WID instead of MID, with the West Midlands even more so than the East Midlands, probably due to a larger text base. As for Kent and the North, they are shown to be highly favorable towards MID, also mildly so for the South. As mentioned, the Northern data are distributed unevenly due to the data gap with a larger number of early data intake. Therefore its high performance in the plot needs to be interpreted with caution. Kent is shown to be rather conservative in the change, even more so than the South.

With these various forms of visualization in mind, we are now more aware of the features of the dataset. I will proceed to conduct a more quantitative analysis on the dataset, by conducting multiple logistic regressions in the next section.
3.3 Logistic Regression

Logistic regression is a statistical method that quantifies the impact of each independent variable on a binary outcome by fitting a logistic model to the dataset. In the current study, it can quantitatively weigh the effect of each variable (region, period, genre and semantic relation) in the historical shift from MID to WID.

Every token in the dataset is tagged with a category of its region, genre and semantic relation, and the period data are entered into the regression model as each specific year (as mentioned in Chapter 1). Moreover, since the opposition relation is almost exclusively predicated by WID yielding no variation, it may create a disturbance (knockout effect) for the model prediction. Hence, the 363 tokens of opposition are further excluded from the logistic regression for a better-fit result. Also, since gloss data are highly restricted to the 10th century only, I collapse them with the prose data to get a smoother overall distribution (since they were a rather fluent translation anyway). Last but not least, the diachronic semantic visualization in Chapter 2 shows that MID and WID’s semantics changed with time, indicative of a potential interaction between the two factors. Therefore, the logistic regression should also take into consideration the potential interactional effect of period and semantics.

I use Rbrul, a linguist-friendly regression script developed by Johnson (2009), for the first stage of regression analysis. Rbrul runs in the R environment by entering the following codes:

```r
source("http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/Rbrul.R")
rbrul()
```

After entering the sorted dataset and setting the interaction for semantic relation and period (as in Relation:Year), I get the following result:
Table 3.1: Result of Rbrul regression

**model formula:** \( \text{Prep} \sim \text{Genre} + \text{Region} + \text{Relation} + \text{Year} \)

+ \text{Relation:Year}

**model.basics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total.n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>intercept</th>
<th>input.prob</th>
<th>grand.proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7349</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-21.047</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**model.fit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>deviance</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>AICc</th>
<th>Somers.Dxy</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6593.861</td>
<td>6623.861</td>
<td>6623.927</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Genre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logodds</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>proportion</th>
<th>factor.weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>4803</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logodds</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>proportion</th>
<th>factor.weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>0.2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East_Midland</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>0.4830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West_Midland   0.753   3037   0.5200   0.68
South          0.596   2058   0.3800   0.645
Kent           -3.801   172    0.0581   0.0219

Semantic Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logodds</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>proportion</th>
<th>factor.weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>16.480</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>-4.955</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>-7.009</td>
<td>2804</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>-7.234</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year

log-odds

+1   0.0163

Relation:Year interaction

log-odds

instrumentality:+1   0.00562
manner:+1            0.00547
parallel:+1          0.00364
interactional:+1     -0.00162
spatial:+1           -0.01311
As Table 3.1 indicates, there are 7349 tokens in the model, with a $R^2$ value of 0.67 and a Somers’ D value of 0.739, signs of a strong and predictive model. In terms of the impact of each variable, the model produces a factor weight for each category, which is an estimated value ranging from 0 to 1. With a factor weight closer to 1, it indicates a stronger predictive ability for the outcome of WID. Otherwise, with a factor weight closer to 0, it indicates a weaker predictive ability towards WID.

Now we can turn to each predicting variable. In terms of genre, prose is slightly more predictive for WID than poem (0.587 vs. 0.413), albeit not by a big difference. The result may be different from the previous association plot due to the deletion of oppositional tokens in the current dataset. Another influencing factor may be the merger of the gloss data with the prose data here.

As for region, both the North and East Midlands are qualified as strong predictors towards WID, both scoring a high factor weight of 0.77 or above. However, given the large data gap in the 12th and 13th centuries in the north, inducing a more drastic data change, the northern result might be skewed and needs to be treated with caution. With a more coherent data distribution, East Midlands appears to be the biggest predictor for the historical shift. As for other regions, both West Midlands and the South respectively score at 0.68 and 0.64, with a weaker predictive power for WID. This is to be expected, since both regions were traditionally regarded as more conservative. The most archaic region is Kent, with an extremely low factor weight of 0.0219, highly resistant to the outcome of WID.

As for the semantic relation, the spatial and the interactional relations have a high factor weight of 0.9 plus, indicative of a strong predictive power for WID. This is already balanced by removing the most skewing category of opposition. The rest of semantics, namely the parallel, manner and instrumental ones, all have an extremely low value of factor weight near 0, indicative of almost no predictive power for WID.
With regard to the period (Year in the model), the result shows a positive effect of each passing year on the outcome of WID. With each year forward, the chance of a WID outcome increases by 0.0163 log-odds. Log-odds is the logarithm of the odds. The odds are the ratio of the probability of a WID outcome divided by the probability of a non-WID outcome, namely \( p/(1 - p) \). Therefore, the Rbrul model suggests that the further down the timeline, the more likely one will get a WID outcome than a MID outcome.

In terms of the period and semantic interaction (Relation:Year interaction in the model), the model shows that with each passing year, the chance of getting an instrumental, manner or parallel WID increases respectively at the log-odds of 0.00562, 0.00547 and 0.00364, while the chance of getting an interactional and spatial WID decreases at the log-odds of -0.00162 and -0.01311. It suggests an incremental semantic expansion of WID into the traditional semantics of MID by each year.

In the next section, a more refined mixed-effects regression will be introduced to reveal the different rates of change in semantics.

### 3.4 Constant Rate Effect

Kroch (1989) puts forward the famous Constant Rate Hypothesis: when a grammatical competition leads to a linguistic change, the rate of replacement is the same in all contexts affected by the change. This effect is called the Constant Rate Effect (hereafter CRE). Many scholars have argued for or against the CRE since, however, in the current lexical study, I observe a breach of this effect due to a different rate of change in different semantic contexts:
As Figure 3.12 (re-attached from Chapter 2) shows, the diachronic merger has very different change patterns in different semantic relations, leading to a reasonable suspicion that the rates of change are different among them. However, since tokens are collected from texts of various lengths, the dataset may be skewed due to varying text sizes. For an accurate
measurement, we should control and equalize different text inputs by using the mixed-effects logistic regression:

\[
\text{model.fit: } \text{Prep} \sim (1 \mid \text{Text_ID}) + \text{Region} + z\text{Year} + \text{Genre} + \text{Relation}
\]

Also, as previously mentioned, semantic relation and period potentially interact with each other, therefore it is necessary to test the interacting effect between them before conducting the mixed-effects logistic regression. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) can quantitatively compare the predicting power of two models. I enter a model with interaction (model.fit2) and a model without interaction (model.fit) into ANOVA and get the following result:

Table 3.2: Result of ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>npar</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>logLik</th>
<th>deviance</th>
<th>Chisq</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;Chisq)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model.fit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4902.4</td>
<td>4965.0</td>
<td>-2442.2</td>
<td>4884.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model.fit2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4871.1</td>
<td>4940.6</td>
<td>-2425.6</td>
<td>4851.1</td>
<td>33.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.997e-09 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘’ 1
According to the result, the model with interaction (model.fit2) indeed significantly outperforms the model without an interaction (model.fit). Therefore, the mixed-effects regression model should have an extra layer of interaction between period and semantics:

\[
\text{model.fit2: } \text{Prep ~ (1 | Text_ID) + Region + zYear + Genre + Relation + Relation:zYear.}
\]

However, with the text inputs equalized and semantic relations interacted with each year, the data became too sparse to successfully converge for the model. This represents the classic dilemma for historical linguists, the pursuit of an accurate result versus the lack of available raw materials. To make the best of the current dataset, I combine the semantic data into two broad branches: the instrumental relation and the non-instrumental relation. This is due to the fact that the instrumental relation represents one of MID’s most classic semantics and was rapidly gained by WID in the ME period. Hence a comparison between the instrumental relation against the rest may yield more interesting results. After the data combining, the model successfully converges:

Table 3.3: Result of mixed-effects regression

Generalized linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood (Laplace Approximation) ['glmerMod']

Family: binomial (logit)

Formula: Prep ~ (1 | Text_ID) + Region + zYear + Genre + Relation + Relation:zYear

Data: data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>logLik</th>
<th>deviance</th>
<th>df.resid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3625.7</td>
<td>3694.7</td>
<td>-1802.8</td>
<td>3605.7</td>
<td>7339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scaled residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10.56</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.1907</td>
<td>17.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random effects:

Groups     Name        Variance     Std.Dev.
Text_ID    (Intercept)  8.016     2.831

Number of obs: 7349, groups:Text_ID, 79

Fixed effects:

| (Intercept)   | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | Pr(>|z|) |
|---------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| RegionKent    | -5.3849  | 1.8503     | -2.910  | 0.00361 ** |
| RegionNorth   | -0.2249  | 1.7511     | -0.128  | 0.89779 |
| RegionSouth   | -1.5122  | 1.1663     | -1.297  | 0.19479 |
| RegionWest_Midland | -1.1995 | 0.9230     | -1.300  | 0.19376 |
| zYear         | 2.4480   | 0.5334     | 4.589   | 4.45e-06 *** |
| GenreProse    | -0.6507  | 0.5733     | -1.135  | 0.25637 |
| Relationinstrumentality | -1.0264 | 0.1515     | -6.774  | 1.25e-11 *** |
| zYear:Relationinstrumentality | 0.8063 | 0.2670     | 3.019   | 0.00253 ** |

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Intr)</th>
<th>RgnKnt</th>
<th>RgnNrt</th>
<th>RgnSth</th>
<th>RgnW_</th>
<th>zYear</th>
<th>GnrPrs</th>
<th>RelIns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RgnKnt</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RgnNrt</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RgnSth</td>
<td>-0.672</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3.3 shows, with 7349 tokens collected from 79 texts, the mixed-effects regression model observes random effects of text variation at the variance of 8.016 with the standard deviation of 2.831. With all textual variance controlled, the variables of Kent (region) and the instrumental relation (semantic) are shown to be significantly slower than the average shift to WID, by the estimates of -5.3849 log-odds and -1.0264 log-odds, as opposed to the intercept of East Midlands and non-instrumental relations. The factor of years, on the other hand, contributes a significant positive effect (by the estimate of 2.4480 log-odds) to the historical shift to WID. This is basically in line with the previous observation from the Rbrul regression.

As for the semantic-period interaction, the model produces a significant result for the instrumental relation:

\[
\begin{align*}
RgnW_\ldots & \quad -0.801 \quad 0.361 \quad 0.390 \quad 0.588 \\
M & \\
zYear & \quad -0.361 \quad 0.004 \quad 0.302 \quad 0.238 \quad 0.070 \\
GnrPrs & \quad -0.540 \quad 0.060 \quad 0.087 \quad 0.173 \quad 0.263 \quad 0.171 \\
RelIns & \quad -0.013 \quad 0.003 \quad 0.012 \quad 0.003 \quad -0.015 \quad 0.022 \quad 0.003 \\
zYr:Ins & \quad -0.010 \quad 0.008 \quad -0.010 \quad 0.003 \quad 0.020 \quad -0.054 \quad 0.001 \quad -0.686
\end{align*}
\]

It means that with each passing year, the shift towards WID is significantly faster (by the rate of 0.8063 log-odds per year) in the instrumental relation than in other relations. This obviously violates the Constant Rate Hypothesis. If a grammatical change was constant, WID’s replacement rate should be constant among all semantic contexts. However, the model here indicates that the replacement rate of MID by WID was much faster in the instrumental semantics.
We can further visualize the different rates of change by different plots. Loess (locally estimated scatterplot smoothing) is often used in the regression analysis by creating a smooth curve across the data points to visualize a change. Due to the one-hundred-year gap between the OE and ME data, Loess cannot successfully converge for the whole dataset. Therefore, I firstly apply it to the Middle English data:

As Figure 3.13 shows, the diachronic change of WID’s percentage is plotted by two curves, the red one representing the instrumental data and the blue one representing the other relations. The x-axis represents the span of years from 1150 to 1400 and the y-axis represents the percentage of WID from 0 to 100%. As we can see, both lines move up in a wavy trajectory with fluctuations, going through two peaks and two dips. However, the fluctuation of the red curve appears to be bigger than the blue one, with a higher first peak and a deeper second dip. Therefore, the rate of change of the instrumental relation should be more drastic than the others.
Another way to view the data is the spline plotting. Spline plot fits a cubic spline onto the dataset whose number of knots is open to customization (knot: breakpoints of the dataset). This means that the user can decide on the number of turning points in-between the curve, avoiding the risk of data overfitting. Figure 3.14 and 3.15 are respectively a spline plot with either 4 or 3 knots on the ME data. Again, the red curve represents the instrumental data while the blue curve represents the other semantics.

Figure 3.14: Spline plot with 3 plots on the ME data

Figure 3.15: Spline plot with 4 plots on the ME data
Both Figure 3.14 and Figure 3.15 consistently show the red curve to have a sharper tilt than the blue one, indicative of a faster rate of change in the instrumental relation, regardless of the change of parameter.

Lastly, a single logistic line is fit to the ME data, as in Figure 3.16. The red logistic line starts off from a lower position but reaches the same height as the blue line, hence indicating a sharper slope. Once again, it confirms the faster rate of change for the instrumental relation.

In order to combine the OE data into the visualization while mitigating the data gap in-between, I regroup the whole dataset into periods of every 50 years for a smoother data distribution. With this re-packed dataset, I re-run the mixed-effects logistic regression, see Table 3.4.
### Table 3.4: Result of mixed-effects regression (regrouped by 50 years)

**Fixed effects:**

|            | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | Pr(>|z|) |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)| 0.7129   | 0.9619     | 0.741   | 0.45859 |
| RegionKent | -5.4587  | 1.8754     | -2.911  | 0.00361 ** |
| RegionNorth| -0.5453  | 1.7752     | -0.307  | 0.75873 |
| RegionSouth| -1.5912  | 1.1770     | -1.352  | 0.17641 |
| RegionWest_Midland | -1.4349 | 0.9360     | -1.533  | 0.12528 |
| zYear      | 2.3330   | 0.5403     | 4.318   | 1.58e-05 *** |
| GenreProse | -0.6466  | 0.5810     | -1.113  | 0.26577 |
| RelationInstrumentality | -1.0421 | 0.1540     | -6.768  | 1.30e-11 *** |
| zYear:RelationInstrumentality | 0.8279 | 0.2667     | 3.104   | 0.00191 ** |

As Table 3.4 indicates, the new result is consistent with the previous one without any regrouping, with Kent, the instrumental relation and the factor of year still being significant predictors with a similar estimate. The rate of change in the instrumental relation is still significantly (p=0.00191 **) faster than the rest of relations. Therefore, the regrouping does not change any previous conclusion. I then create a new spline plot and a new logistic plot for whole dataset (regretfully still not smooth enough for Loess), see Figure 3.17 and 3.18.
Figure 3.17: Spline plot with 3 plots (regrouped by 50 years)

Figure 3.18: Logistic plot (regrouped by 50 years)
Both Figure 3.17 and Figure 3.18 indicate that, with the OE data incorporated and the time period regrouped by 50 years, the slope of change in the instrumental relation remains sharper (if not even more) than the rest of semantics, especially evident in the logistic line. Hence, all evidence points to an actual faster rate of change in the instrumental context, a breach of the renowned Constant Rate Effect.

3.5 Reflection

In the current lexical study, the two competition forms MID and WID competed with each other to realize the semantic functions of parallel, interactional, instrumental, spatial and manner. The form MID was finally replaced by WID, yet the replacement rate seems not to be constant across different semantic contexts, much faster in the instrumental semantics than the rest. According to the Constant Rate Hypothesis, if a single underlying grammatical change occurs, its rate of change would remain constant across different contexts. Since WID replaced MID faster in the instrumental context than the rest, it indicates an underlying lexical change that progressed at different speeds, with a more explosive speed in the instrumental semantics but a slower one in other lexical semantics, therefore violating the assumption of a constant rate.

The faster replacement rate in the instrumental semantics may be due to its nature as a critical product of the Anglo-Scandinavian contact, rather than a natural continuity from the OE linguistic repertoire. Since the Scandinavian WID was the only Germanic cognate to govern instrumentality, it is the most likely origin for the sudden gain of function of the instrumental WID in the early ME period. On the other hand, in other semantic areas the OE cognates were less distinctly different from the Scandinavian ones, hence inducing a less drastic replacement rate.

Another concern is the distinction between surface-observable phenomena (e.g., the use of WID in a manner context) and the underlying grammatical representation. Since the coding
of semantic contexts can be subjective and fluid, it contrasts with other classic CRE examples where clear-cut and distinct syntactic contexts can be made between competing forms. Since lexical-semantic study inevitably involves subjective elements, the interpretation of the CRE result here perhaps requires more caution than the usual syntactic cases.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter studies the historical change by using different data visualizations and regression models. The uses of pie chart, mosaic plot and association plot present to us different aspects of the dataset by different variables, while Rbrul and mixed-effects logistic regressions quantify the predictive effect of each variable numerically. The result shows East Midlands to be highly predictive for the historical change, with Kent being the strongest opponent to the change. The passing of each year increases the chance of the shift towards WID significantly. The mixed-effects regression shows a faster replacement rate of WID in the instrumental semantics, possibly due to the more prominent Anglo-Scandinavian exchange in the instrumental semantics.

The quantitative result here warrants a further detailed look into the qualitative details of different specific periods and regions. More questions need to be answered as to how the change was undertaken in different times and spaces under different sociolinguistic circumstances. Hence, in the following chapters, I will put more flesh on the bones by diving into more fine-grained historical textual analyses.
Chapter 4. Old English Gospels

4.1 Old English Dialects

This chapter focuses on the initial stage of the change in the late OE period, with a cross examination of MID and WID tokens in three OE gospels: the West Saxon Gospels, the Rushworth Gospels and the Lindisfarne Gospels (hereafter WSG, RG and LG). The three dialectal OE gospels were all derived from the Latin Vulgate. This offers a good basis for comparison, especially with common reference to the Latin original text.

Old English dialects can be roughly divided into four groups: the Northumbrian dialect in the North, the Mercian dialect in the Midlands, the West Saxons dialect in the South and the little-documented Kentish dialect in Kent. These four dialects were distinct from each other in phonology, morphology and syntax from very early on.

As shown in Table 4.1, phonologically, the West Saxon dialect was marked by its lack of contemporaneous changes like the raising of /æ/, the retraction of /æ/ to /a/ and the rounding of /a/ before nasal etc. Both the Northumbrian and Mercian dialects, commonly derived from the Anglian Old English, shared many of these common phonological changes. The Kentish dialect was partially similar to the Mercian dialect in some phonological development, but was also distinct in its own way.

Table 4.1: Phonological development in OE dialects

(Toon, 1992, p.416-417)
The same can be said of morphology and syntax. Toon (1992, p.432) observes a series of morphological differences in the infinitival endings, third-person singular forms and the first- and second-person accusative pronouns between the Northumbrian and the West Saxon dialects. Suárez-Gómez (2009) also finds dialectal differences in the distribution of the OE relativisers and the relative clause positions. Kroch, Taylor & Ringe (2000) further points out the difference between the Northumbrian V2 and the West Saxon V2 in the 10th century.

There are other disturbing factors in the scene. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.266) notes that the Anglo-Saxons were clearly still in contact with their continental Frisian and Low Frankish siblings from 500 to 800, based on their common developments in breaking, velar umlaut and palatal umlaut. The linguistic exchange between different North Sea Germanic tribes might have continued even after the Anglo-Saxon migration to England (see Chapter 9). Another problem facing OE dialectologists is “the scarcity of available material and... the dominance of West Saxon” (Suárez-Gómez, 2009, p.58). With the rise of the Wessex Kingdom, it created a focused language\(^4\) like the late West Saxon dialect (Hogg, 2006, pp.365-366, p.404), bringing a masking effect for the study of other dialectal variants.

In the following sections, I will demonstrate the different uses of MID and WIÐ in different dialectal Old English gospels.

### 4.2 Comparison of Gospels

#### 4.2.1 Text Background

A fair comparison of the Old English dialects is always hindered by the uneven distribution of texts across time and space. Most early OE texts (dating to the 7th or 8th centuries) tend to be of Northumbrian and Mercian origins and late OE texts (dating to the 9th or 10th centuries) were mostly of West Saxon origin.

\(^4\) Focused language is defined by Hogg (2006) as a prestigious written language that “rather than having fixed, codified forms...contains a small amount of internal variation” (p.401).
Table 4.2: OE texts across time and space
(Toon, 1992, p.427)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>(Rum, Arwag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>(Ps, Scholus, RuthCr)</td>
<td>(Ch), EpGl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Bede, (Card, BDS)</td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>(LRd)</td>
<td>Bede, (Ch)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch, BGl), ErfGl</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>VPs, LarPr, LarGl</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch, (Med)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ch, Gn, Mart)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>CP, ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>Or, ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>RayGl</td>
<td>ASC, (Med)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch, KrHy, KrGl, KrPr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>Ru2, Li, DurRit</td>
<td>Ru1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that in most periods it was hard to find texts from all regions at once and many early texts were essentially fragmentary or too short to be studied (indicated by the bracket). According to Toon (1992), “only after the middle of the tenth century do we find several varieties (of OE dialects) represented simultaneously” (p.428), namely the Lindisfarne Gospels (Li), the Mercian part of the Rushworth Gospels (Ru1) and the slightly later West Saxon Gospels (dating to around AD 990). The three OE gospels therefore offer a good chance (probably the only chance) for a comprehensive dialectal comparison in the OE period.

The Lindisfarne Gospels was firstly produced at the monastery of Lindisfarne off the coast of Northumberland. The monastery was later attacked by Vikings and forced to move to Chester-le-Street in Durham. In around 950, its original Latin text was glossed word-for-word interlinearly in the Northumbrian Old English by a priest called Aldred (Kroch, Taylor & Ringe, 2000, p.21; Suárez-Gómez, 2009, p.60).

The Rushworth Gospels, also named MacRegol Gospels, were similarly glossed in Mercian and Northumbrian Old English in the 10th century (Kotake, 2017, p.83). Its first part, comprising the whole of Matthew’s gospel, part of Mark’s gospel (1.1-2.15) and part of John’s gospel (18.1-3), was glossed in the Mercian dialect by a priest named Farman. The rest was glossed in the Northumbrian dialect by a glossator called Owun, closely resembling
the glosses in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (Mackowski, 2010, p.3). I only include the Mercian part in the relevant comparison.

Further south, there existed a Wessex translation of the Gospels, the *West Saxon Gospels*. It is the first freestanding translation of the Latin gospels into English by the Winchester School, dating to the end of the 10th century (Suárez-Gómez, 2009, p.60).

All three OE versions were largely based on the common Latin Vulgate Gospels, a classic version used by the Catholic Church since the 4th century. This lays the textual common ground for a fair comparison in various OE dialects.

The mixed use of glosses and translation materials here can be justified, as Pons-Sanz (2001, p.173) comments that the gloss by Aldred was “nothing similar to the mechanical translation of the Latin text”. Curme (1912) also comments that “the (OE) glossator had endeavored to be true to both the Latin and the native tongue” (p.181). Therefore, the genre variation should not cause a huge concern here. Table 4.3 below shows the relative percentages of MID and WID tokens (including non-verbal collocations here) in three OE versions:

Table 4.3: MID and WID tokens in three OE gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num</th>
<th>WID Num</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lindisfarne Gospels</em></td>
<td>493</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rushworth Gospels</em> (Mercian part)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>West Saxon Gospels</em></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result shows that MID’s percentage is the highest in the *LG*, at 91.5%, followed by the *WSG* (88%) and the Mercian part of the *RG* (74%). In all three OE gospels, WID only take up a small proportion ranging from 8% to 25%. This indicates that in the 10th century MID was certainly the dominant preposition in the competition.
4.2.2 *Lindisfarne Gospels*

In this sub-section, I will compare the tokens of MID and WID from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to the source prepositions in the Latin text. Some tokens of non-prepositional use of MID and WID were not included in the comparison, such as *miððy* (a temporal adverb), *wið ḫa huile* and *wið þæt* (a temporal conjunction) etc. Only tokens truly belonging to the prepositional category are counted here. Also, in the *LG* and *RG*, double glosses widely exist, especially when “the scribe (was) confusing two senses of the same Latin word or two distinct Latin words” (Ross, 1932, p.386). Pons-Sanz (2016) suggests that double glosses in the OE manuscripts need to be treated with care. Therefore, all tokens of MID and WID from the double glosses will be taken out for a separate discussion in the following count.

4.2.2.1 *LG* MID

There are in total 493 tokens of prepositional MID in the *LG*, corresponding to 310 tokens of Latin prepositions (including *cum* and *apud*) and 180 tokens of a Latin dative/ablative construction or a non-prepositional phrase. 3 tokens of MID from the double glosses are taken out for a separate discussion. The OE-Latin prepositional correspondence is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Lindisfarne Gospels</em></th>
<th><em>Latin Vulgate</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID tokens</strong></td>
<td><strong>CUM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantics</strong></td>
<td><strong>comitative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Comitative here refers to all ‘accompaniment’ contexts.
The Latin-English translations are quoted below:

**CUM**

*with, together, together with, in connection or company with, along with*

**APUD**

*on to, unto, at, near, around, before*

*(A Latin Dictionary, Lewis & Short, 1879)*

Some examples are given as follows:

(1)

**MID-CUM**

**LATIN:** \( Et \ conuocata \ turba \ cum \ discipulis suis \)

**LG:** \& gecliopad wæs \æt folc mið ðegnum his

\( \text{and summoned (was) the crowd with disciples his} \)

‘And when the people were called together with his disciples…’ *(Mark 8:34)*

(2)

**MID-APUD**

**LATIN:** \( rogauit illum quidam pharisaeus ut pranderet apud se \)

**LG:** baed hine sum ælde wuto ðætte gebrece mið hine

\( \text{bade him some old chief that dines with him} \)

‘A Pharisee (old chief) prayed to him that he should eat with him.’ *(Luke 11:37)*
(3)

**MID-DATIVE/ABLATIVE**

**LATIN:** 

`ne forte conculcent eas pedibus suis`

not perhaps trample-SUB them feet their

**LG:** 

`ðy læs hia getrede ða ilco mið fotum hiora`

that lest they trod those same with feet their

‘Lest perhaps they trample them with their feet’ (Matthew 7:6)

(4)

**NON-PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE**

**LATIN:** 

`ibi dissipuit substantiam suam uiuendo luxoriose`

there dissipated wealth his living lecherously

**LG:** 

`ðer gispilde feh his mið life lustfullice`

there dissipated wealth his in life lecherously

‘And there he wasted his wealth in living lecherously.’ (Luke 15:13)

The prepositional correspondence can be visualized as follows:
As Figure 4.1 shows, the corresponding Latin prepositions to MID are mostly the comitative preposition CUM, accounting for 88% of total corresponding tokens, followed by a spatial preposition APUD at 12%. It is noteworthy that in both Latin and OE prepositional use could be complemented by the alternative dative/ablative construction. Since Aldred apparently preferred the prepositional use over the original Latin dative/ablative constructions, it implies his preference for a more transparent construction in the glossing.

The use of double glosses offers an alternative preposition that co-occurred with MID in the LG, including to, from and of, see (5) to (7).

(5)

**MID / TO**

**LATIN:**  
*ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo*  
I however say to-you NEG resist evil

**LG:**  
*ic sodlice cueðo to iuh ne wiðstonde mið l to yfle*  
I truly say to you NEG withstand with to evil
'But I say to you, that you do not resist evil (persons)’ (Matthew 5:39)

(6)  

**MID / FROM**

**LATIN:** diliges proximum tuum et odio habebis inimicum tuum  
**LG:** lufa ðone neste dinne & mið l from læðo hæfe ðu fiond ðinne  
love the neighbor your with from hatred have you enemy your

‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’ (Matthew 5:43)

(7)  

**MID / OF**

**LATIN:** emerunt ex illis agrum figuli  
they-bought from them field of-potter  

**LG:** gebohton of l mið dæm lond lamwrihta  
bought from with them land of-potter

‘They bought with them (coins) a potter’s field.’ (Matthew 27:7)

The Latin original in (5), resistere malo, expresses a sense of opposition, ‘resist the evil’. To use MID here seems rather odd, therefore the second gloss supplies *to* as an alternative option. Sentence (6) has *mið læðo* ‘with hatred’ to describe an accompanying emotion, and the second gloss *from* seems to emphasize more on the source of the emotion. Sentence (7) is an instance of MID in the instrumental use, *to buy with them (coins)*. The second gloss *of* was perhaps motivated by a direct translation of the Latin original *ex* ‘from, of’. All three double glosses reflect a subtle textual modification, albeit not great changes in nature.
To conclude, MID tokens in the *LG* mostly correspond to the Latin CUM, expressing a comitative sense. This is its main semantics in the *LG*.

### 4.2.2.2 *LG* WID

As for WID tokens in the *LG*, 28 of them correspond to the Latin oppositional prepositions *adversus* and *contra*. Another 12 tokens of them correspond to a Latin temporal adverb *usque* (‘until’), which are not included due to the non-prepositional use. Six tokens are found in the double glosses, taken out for separate discussions. The 28 tokens of Latin-OE prepositional correspondence can be seen as follows.

Table 4.5: Latin prepositions to *LG* WID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lindisfarne Gospels</th>
<th>Latin Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>ADVERSUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin-English translations are quoted:

**ADVERSUS**

*opposite to, against, toward*

**CONTRA**

*against, fronting, in opposition to, contrary to, opposed to*

*(A Latin Dictionary, Lewis & Short, 1879)*

Examples for each correspondence are given below:
The correspondence pattern indicates that LG WID has a unique oppositional semantics, by its match to the Latin contra or adversus.

Another six tokens of WID in the double glosses are quoted below from (10) to (13), three of which occurred in (11) alone. The alternative prepositions from these double glosses include to, from, betiuih (‘between’) and ongægn (‘against’).
‘Lest you may hurt your foot at a stone.’ (Matthew 4:6)

(11)

**WID / FROM**

**LATIN:** separare hominem adversus patrem suum et filiam adversus...

**LG:** to sceadanne monno wið ł from fȩder his & dohter wið ł from...

to separate man against from father his daughter against from

...matrem suam et nurum adversus socrum suam
...moder hire & mag l sunu wif wið ł from swer hire
mother her and son’s wife against from mother-in-law her

‘To part a man against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the son’s wife against the husband’s mother’ (Matthew 10:35)

(12)

**WID / BETWEEN**

**LATIN:** Si Satanas Satanan eicit adversus se divisus est

**LG:** if ðæ wiðerbraca ðone wiðerbraco drifes wið ł betiuuh him todeled wæs
if the Satan the Satan dispels against between him parted was

‘And if Satan casts out Satan, he is parted against himself.’ (Matthew 12:26)
(13)

**WID/AGAINST**

Latin: sedens Iesus *contra* gazofilacium

LG: sætt se hælend *wið* longægn ðæs dores
sat the Saviour *against* the treasury

‘And Jesus sat against the treasury.’ (Mark 12:41)

All of the double-glossed tokens either express a sense of opposition or separation. Sentences (11) and (12) use the alternative *from* and *between* to express a sense of separation and division, while both (10) and (13) express a spatial opposition, calling for the use of alternative spatial prepositions like *against* or *to*. All examples but (10) put WID in the first place of the double gloss, perhaps due to its close correspondence to the Latin *contra* or *adversus*. (10) glossed *to* in the first place, probably motivated by the Latin original AD.

The prepositional correspondence can be visualized in Figure 4.2:

![Latin Prepositions to LG WID](image)

Figure 4.2: Latin prepositions to *LG WID*
To conclude, WID in the LG largely corresponds to the Latin oppositional prepositions, either *contra* or *adversus*, indicating a strong sense of opposition.

4.2.3 *West Saxon Gospels*

The WSG was dated slightly behind the LG in time, but as a translation, it is fully coherent in content without the use of any double glosses. Its Latin-OE corresponding patterns are as follows:

4.2.3.1 *WSG MID*

In total there are 431 MID tokens collected from the WSG, 292 of which correspond to a Latin preposition (including *cum, apud, ex, in, ab* and *sub*) and 139 of which correspond to a Latin dative/ablative construction or non-prepositional phrases. The OE-Latin prepositional correspondence in WSG is shown below and their respective semantics can be summarized as comitative, spatial, instrumental/manner and “by” (as in a passive construction):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSG</th>
<th>Latin Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>CUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>comitative</th>
<th>spatial</th>
<th>instrumental/manner</th>
<th>by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin-English translations for the new prepositions are as below:

**SUB**

*under, below, beneath, underneath*
EX

out of, from

AB

from, away from, out of; down from; since, after; by, at, in, on, etc

(A Latin Dictionary, Lewis & Short, 1879)

Some examples are given as follows:

(14)

**MID-CUM**

LATIN:  *Qui manducat mecum panem, levabit contra me calcaneum sum*

who eats with-me bread raises against me heel his

WSG:  *se þe ytt hlaf myd me ahefp hys ho ongean me*

he who eats bread with me raises his heel against me

‘He who eats my bread shall raise his heel against me.’ (John 13:18)

(15)

**MID-APUD**

LATIN:  *clarifica me tu, Pater, apud temetipsum*

WSG:  *Gebeorhta me mid þe sylfon*

glorify me you father at you self

‘Father, glorify me in your presence.’ (John 17:5)
(16)

**MID-IN**

**LATIN:** Domine, si percutimus in gladio?

**WSG:** Drihten, slea we mid swurde?

Lord whether strike we with sword

‘Lord, should we smite with our swords?’ (Luke 22:49)

(17)

**MID-EX**

**LATIN:** emerunt ex illis agrum figuli

they-bought from them field of-potter

**WSG:** gebohton hig ænne æcyr mid þam feo tigylwyrhtena

bought they one acre with the wealth of-potter

‘They bought with those (coins) a field of the potter’ (Matthew 27:7)

(18)

**MID-AB**

**LATIN:** Cum autem videritis circumdari ab exercitu Jerusalem

when also you-see to-be-surrounded by army Jerusalem

**WSG:** Þonne ge geseoð Hierusalem mid here betrymede

when you see Jesusalem by army surrounded

‘When you see Jerusalem being surrounded by armies…’ (Luke 21:20)
(19)

**MID-SUB**

LATIN: *qui devorant domos viduarum sub obtentu prolixæ orationis*

that devour houses widows’ under pretended extensive prayer

WSG: *Þa þe wudewena hus forswelgath mid heora langsuman gebede*

those who widows’ house devour with their lengthy prayer

‘Those who devour widows’ houses with their pretentious long prayer’ (Mark 12:40)

(20)

**MID-DATIVE/ABLATIVE**

LATIN: *illi autem spongiam plenam aceto, hyssopo circumponente*

they also sponge full of-acid hyssop placed-around

WSG: *Hi bewundon ane springan mid ysopo seo wæs full ecedes*

they bound a sponge with hyssop that was full of-acid

‘They wrapped a sponge which was full of vinegar with hyssop’ (John 19:29)

(21)

**NON-PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE**

LATIN: *quia panes non accepimus*

for loaves NEG we-take

WSG: *namon we hlafas mid us*

take we loaves with us
‘For we have (not) taken loaves with us?’ (Matthew 16: 7)

The token distribution can be visualized as follows:

Figure 4.3: Latin prepositions to WSG MID

Figure 4.3 shows that West Saxon MID still largely corresponds to the Latin CUM, just its LG counterpart. APUD in the WSG takes up a similar 10% as in the LG. However, there are many more minor Latin prepositions involved in the WSG correspondence: IN, EX, SUB and AB. Latin IN appears frequently in an instrumental/manner context, as in *in parabolis loqueris* ‘(you) speak in parables’, *in veritate doces* ‘(you) teach in truth’, *in albis sedentes* ‘sitting in white robe’ and *percutimus in gladio* ‘(we) fight with sword’, all of which were translated by the West Saxon MID. On the other hand, in the corresponding Lindisfarne lines, these Latin IN tokens were often rendered into the Northumbrian *in*, for example: *in veritate doces > in sodfäestnise ðu læres*, and *in gladio > (we geslaa) in suorde*. This reflects a greater lexical freedom in the southern version.

To conclude, WSG MID is consistent with the Lindisfarne counterpart by largely corresponding to the Latin CUM, albeit with more lexical variations.
4.2.3.2 WSG WID

For WID in the WSG, 48 tokens are found to match a Latin preposition, as Table 4.7 shows, including a wide range of semantics such as “proximity”, “against/towards” and “comitative”. It is noteworthy that there are 10 tokens of a WID-CUM correspondence in the WSG, completely unseen in the LG. 10 additional tokens of WID (not included hereafter) correspond to a Latin dative/ablative or a non-prepositional phrase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7: Latin prepositions to WSG WID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WSG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin-English translations for the new prepositions are as follows:

**SECUS**

*by, beside, along, on*

**JUXTA**

*very near, close to, near to*

**CIRCA**

*around, in the environs or neighborhood*

**DE**

*from, away from, down from, out of*
AD

toward, to; near, by, at

(A Latin Dictionary, Lewis & Short, 1879)

Some examples are given here:

(22)

WID-SECUS

LATIN: aliud cecidit secus viam
WSG: Sum feoll wip hæne weg
    some fell near the way

‘Some fell beside the road.’ (Luke 8:5)

(23)

WID-JUXTA

LATIN: Et ecce angelus Domini stetit juxta illos
    and lo angel God’s stood near them

WSG: Pa stod Drihtnes engel wip hig
    then stood God’s angel near them

‘The angel of the Lord stood beside them.’ (Luke 2:9)

(24)

WID-CIRCA

LATIN: aliud cecidit circa viam
Some (of the seeds) fell beside the way.’ (Mark 4:4)

But if your brother sins against you, go...’ (Matthew 18:15)

‘Beware of the scribes.’ (Luke 20:46)
regard and beware against all covetousness

‘See ye, and beware of all covetousness.’ (Luke 12:15)

(28)

**WID-AD**

LATIN: \( et \ missus \ sum \ loqui \ ad \ te \)

and sent I-am to-speak to you

WSG: \( ic \ eom \ asend \ wið \ þe \ sprekan \)

I am sent to you to-speak

‘I am sent to speak to you.’ (Luke 1:19)

(29)

**WID-DE**

LATIN: \( Et \ audientes \ decem, \ indignati \ sunt \ de \ duobus \ fratribus. \)

and disciples ten angry are of two brothers

WSG: \( Þa \ ða \ tyn \ leorningcnihtas \ gebulgon \ with \ þa \ twegen \ gebrothru \)

then the ten disciples become-angry with the two brothers

‘Then the ten disciples become indignant at the two brothers.’ (Matthew 20:24)

(30)

**WID-APUD**

LATIN: \( et \ hic \ diffamatus \ est \ apud \ illum \ quasi \ dissipasset \ bona \ ipsius \)
and this maligned was at him as wasted goods his

WSG: weard wið hine forwreged swylice he his god forspilde
became to him denounced as he his goods wasted

‘And this was accused unto him, as he had wasted his goods.’ (Luke 16:1)

(31)

WID-CUM

LATIN: Quid loqueris cum ea
WSG: hwæt sprycst þu wiþ hig
what speak you with her

‘What do you say to her?’ (John 4:27)

(32)

WID-DATIVE/ABLATIVE

LATIN: Quare hoc unguentum non venit trecentis denariis
why this ointment NEG sold three-hundred coins

WSG: Hwi ne sealde heo thas sealfe wiþ thrim hundred penegon?
why NEG sold he the salve for three hundred pence

‘Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence?’ (John 12:5)
NON-PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE

LATIN: aliocin adhuc illo longe agente legationem mittens rogat
otherwise still there far will-act messenger sending ask

WSG: gif he þonne wið hine gefeohtan ne mæg, he sent æryndracan
if he then against him fight NEG may he sends errand

‘Or else the other is afar (if he may not fight against him), he sends a messenger’
(Luke 14: 32)

The Latin-WID prepositional correspondence in the WSG can be seen in Figure 4.4. We can compare it to the pattern in the LG (Figure 4.2 reattached below):

Figure 4.4: Latin prepositions to WSG WID
The comparison shows that the West Saxon WID is much more lexically variable in its Latin correspondence, especially in the spatial sense, since 58% of the tokens correspond to the Latin secus, juxta and circa. Its unexpected correspondence to the Latin CUM mostly concerns a speak+WID collocation, which will be further dealt with in Section 4.3.4.

To summarize, the most prominent sense in the WSG WID is spatial proximity, manifested by its frequent correspondence to secus, juxta and circa. Opposition is not a major semantics for the WSG WID, as opposed to the LG WID.

4.2.4 Conclusion
With the Latin Vulgate serving as the vorlage, we can compare three versions of Anglo-Saxon gospels by a common Latin reference. This facilitates a more objective semantic discussion. MID’s Latin correspondence was mostly CUM, highly homogeneous across north and south. On the other hand, WID had divergent semantics between regions, with the LG WID specializing in the oppositional semantics, and the WSG one specializing in the spatial semantics. Given the high prestige of the gospel books in Christianity, the glossing and translation should be done in an extremely careful and truthful manner. Hence, the gospel evidence offers a valuable insight into the early dialectal difference of MID and WID in the late OE period.
4.3 Semantic Analysis

4.3.1 Semantic Overview

As introduced in Chapter 3, six semantic relations are identified for MID and WID, namely instrumental, interactional, manner, opposition, parallel and spatial relations. Below is a semantic analysis of the WID tokens (verbal collocation) in all three gospels.

Table 4.8: Semantic comparison of WID in three OE gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG</th>
<th>RG (Mercian)</th>
<th>WSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>2 5.4%</td>
<td>3 11.12%</td>
<td>17 31.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>1 2.7%</td>
<td>0 0.00%</td>
<td>3 5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>30 81%</td>
<td>22 81.48%</td>
<td>8 14.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 3.70%</td>
<td>5 9.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>4 10.9%</td>
<td>1 3.70%</td>
<td>21 38.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37 100.00%</td>
<td>27 100.00%</td>
<td>54 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.8 shows, their WID tokens are rather divergent in semantics: the LG and the RG WID have a much higher (above 80%) percentage of the oppositional use, while the WSG one focuses more on the interactional and spatial semantics (both above 30%). I will further elaborate on their semantic difference in the following sections, especially in the fields of opposition, interactional and spatial relations, followed by an extra study of another late Wessex writer, Ælfric, and his idiosyncratic use of WID.

4.3.2 Oppositional WID and AGAINST

A cross-examination between the Lindisfarne WID tokens and the corresponding lines in the Latin and West Saxon versions reveals a major difference in the lexical choice: while the LG scribe almost always translated the Latin adversus and contra into WID, the WSG scribe preferred to use AGAINST (or marginally at or on) in the same contexts. Below is the summary of the result from the cross-examination (see Appendix for line details).
Table 4.9: *LG WID and WSG AGAINST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Vulgate</th>
<th>Lindisfarne Gospels</th>
<th>West Saxon Gospels</th>
<th>Occurrence times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contra</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adversus</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>Non-prepositional phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contra</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>at, on</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.9 indicates, the Latin-*LG-WSG* triplet (adversus/contra-WID-AGAINST) occurs 25 times in total, a rather neat correspondence. Some examples are quoted below:

(34) **ADVERSUS-WID-AGAINST**

LATIN:  
*et omne concilium quaerabant adversum iesum testimonium*

LG:  
*all þæt somnung sohton wið ðone hælend cyðnisse*

and all the council sought against the Saviour testimony

WSG:  
*þa heahsacerdas sohton eall gepeaht tale agen þone hælend*

the high-priests’ sought all council slander against the Saviour

‘And all the council looked for testimony against Jesus...’ (Mark 14:55)

(35) **CONTRA-WID-AGAINST**

LATIN:  
*omne concilium quaerabant falsum testimonium contra iesum*

LG:  
*all ðiu somnung gesohton lesa witnessa wið ðone hælend*

WSG:  
*eall þæt gemot sohton lease saga ongen þone hælend*
all the council sought false witnesses against the Saviour

‘The whole council looked for false evidence against Jesus...’ (Matthew 26:59)

(36)

CONTRA-WID-AT

LATIN:  
et altera maria sedentes contra sepulchrum

LG:  
& òdero sittendo wið ðæt byrgenn

WSG:  
seo òdero Maria sittende æt þære byrge

the other Maria sitting against the sepulchre

‘And another Mary was there, sitting against the tomb.’ (Matthew 27:61)

(37)

CONTRA-WID-ON

LATIN:  
onne regnum diuisum contra se

LG:  
eghuelc ric todæled bið wið him

all kingdom parted be against it

WSG:  
ælc rice þe byð twyræde on him sylfum

all kingdom that be parted in it self

‘Each kingdom (that) is parted against itself’ (Matthew 12:25)

(38)

ADVERSUS-WID-NON.PREPOSITIONAL

LATIN:  
adauersus se diuisus est
Besides the classic correspondence of *adversus/contra-WID-AGAINST* in (34) and (35), some minority patterns are also seen in (36) to (38). (36) describes Mary sitting against the sepulchre as a case of spatial opposition, but the WSG scribe translated it with a more neutral proximity preposition *at*, as in the Modern English case of *she was sitting at grandma’s feet reading books*. Sentence (37) describes a state of self-division and the WSG scribe alternatively employed *on*, since *on* in OE time was parallel to *in*, therefore rendering the phrase into *divided (with)in itself*. In (38), the WSG scribe even translated the sentence without using any preposition. These three sentences show that the WSG scribe generally had more lexical liberty in the translation.

The WID-AGAINST pair may arise from different regional customary uses, with WID highly popular in the north and AGAINST preferred by the Winchester School. It is worth noting that such a lexical choice is not set in stone, there are occasional mix-uses in both texts. Table 4.10 summarizes the occasions in which the *LG* glossator supplied AGAINST either in the double gloss or as an independent lemma.

Table 4.10: Lindisfarne AGAINST and its correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th><em>LG</em></th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th><em>WSG</em></th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:41</td>
<td>sætt se hælend wið længægn ðæs dores</td>
<td><em>Et sedens iesus contra gazophilaciunm</em></td>
<td>Da sæt se hælend ongen þone tollsceamol</td>
<td>‘Jesus sitting against the treasury’</td>
<td>spatial opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10 shows that AGAINST in the LG appears twice as a double gloss beside WID, once beside another synonymous spatial preposition *togægnes* ‘against, towards’, and twice as an independent lemma. In terms of Latin correspondence, AGAINST matches the Latin preposition *contra* four times, twice arising from a context without any Latin preposition.

Five of the LG AGAINST correspond to the same WSG AGAINST, with one corresponding to a non-prepositional phrase in the WSG. In terms of semantics, it can either govern a spatial opposition (as in *sit against something*) or a confrontational opposition (as in *folk shall rise against folk*), although in 4 out of 6 times (66.66%) it governs a spatial opposition. The result indicates that AGAINST was equally available in the Northumbrian Old English, albeit at a lower frequency than WID and perhaps more specialized in the spatial opposition.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:26</td>
<td><em>dio is fora ongægn</em> galilea</td>
<td><em>quae est contra galilaeam</em></td>
<td><em>pæt is foran ongen</em> Galileam</td>
<td>‘...that is against Galilee’</td>
<td>spatial opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:10</td>
<td><em>arisað cynn wið l ongægn cynne</em></td>
<td><em>gens contra gentem</em></td>
<td><em>þeod arist agen þeode, rice agen rice</em></td>
<td>‘Folk shall rise against folk’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:18</td>
<td><em>forða l foreðon &amp; ongægn l togægnes cuom him ðe here</em></td>
<td><em>propterea et obuiam uenit ei turba</em></td>
<td><em>forði him com seo menio ongean</em></td>
<td>‘And therefore, the people came, and met with him’</td>
<td>spatial opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:19</td>
<td><em>he ahefeð l ongægn mec hel his.</em></td>
<td><em>leuabit contra me calcaneum suum</em></td>
<td><em>ahefþ hys ho ongean me</em></td>
<td>‘...shall raise his heel against me’</td>
<td>spatial opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25</td>
<td><em>buta oðrum yfe ongægn</em></td>
<td><em>quia odio me habuerunt gratis</em></td>
<td><em>pæt hi hatedon me buton gewyrhton</em></td>
<td>‘They had me in hate without cause’</td>
<td>Confrontational opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reverse is also true in the WSG, where 8 tokens of oppositional \textit{wîð} are found, see Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: West Saxon oppositional \textit{wîð} and its correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>WSG</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>\textit{LG}</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 11:4</td>
<td>\textit{we forgýfað ælcum þara be wîð us agyltað}</td>
<td>\textit{Ipsi dimittimus omni \textit{deben}ti nobis}</td>
<td>\textit{æc we forgefes egwelc scylde us}</td>
<td>‘...as we forgive to each man that sins against us’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:1</td>
<td>\textit{Warniað wîð Farisea lære þæt is licetung}</td>
<td>\textit{Adtendite a fermento Pharisaorum quae est hypocrisis}</td>
<td>\textit{behaldað gie iuih \textit{from} dærste þæt is esuincise}</td>
<td>‘Be ye ware \textit{of} the sourdough of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:15</td>
<td>\textit{warniað wîð ælce gysunge}</td>
<td>\textit{cavete ab omni avaritia}</td>
<td>\textit{behaldað \textit{from} egwelcum gitsunge}</td>
<td>‘Beware \textit{of} all covetousness’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 14:32</td>
<td>\textit{gif he bonne wîð hine gefeohtan ne mæg, he sent æryndracan}</td>
<td>\textit{aliaquin adhuc illo longe agente legationem mittens rogat}</td>
<td>\textit{oðero ðingo l ðaget him longe l fearre doend erendureca sende}</td>
<td>‘If he then could not fight \textit{with} him, he sends a messenger (while the other is still afar)’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:3</td>
<td>\textit{Wrec me wîð minne wîðerwinnan}</td>
<td>\textit{Vindica me de adversario meo}</td>
<td>\textit{Wrec \textit{du} mec of wîðerworde minum}</td>
<td>‘Venge me \textit{of} my adversary’</td>
<td>confrontational opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 4.11, the WSG WID never corresponds to a Latin *contra/adversus* or a *LG* WID, but they arise from contexts when the Latin original uses marginal oppositional prepositions like *a, ab, de* and *in*. These marginal prepositions mostly appear in set verbal collocations, whose oppositional senses are not clear-cut except from the verbal semantics. All tokens involved belong to the confrontational opposition. The *LG* counterparts are glossed in a close word-for-word correspondence to the Latin version, as in: Latin *in* > *LG in*, Latin *de* > *LG of* and Latin *ab* > *LG from*. In general, the WSG WID tokens seem to be motivated by fixed verbal collocations rather than its own oppositional semantics.

The north-south WID-AGAINST divide extends beyond the current texts. It is also reflected in the Old English Psalter-Glosses. Old English Psalter-Glosses are a collection of Latin-OE psalter psalms written by different hands, containing Manuscripts A to P⁶ (Kitson, 2002, p.474). Scholars like Gretsch (2000, p.88) and Pulsiano (1991, p.196) claim that these glosses

---

can be divided into three distinct groups: the A-type (consisting of Psalter A, B and C) representing a 9th-century Mercian dialect, the D-type (Psalter D, F and J) representing an early form of the West Saxon dialect and the I-type (Psalter I) representing a late West Saxon dialect from Winchester. A search in the Psalter-Glosses yields the same divide between the choices of WID and AGAINST (including its various forms of ongean, ongen, angean, agen, togeanes etc.) for the Latin CONTRA and ADVERSUS, see Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Examples of WID-AGAINST divide in Psalter-Glosses
(Pulsiano, 2001)

Psalm 3.2:

aduersum

\[\text{wið AC, wiþ B, ongean DE}, \text{ongean HIK, togeanes FGJ}\]

Psalm 22.5:

aduersus

\[\text{wið AJ, ongen BC, ongean DE}^{*}\text{HK, ongean } G^{*}, \text{ongeanes F}, \text{agen hi } \text{agenes I}\]

Psalm 30.18:

aduersus

\[\text{wið ABC, ongean DGHJ, ongen E}^{*}\text{*, togeanes F, togenes IK}\]

Psalm 43.16:

contra

\[\text{wið AB, wiþ J, ongen C, ongean D}^{*}\text{E}^{*}\text{FGHK*, togeanes I}\]

As Table 4.12 shows, WID tends to appear in the A-type manuscripts (A, B, C), while AGAINST in the latter two types (D, F, J, I). Since the A-type was mostly of Mercian origin, it again confirms a Northern/Midlands origin of the oppositional WID. On the other hand, the Wessex types were more preferential to AGAINST, as the way in the WSG. Therefore, the divide between WID and AGAINST must have widely existed in different OE texts and dialects. This is the first dialectal feature concerning OE WID.
4.3.3 Interactional WID

As introduced in Chapter 2, the interactional relation describes a comitative relation in an interactional event. WSG WID has a higher interactional percentage than the other two versions, see Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Interactional WID in three OE gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG</th>
<th>RG (Mercian)</th>
<th>WSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
<td>31.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.13, we can see that interactional WID constitutes 31% of the total WSG WID tokens, but only 5% and 11% of such can be observed in the LG and RG (Mercian) data. A more careful inspection reveals that the WSG interactional WID mostly arises from a specific West Saxon verbal collocation, *speak+WID*. Since SPEAK is a common communicative verb, the frequent occurrence of *speak+WID* greatly adds to the instances of interactional WID in the WSG data. On the other hand, the Lindisfarne and Rushworth (Mercian) scribes preferred the collocation of *speak+MID*.

In Modern English, there is a fine line between *speak+WITH* and *speak+TO*, of which the former mostly implies an interactive exchange, as in *the prime minister wishes to speak with the Queen*, and the second of which denotes a unidirectional tone by an authoritative body, as in *the boss is speaking to the employees*. We can differentiate different types of tones in the gospels by referring to the *speak*-collocations in the modern translation. Table 4.14 summarizes the instances of different SPEAK collocations in both tones across the LG, the WSG and the Latin Vulgate (see Appendix for line details).
Table 4.14: SPEAK collocation across various gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone (from modern translation)</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>LG</th>
<th>WSG</th>
<th>RG (Mercian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidirectional (<em>speak to</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT/ABL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DAT/ABL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive (<em>speak with</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>with 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT/ABL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DAT/ABL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mid 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some corresponding examples are given below (in the order of Tone:Latin/LG/WSG):

(39)

**Interactive: CUM/MID/WID**

LATIN: *qui loquitur tecum*

*LG*: *seðe spreces ðec mið*

who speaks you with

*WSG*: *se ðe wið be sprycð*

who that with you speaks

‘...who speaks with you’ (John 9:37)

(40)

**Interactive: CUM/MID/TO**

LATIN: *erant loquentes cum iesu*
& woeron sprecende mið ðæm hælende
were speaking with the Saviour

& to him spæcon
to him spoke

‘and they spoke with Jesus’ (Mark 9:4)

(locutus est cum principibus sacerdotum)

speccend wes mið aldormonnum sacerda
speaking was with chief of-priests

spæc mid para sacerda ealdormannum
spoke with the priests’ chief

‘and spoke with the chief of the priests’ (Luke 22:4)

(locutus est cum principibus sacerdotum)

quaerentes loqui ei
seeking to speak with him

‘seeking to speak with him’ (Matthew 12:46)
Unidirectional: AD/TO/ WID

LATIN: missus sum loqui ad te et haec tibi evangelizare

LG: sendet am þæt ic sprece to ðe & ðas ðe gebodage
sent am that I speak to you and this to-you evangelize

WSG: ic eom asend wið þe sprecan & þe ðis bodian
I am sent to you speak and you this evangelize

‘And I am sent to speak to you and to tell you the good news.’ (Luke 1:19)

As can be seen from Table 4.14, for the unidirectional tone the Latin text tends to use the dative/ablative construction (4/6=66%), as well as the directional preposition ad (‘to’), while West Saxon version consistently uses the collocation speak+WID. The Lindisfarne version follows closely the Latin wording by the use of dative/ablative and to.

As for the interactive tone, the Latin Vulgate predominantly (9/11=81.8%) uses the preposition CUM and the Lindisfarne glossator followed suit by predominantly using MID. The West Saxon scribe used MID twice in this context (both corresponding to the Latin CUM), but still mostly (6/11=54.5%) preferred speak+WID.

The translation correspondence shows that the WSG uses speak+WID in a large number, in all of the unidirectional cases and half of the interactive cases. The Mercian part of the RG only produces one token of speak+WID in the interactive context, not enough for a detailed discussion.

Since the WSG is a more fluent translation than the LG, I suspect the translation effect to be in play. To further investigate this, I conducted a search of different SPEAK collocations (speak+mid/to/with) in the YCOE corpus (The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose, Taylor et al., 2003-). Discarding texts with too few tokens, the result is summarized as follows:
Table 4.15: SPEAK collocation in the YCOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Total Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric's Homilies Supplemental</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>32 3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric's Lives of Saints</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blickling Homilies</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies I</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric's Catholic Homilies II</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (E)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology, I</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede's History of the English Church</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5 9 2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boethius, Consolation of Philosophy</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cura Pastoralis</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory's Dialogues (C)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1 16 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel of Nicodemus (A)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel of Nicodemus (C)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptateuch</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>51 15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-Saxon Gospels</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2 14 11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Result</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 187 48</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.15, we can see that all but two tokens of *speak*MID are to be found in translated texts and Fisher’s exact test also shows a significant correlation between translated
texts and the use of *speak+MID*, at the level of $p=0.0558$. Therefore, it is very likely that *speak+MID* was an artificial linguistic product arising from translation. Since the WSG has a freer lexical choice than the *LG* as previously shown, its use of *speak+WID* must have been a more natural reflection of the native linguistic repertoire.

It is noteworthy that there exists a rare case of *speak+WID* in the *LG*, see (44). This is used in the absence of a Latin CUM, indicating that *speak+WID* might have been a more native choice without the Latin prime.

(44)

LATIN: *mihi non loqueris?*

*LG: me uiað ne spreces du?*

me with NEG speaks you

‘Do you not speak to me?’ (John 19:10)

To conclude, OE interactional WID was more natively used in the SPEAK collocation. This also testifies the potential translation effect exerted by the Latin prime.

4.3.4 Spatial WIÐ

In the WSG, WIÐ was productively used as a spatial proximity preposition, as in (45), a usage completely absent in the northern or Midlands counterparts. Again, this represents a true north-south divide, since the only spatial use of WIÐ that the *LG* scribe employed is like (46) and (47).

(45)

**BESIDE**

LATIN: *cum esset secus locum*

*WSG: pa he was wið pa stowe*

when he was beside the place
‘When he was beside the place’ (Luke 10:31)

(46)

AGAINST

LATIN: et sedens Iesus contra gazofilacium

LG: sætt se hælend wið læng æs dores
sat the Saviour against the treasury

‘And Jesus sat against the treasury’ (Mark 12:41)

(47)

TOWARDS

LATIN: Usque in infernum descendes

LG: wið helle ofdune gestigdes ðu
towards (in) hell down descend you

‘You shall go down to hell’ (Matthew 11:23)

The spatial relation respectively takes up 10% and 38% of all WIÐ tokens in the LG and WSG:

Table 4.16: Spatial WIÐ in LG and WSG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LG</th>
<th>WSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIÐ</td>
<td>WIÐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4.16 indicates, the southern use of spatial WID (39%) was much greater than in the north (10%) by percentage and by pure numbers. Semantically, they are rather different as well. The WSG has 21 tokens of spatial WID, all pertaining to the meaning of ‘near, by’, while the LG only has tokens related to spatial meanings such as ‘against’ or “towards”.

They are rather different in their Latin correspondence as well. The West Saxon WID frequently corresponds to the Latin proximity prepositions secus and juxta. However, in the same contexts the Lindisfarne glossator would use at or neh ‘nigh, near’ in the glossing. The Mercian RG, on the other hand, uses another spatial preposition be ‘by’. Their correspondence can be summarized as follows (for detailed correspondence see Appendix):

Table 4.17: Proximity prepositions across various gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>WSG Prep.</th>
<th>RG Prep.</th>
<th>LG Prep.</th>
<th>Wycliffe Translation</th>
<th>Occurrence times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>at/neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxta</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxta</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>at/neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxta</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxta</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>at/neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxta</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secus</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>at/neh</td>
<td>‘beside’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below shows a classic correspondence of with-by-at/neh across gospels:
Different prepositions may represent different lexical preferences in the Lindisfarne, West Saxon and the Rushworth (Mercian) Gospels. In fact, many of these prepositions (near, by and at) continue to express spatial proximity in Modern English, as in *the apple fell by/near the road* and *the guest arrives at the door*. The spatial use of *wið*, however, is now lost in English.⁷ Such a proximity use of *wið* was also productive in Old Norse and remains so in its modern descendants, see the following examples from Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and Icelandic:

(49)  

**Danish:**

*Huset ligger ved vejen.*  
the-house lies by the-road  
‘The house is situated by the road.’

---

⁷ However, the OED (“with, prep., adv., and conj.”) reveals some remnant spatial jargon use in as late as the 18th century, see Chapter 9.
Norwegian Nynorsk:

_Huset ligg ved veugen._
the-house lies by the-road
‘The house is situated by the road.’

Swedish:

_Han står där, vid min bil._
he stands there by my car
‘He stands there, next to my car.’

Icelandic:

_Ég stend við veginn._
I stand by the-wall
‘I’m standing next to the wall.’

The frequent use of proximity WIÐ in the WSG, shows a high resemblance to the Scandinavian cognates. This may have resulted from some early common linguistic exchanges across the North Sea (see Chapter 9).

To conclude, the WSG WIÐ had a vibrant spatial proximity sense unseen in the Midlands nor in the North. This represents another major lexical difference with a north-south divide in the OE period.
4.3.5 Ælfrician Old English

Ælfric of Eynsham is a major contributor to the late OE literature in the 10th century. He was a prolific homily writer both in Latin and in Old English. His literary language is often lauded as the fine specimen of the late West Saxon dialect (Gneuss, 1972, p.75). To compare the contemporary intra-dialectal difference of MID and WID in the south, I took a sample from his writing *Lives of Saints* (composed in 998, see Scheil, 2014, p.5) to further examine. This text, albeit with a corresponding Latin version, is a free-standing creation by Ælfric rather than a translation (Taylor, 2008, p.360). The use of WID in this text is very different to that in the WSG, see Table 4.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ælfric’s Lives of Saints</th>
<th>WSG</th>
<th>RG (Mercian)</th>
<th>LG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>instrumentality</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interactional</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>manner</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opposition</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80.36%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>parallel</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>spatial</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.18 shows, Ælfric’s WID tokens have a stronger oppositional sense than those from the *West Saxon Gospels*. The Ælfrician WID tokens see a high 80% used in the opposition semantics, equivalent to the LG’s and RG’s percentages, with the WSG only recording a low 14.8%. As previously mentioned, there is one suspicious token of instrumental WID open for alternative readings here. Also, only 5 out of the 56 WID tokens (9%) express a spatial relation in *Lives of Saints*, almost half of which in a spatial proximity sense and the rest in a ‘towards’ sense, seemingly a mix of the LG and WSG usages. This is very different from the high spatial percentage (38.9%) in the WSG tokens, despite both belonging to the late Wessex group. To sum up, the Ælfrician use of WID was semantically
very different from its southern peer, sharing more similarities with the northern or Midlands varieties.

This may reflect the internal variance in the so-called focused language group of late West Saxon. Hogg (2006, pp.400-401) also mentions that internal differences must have existed within the seemingly uniform late West Saxon dialect. Kitson (1993, pp.7-11) further points the possible origin of Ælfric’s idiolect to S Gloucs/ N. Wilts/ N. Somerset, based on his early use of non-West-Saxon features, such as wið...weard +ACC, a feature that Ælfric later came to suppress after the Catholic Homilies either due to its marked provincialism or archaism. Another study by Takeuchi (1998) shows that Ælfric had an idiosyncratic lexical choice, preferring unusual verb forms like andwyrdan and forgyfan to create an archaic style. Therefore, we should not simply equalize Ælfric’s language with the rest of the Winchester Group, since each writer in this group had their own liberty in the choice of words. In fact, not only Ælfric, another prominent OE writer Wulfstan also had his own set of preferred vocabulary different from the classic Winchester vocabulary, as Gneuss (1972, pp.79-80) points out.

What seems particularly important for our argument is the fact that those contemporaries of Ælfric who otherwise kept to Standard Old English felt themselves at liberty, in their choice of words, to follow their own inclinations or other models.

Gneuss (1972, p.79)

Therefore, it is likely that the Ælfrician language had a more northerly color than his contemporaries, at least in the use of MID and WID. Kitson (1993) comments that “Ælfric’s literary dialect was based on the speech of north-west Wessex, in contradistinction to the Winchester area” (p.24), although Ælfric was intensively trained in the Winchester tradition under Bishop Æthelwold. It is possible that Ælfric retained some covert traces of his original patois from a more northerly region in Wessex, a region that may have been historically influenced by the Mercian dialect, since “standard Mercian was of considerably more...
importance as a *schriftsprache* in the ninth century than was standard West Saxon in the tenth century” (Kitson, 1993, p.20).

To conclude, the dialectal situation in the OE period was very fluid. As Hogg (2006, p.413) notes that “there was certainly a wide dialectal variation in this large area of the South and the South Midlands”, the notion of a unitary late West Saxon dialect may be just a myth. The different uses of WID in the OE time show both an inter- and intra-regional variation. A north-south divide was obviously present, as well as an internal variance within the late West Saxon group.

### 4.4 Conclusion

The study of MID and WID in the OE gospels yields many meaningful results. Firstly, with reference to the Latin source prepositions, I find a consistent semantics of MID across regions, but a great variation between northern and southern WID, especially in the oppositional, spatial and interactional relations. Oppositional WID was a very northern feature and was frequently substituted by AGAINST in the WSG. Spatial WID was very common in the WSG, especially in the proximity sense. The SPEAK collocations varied significantly between *LG* and WSG, probably due to a translation effect. The *LG* followed a strict word-for-word glossing strategy while the WSG translation was done more naturally. The introduction of Ælfric’s work offers a new perspective to the comparison, showing that intra-dialectal variance may also have existed within the seemingly uniform late West Saxon group. To sum up, this chapter shows that the use of WID in the OE time was very fluid and variable from region to region. On the other hand, the use of MID was more consistent across dialects.
Chapter 5. East Midlands Scandinavianism

5.1 Middle English and Anglo-Scandinavian Contact

Middle English period began from the Norman rule until the 15th century, during which period major simplification occurred in the OE grammatical system, leading the language into a more simplified and analytic direction. The gradual collapse of the OE inflectional system boosted the rise of the use of prepositional constructions. Due to the change of ruling class, many early ME texts were written in Norman French. Vernacular English writings resurfaced significantly after the 12th century in a range of local dialects without a standard form, and above all, some of them showed a deep Scandinavian influence.

Among different ME dialects, the most prominent one is the East Midlands dialect, a type arising from the traditional Danelaw region. Danish Vikings established extensive permanent settlements in eastern England during the 9th and 10th centuries, covering the shires of York, Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, Leicester, Northampton, East Anglia and southern Northumbria (Ekwall, 1936, p.134). The historical Anglo-Scandinavian contact in this region produced a local dialect riddled with Norse features.

Figure 5.1: Scandinavian settlements in 10th-century England

(Blair, 2000, p.50)
As Figure 5.1 shows, Viking settlements in Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Cornwall and the Northwest were mainly of Norwegian (“Norse” in a narrow sense) extraction, while those in Northern and Eastern England were mainly of Danish origin. Scandinavian place name elements such as -by, -thorp and -thwaite are common in Danelaw (Trips, 2001, pp.29-30). Norse grammatical words like the third-person pronouns they, their and them (Morse-Gagné, 2003) and the ON infinitive marker at (as in Modern English ado, ‘at-do, to do’) also penetrated into the local dialect.

Different scholars hold different views as to the nature and mechanism of the Anglo-Scandinavian contact. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.282), recognizing the close linguistic similarity between OE and ON, believes that Danelaw English was essentially just a type of English with heavy Norse borrowing. Townend (2002, pp.145-210), on the other hand, argues that since OE and ON speakers could communicate with each other with relative ease, there was no need for massive lexical borrowing, and Danelaw English is best explained as the product of historical language shift from the Norse-speaking population into English-speaking. Besides language shift, Warner (2017) and Millar (1997) also hint at another possible scenario, the koineization (mixing of dialects). According to Warner (2017, p.386), OE and ON were mutually intelligible enough to be regarded as two Old Germanic dialects and “(ON) speakers’ goal might be better interpreted as one of achieving communication rather than acquiring a different language” due to the high retention of Norse core (basic) lexis in the later Danelaw English. In fact, both language shift and dialect mixing (koineization) could occur at the same time, as Warner (2017, pp.387-388) implies.

Now we can imagine that in areas where the historical Scandinavian population were thickest, such as the heartland of Danelaw like Lincolnshire, koineization could have occurred since the large local ON community had a population advantage against the local Anglo-Saxons, leading to a mutual linguistic accommodation rather than a full language shift in these areas. In contrast, in places where the Norse population was much thinner, such as on the fringe of the Danelaw, a full language shift to English may be more likely to have occurred due to the demographic dynamic. This lays the ground for the later discussion of the birth and transmission of Scandinavian features in East Midlands and beyond.
The long-lasting Anglo-Scandinavian contact has left an important linguistic imprint on the later development of the East Midlands English. The loss of MID firstly arose from this particular type of ME dialect not out of chance, but as a critical product of the Anglo-Scandinavian contact. In the following sections, I will trace the historical development of Scandinavianism in English from the earliest incubation stage in the late OE period to its full bloom in the Danelaw Middle English.

5.2 Scandinavianism

Scandinavianism is defined as the gradual absorption and integration of Scandinavian (in the Viking Age) elements into the English language. Although this phenomenon is best illustrated in the ME dialects, its earliest origin can be traced back further north to the Northumbrian coast in the late OE period.

5.2.1 Late OE Incubation

The Northumbrians were the first Anglo-Saxon people to come into contact with the Vikings. According to the Anglo−Saxon Chronicle, plunders and raids in the North began in AD 787 and lasted up to about AD 850, followed by an extensive Viking settlement in Danelaw (Trips, 2001, p.29). Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.267, p.282) estimates that Norse speakers began settling in the North and East of England from 865 to 955, although “Norse (as a language) probably lasted no more than two generations after 955” and “was largely or entirely absorbed by English by A.D. 1100”. The absorption led to a distinct mix of features in the local dialect, leading to an infiltration of Norse features into the late Northumbrian OE dialect.

This can be felt in the Lindisfarne Gospels. Hines (1991, p.409) observes a list of Norse loanwords used alongside the OE native vocabulary in the glosses of the Lindisfarne Gospels. Pons-Sanz (2015, p.311), based on the frequent use of non-technical Norse loans in the LG glosses, hints at the close interaction between the Northumbrian and ON speakers and a potential language shift. Some even goes so far as to describe the gloss language in the Lindisfarne Gospels as “Dialectus Dano-Saxonica”, a Dano-Saxonic dialect (Gneuss, 1993, p.108).
Syntactic evidence of early Scandinavianism is also noticed by Kroch, Taylor & Ringe (2000), discovering an emerging CPV2 grammar in 10th-century northern England, manifested by the inserted post-verbal pronoun subjects in the Lindisfarne gloss. According to their account (2000, p.18), the Scandinavian newcomers “must have learned English imperfectly and must have passed on certain features of their learners’ English to subsequent generations”, giving rise to a continental type of CPV2 in the northern English. This type of northern V2 contrasts with the V2 in the West Saxon Old English where pronouns frequently appear between the sentence-initial topic and the finite verb. Therefore, pronoun inversion was more frequent in the northern texts than the southern ones:

Table 5.1: Contrast of pronoun subject inversion in late OE
(Kroch, Taylor & Ringe, 2000, p.23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic appears in both West Saxon and Northumbrian texts</th>
<th>Topic appears only in Northumbrian texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inversions in Northumbrian</td>
<td>5 out of 58</td>
<td>14 out of 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversions in West Saxon</td>
<td>0 out of 58</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5.1 shows, the Northumbrian text has a total of 19 tokens (15+4) showing a pronominal inversion, a sign of it slowly shifting to CPV2 under Viking contact as opposed to the West Saxon. Therefore, the incubation of Scandinavianism started as early as in the late OE period.

5.2.2 Scandinavianism in *Ormulum*

Such Scandinavianism continues into the ME period, especially in an East Midlands religious writing, *Ormulum*.

Many Vikings were pagans when they set foot in England. The process of Christianization of Vikings in England was relatively peaceful. King Cnut “changed from a wild man into a most Christian king” once he secured political power in England (Blair, 2000, p.60). The process of Viking Christianization could have promoted more social interactions between them and the local Anglo-Saxons, in the forms of intermarriage or religious gathering. Against this historical background, we find one of the earliest Middle English homilies, *Ormulum*, in
Lincolnshire. It was written in AD 1200 by a priest called Orm (a Scandinavian name meaning “worm, serpent”). Possibly composed in the Abbey of Bourne, it is a 20000-line unrhymed verse with a heavy Old Norse overlay (Parkes, 1983, pp.115-127). As its provenance, Lincolnshire sits in the heartland of the Danelaw, as Ekwall (1936) notes that Lincolnshire is a region with “the Scandinavian influence at its highest” (p.144).

As a vernacular homily, *Ormulum* was intended to be read out loud in public preaching, therefore the author meticulously employed a unique spelling system to indicate the vowel length in the text: all consonants were doubled when they followed a short vowel. For example, *him* was spelled as *himm* due to the preceding short vowel /ɪ/, while *-se in huse* would remain the same after the long vowel /uː/. Accordingly, *WİÐ* in *Ormulum* was spelled as *wipþ*:

(1)

**Consonant doubling in *Ormulum***

\textit{Himm wass ʒifenn forr to ben / wipþ Sannte Marʒe inn huse}

him was given for to be with Saint Mary in house

‘It was granted to him [Joseph] to live with Saint Mary’

(*Ormulum*, 2111-2112)

Townend (2002, p.208) further summarizes four distinctly Scandinavian features in *Ormulum*: (1) over 200 Norse loanwords were found in the text, some of which were unparalleled elsewhere in the Middle English; (2) Scandinavian third person plural pronouns were in active use, much earlier than many other contemporary texts, such as *beʒʒ* ‘they’, *beʒʒm* ‘them’ and *beʒʒre* ‘their’ (albeit with occasional alternation with the native forms of *hem* ‘them’ and *here* ‘their’); (3) some late Norse sound change was reflected in *Ormulum*’s loanwords; (4) some Norse alliterative pairs were also borrowed in part or in whole as a unit into the text. Trips (2001, p.356) also finds a markedly Scandinavian syntactic construction, stylistic fronting, in *Ormulum*:
Table 5.2: Stylistic fronting in *Ormulum*

(Trips, 2001, p.356)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Ormulum</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stylistic fronting with a subject–gap of a past participle</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an adjective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an adverb</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the negation &quot;noht&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a verb particle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Trip’s count, stylistic fronting in *Ormulum* is most frequent with a negation (70%) and an adverb (66%). Trips (2001) claims that “the fronting operation was part of Orm’s grammar due to intense Scandinavian influence on his language” (p.373), even though the metrical needs to avoid prosodic clash is a prominent consideration behind the use.

As mentioned, preposition MID is completely absent from the text\(^8\). WID, on the other hand, was the only one being used throughout. As Groussier (2001, pp.27-28) notes, *Ormulum* witnessed the earliest replacement of MID by WID in most of its semantic fields. Below in Table 5.3, I juxtapose the semantic tokens from *Ormulum* against those in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* for a pre- and post-ME comparison:

Table 5.3: Semantic composition of WID in *Ormulum* and *LG*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ormulum (sampled)</th>
<th>Lindisfarne Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID tokens</td>
<td>WID %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) Although there are tokens of the prefix *mid*- (meaning ‘middle’, as in *mid-night, mid-summer* etc.), they are apparently different from the prepositional MID.
As Table 5.3 shows, WID tokens in *Ormulum* obtained a full-fledged instrumental semantics (up to 24% of total occurrences) as opposed to nil in the *LG*. Instrumental relation is a classic semantic relation governed by Old English MID and its early transfer to the *Ormulum* WID was more than a mere coincidence. As Groussier (2001, pp.32-33) points out, the newly-gained instrumental function in the Danelaw WID is most likely to be modeled after the Old Norse cognate VID. Typologically, instrumental WID was unseen in any other West Germanic languages, including the classical Old English. The sudden gain of this new semantics points to the potential ON influence behind the scene.

Another obvious development is WID’s drastically-dwindled oppositional use in *Ormulum*, since AGAINST (*onnȝæn*) became the main oppositional choice in this text, see (2):

\begin{displaymath}
\text{(2) } \\
\textit{Forrþi wass mikell wraeche sett} \\
\text{for was much vengeance set} \\
\textit{Onnȝæn patt woh wihþ rihhtë.} \\
\text{against that woe with justice} \\
\text{‘For much vengeance was set against that woe by justice.’}
\end{displaymath}

*(Ormulum, 17-18)*

To sum up, *Ormulum* is a fine specimen of Scandinavianized English, whose lexical and grammatical structures were fully infiltrated by Norse traits. The enlarged semantics of WID therein was highly likely to be impacted by the Norse cognate, without any West Germanic or Old English precedents.
5.2.3 Conservatism in the Peterborough Chronicle

Another important contemporary East Midlands text is the Peterborough Chronicle (hereafter PC). Peterborough is situated in present-day Cambridgeshire, but originally was part of Northamptonshire, on the fringe of Danelaw. The PC is a late version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle copied down in Peterborough around 1116 after a fire had destroyed their original chronicle copy. Therefore, the full PC consists of three parts: the earlier part of the text (1070-1121) and two later continuations. The ME text under discussion here, as the PPCME2 corpus indicates, refers only to the continuation part.

The First Continuation (1122-1131) was added by a single scribe who also copied the earliest part. According to Allen (1995, p.170), the scribe was a faithful copyist of the earlier materials but did not himself control the OE system well. The Final (or Second) Continuation (1132-1154) was added by a second scribe probably soon after 1154 (Trips, 2001, p.39). The PC continuations prove to be a good specimen for Middle English study, because the text “is strongly marked by the dialect of the district where it was written, and, moreover, offers some of the earliest examples preserved of distinctively Middle-English accidence and syntax” (Clark, 1970, p.xxx). Having said this, there was more of a French influence than Scandanavianism observed in the PC. This is supported by Clark’s observation (1970, pp.lxii-lxiii, p.lxviii) that Latin and French new loans flourished in the writing of the PC, such as cardinal, concilie ‘counsell’, legat ‘legate’, duc ‘duke’, Pasches ‘Easter’ and sotscipe ‘folly’. Some native forms were even replaced by these new loans, such as hired by curt ‘court’, frið by pais ‘peace’, gersume (originally a Norse loan) by tresor ‘treasure’ and rihtwisnesse by iustise ‘justice’. Nevertheless, occasional Norse loans could also be spotted in the PC, with words like band ‘a cord, string’, utlaga ‘outlaw’, wrang ‘wrong’ and even grammatical words like oc ‘also’ and fra ‘from’ (Clark, 1970, p. lxix, note 1).

In terms of the prepositional use, we can see a high retention rate of MID in the Peterborough Chronicle. Below is a token comparison of both prepositions in Ormulum, PC and the Mercian OE Rushworth Gospels:
Table 5.4: Semantic comparison of Ormulum, PC and RG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ormulum (sampled)</th>
<th>Peterborough Chronicle</th>
<th>RG (Mercian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>MID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>16.43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the comparison in Table 5.4 we can see that both PC and RG share a similar semantic use of MID and WID, where the instrumental and manner relations are both exclusively governed by MID in both texts. Another common point is that opposition remains a hugely dominant semantics of WID tokens in both texts as well, albeit slightly less so in the PC than in the RG. On the other hand, having replaced MID, WID in Ormulum has a full extension in the instrumental and parallel semantics (reaching 24% and 16% of total tokens respectively), at the same time transitioning away from its original oppositional semantics (dropping to 0.71%). To conclude, Ormulum’s usage of WID is highly divergent from the other two texts. The Peterborough Chronicle keeps the semantic distinction between MID and WID almost as intact as its OE counterpart RG, showing a high degree of conservatism.

From the incubation of Scandinavianism in the late OE period to the early 12th-century Danelaw texts of Ormulum and the PC, we find an early advanced replacement of MID by WID in some texts but not across the board. Some sociolinguistic factors may be invoked to explain this diversity.
5.3 Sociolinguistic Factors

Weinreich, Labov & Herzog (1968) poses five pivotal sociolinguistic problems in the study of linguistic variation and change. These problems include Constraints, Transition, Embedding, Evaluation and Actuation.

– Constraints: *what is possible?* It is clear that not just any kind of change happens, so *there must be principles that underlie what kinds of innovations are possible, and what kinds of changes propagate easily.*

– Transition: *how does a change propagate in an idiolect and in a community?*

– Embedding: *what implications does a change have for the larger linguistic system in which it occurs? And how is it connected to different layers in society, i.e. who uses the new variant?*

– Evaluation: *what is the social meaning of a particular change? How do people view it?*

– Actuation: *why this change, and why now?*

(Summarized by Backus 2015: 280)

Historical linguists should also pay due attention to these five problems, since any historical variation and change would first operate on a synchronic level as well. For the current study of the loss of MID, I generate the following questions based on their formats:

– Constraints: Why was MID’s replacement by WID possible? Why did the new feature propagate easily?

– Transition: How did it propagate in an idiolect and in a community?

– Embedding: What implications did the loss of MID have for the larger linguistic system in which it occurred? And how was its use connected to different layers in society, i.e., who used the new variant?

– Evaluation: What was the social meaning of the replacement? How did people view it?

– Actuation: Why did this change happen, and why did it occur during the Middle English period?

These questions will be further investigated in this section.
5.3.1 Register and Style

As previously introduced, there is a stark contrast between *Ormulum* and the *PC* in their retention of MID, albeit both being not far in distance. Figure 5.2 shows that both places are only 16 miles apart, not to mention the common clerical background of both writers, with Orm being a local priest in the Bourne Abbey and the *PC* scribe working for the Peterborough Monastery. It is then odd to see such a big discrepancy in their contemporary prepositional use.

![Figure 5.2: Dialectal continuum in the East Midlands](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

The ethnic demographics of both places were not too different as well. Danish presence was also evident in the Peterborough area, since “many old street-names in Peterborough contain OScn (Old Scandinavian) *gata* ‘street’...(and) a late tenth-century document dealing with the Peterborough area...mentions many with Scandinavian names, about a third of the whole number” (Ekwall, 1936, p.148).

Period might be to blame, since *PC* was written around 50 years earlier than *Ormulum*, although the time gap is not big compared to the time gap between the *PC* and the *RG*. Therefore, we are faced with a mysterious continuum, with one end being extremely
advanced in the change (*Ormulum*) and the other end being extremely conservative (the *PC*). These two poles were very close in time and space, and even in population demographic and authorial background.

A more powerful explanation may be invoked from their different styles. While *Ormulum* was a highly colloquial work (albeit being a poem) aimed to preach, the *PC* was more of a formal historical writing. Historically, many linguistic changes occurred first in the oral language before it was officially accepted in formal writing. A good example is the 19th-century Dutch case system that was rigidly maintained in formal writings but was lost much earlier in the colloquial speech (see de Vries et al., 1995, p. 104-105). Similarly, the superficial difference between the *PC* and *Ormulum* was likely to be masked by the style consideration. Signs of contrived archaism in the *PC* have been noticed by Clark (1970, p. lxi), who comments that the *PC* scribe (of the first continuation) must be fully aware of the contemporary *Schriftsprache* and was trying to “palliate his own provincialism and modernity” by mechanically introducing false archaism, as in the unhistorical use of some definite articles. Being a historical chronicle, *PC* would naturally opt for a more elevated set of vocabulary and avoid some innovative colloquial expressions like the *Ormulum* WID. This new form of WID may have been regarded as foreign or unorthodox by the literary circle in Peterborough. Since *Ormulum* was designed to be a day-to-day homily aimed at the countryside folk, its language would not shy away from overt colloquialism or advanced features, as Thomason & Kaufman (1988) also notices that “the influence of Norse-speakers on rural pursuits was decisive” (p.303).

Therefore, the difference between the *PC* and *Ormulum* could be explained away by the style difference between the formal and the colloquial languages. Another example concerning the style difference in the West Midlands will be discussed in Chapter 6 concerning West Midlands. To conclude, *Ormulum* was apparently “a witness of spoken language rather than an artefact which has nothing to do with naturally produced language” (Trips, 2001, p.22). This stands in sharp contrast to the high style employed in the *PC*. The different retention rates of MID in contemporary East Midlands texts can be derived from this factor.
5.3.2 Immigrant Society

Another social factor in play may be the multi-ethnic social environment in Danelaw. Orm himself was likely to be a descendant of the previous Scandinavian settlers, as implied by his name. Such ethnic blending was very common in 12th-century Danelaw and a multi-racial society is often accommodating to linguistic changes.

After the Norman Conquest, there was a new realignment of power after which the original political loyalty was shifted and reshaped. At this time in Danelaw, the ethnic distinction between the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavians might already have been blurred despite the number of the previous immigrants, as Hadley (2002, p.45) comments that the absorption of the Scandinavian elements into the northern and eastern English society within a certain social-political context is more important than discussing the pure number of Scandinavian immigrants. The old ethnic identity was then replaced by a new regional identity shared by both the locals and the Scandinavian descendants, through long-term integration and acculturation. Language happens to play a very important role in the integration process.

Linguistic innovation can accelerate immigrant integration within a multi-ethnic society. A similar case can be found in modern metropolitan London where Multicultural London English (MLE) was spoken. Cheshire, Adger & Fox (2013) studies an innovative topic-marking relativiser who in the London Hackney dialect. This feature is specifically used to mark out a topic in the Hackney dialect, playing a different role from the generic relativiser that. An example is quoted in (3), where the topic my medium brother was marked out by who and was repeatedly referred back to in the following conversation:

(3)
“...I’ve done three things cos of my mum and one thing for my little [Brother] [Topic]. my medium [Brother] who [Topic marking] moved to Antigua. cos he’s got a spinal disorder.so he grows kinda slow [S: mhm].so he is kinda short. people were swinging him about in my area.”

(Cheshire, Adger & Fox, 2013, p.63)

Cheshire, Adger & Fox (2013) traces this innovation to a generation of speakers born and brought up in the London inner city in the 90s whose “target variety of English would have
been the English spoken by their peers, who include both Anglos and non-Anglos” (p.67). This is different from the previous generations of immigrant learners who targeted English from a formal school setting. The who relativiser became so popular in the community that even English native children adopted it in their peer communication, as Cheshire, Adger & Fox (2013) observes that “Anglo children in Hackney also use MLE features, especially those with multiethnic friendship networks, though the frequency with which they use these features is lower than for non-Anglos” (p.67).

This case study can shed some light on the situation in medieval Danelaw, as Hadley (2002, p.55) notices that “the languages of the indigenous population and the settlers did not simply mark out each group as distinctive, but rather language was utilized for socially integrative purposes in the wider context of social mixing and as part of the creation of an Anglo-Scandinavian culture”. In the 12th-century Danelaw, as numerous Scandinavians settled in and lived with the Anglo-Saxon locals, we can expect an intense L2 learning experience for both Norse-speaking adults and children. While a growing sense of community was being established in the region, both Anglo and Scandinavian groups of children must have had more exposure and social interaction with each other. Since the school system in early Norman time did not institutionalize a standard English teaching, as “the language of instruction in English schools was French until the second half of the fourteenth century” (Freeborn, 1992, p.60), it is most likely that the medieval children would have to target the English spoken by their peers, therefore easily creating innovative forms like the Hackney who. The new use of WID could also arise from L1 transfer from the Scandinavian children and this new form could diffuse from non-Anglo to Anglo households via the multi-ethnic friendship network. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.43) remarks that minority groups, if well integrated, can initiate new features in the host community, even if these are forms resulting from imperfect learnings. What happened in multicultural London could also happen in the 12th-century Danelaw, since an immigrant society is highly receptive to linguistic innovations.

Another factor is the lack of English-speaking elites in the early Norman England, as Millar (1997, p.34) suggests that the absence of an English-speaking ruling class and “a laissez-faire attitude” by the ruling Norman class towards English were key to the fast spread of the
innovative local forms. Without the regulation of a native upper class, linguistic innovations in different English dialects were free to compete and diffuse in a “free-market” environment.

5.3.3 Diffusion
Since the whole Danelaw was homogeneously mixed in the Anglo-Scandinavian demography, the diffusion of any common Anglo-Scandinavian innovation within this region would have been rather easy and smooth. The later transmission of such features from Danelaw to other parts of the nation, on the other hand, has to do with the historical southward migration of the Danelaw population.

5.3.3.1 Havelok the Dane
About a century after Ormulum was completed, another highly-Scandinavianized poem Havelok the Dane (hereafter Havelok) was produced further south in East Anglia. LAEME locates the manuscript dialect to West Norfolk in 1312. The verse, with a Scandinavian undertone, recounts the tale of a hero called Havelok who was trapped in the Anglo-Danish court struggle for kingship. Like Ormulum, there is no MID token in Havelok and both texts see a rather similar semantics of WID as well:

Table 5.5: Semantics of WID in Ormulum and Havelok

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ormulum</th>
<th>Havelok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
<td>35.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>16.43%</td>
<td>25.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 However, the original text language could reflect features tracing back to the city of Lincoln (Smithers, 1987, p. lxxxix).
As Table 5.5 shows, both WID in *Ormulum* and *Havelok* have a full-fledged instrumental function (reaching 24%-35% of overall tokens) and a minimal oppositional use. The innovated WID firstly seen in *Ormulum* seems to have propagated southward into East Anglia by then.

It is worth mentioning that East Anglia, especially Suffolk, had a much thinner Scandinavian presence than the rest of Danelaw. It shows that the loss of MID gradually spread from central Danelaw (like Lincolnshire) to the fringe area like East Anglia, before making a jump into the capital via population migration.

5.3.3.2 Chaucer’s English

14th-century London was about to see the birth of a national standard language due to the changing linguistic climate in the second half of the 14th century: English began being used in the law courts and the parliament openings instead of French after 1362 and the educated London English was “beginning to become the standard form of writing throughout the country” (Freeborn, 1992, p.60). The Norman aristocrats were clearly shifting to English-speaking after three hundred years of rule.

As for the best specimen of 14th-century London English, we have no better choice than Chaucer. Chaucer is lauded as the father of English literature, whose works were remarkably important in documenting contemporary London English. Chaucer was born in London to a wealthy merchant family, originally from Ipswich, Suffolk (Crow & Leland, 1988, p. xv). The Chaucers had a well-to-do family business in London with connections to high society, therefore Chaucer’s language (when he was not mimicking any regional dialect) ought to reflect the educated form of London English. His works already saw no token of MID, more advanced than the contemporary Kentish texts. For this reason, I did not include any of Chaucer’s works into my dataset. Smither (1987, p. lxxxix) also comments that Chaucer had a “relatively advanced (linguistic) accidence” (such as the uniform *-es* as the plural ending) belonging to a northerly variety rather than to the traditional south. This may be due to the large number of East Midlands immigrants moving into London (for more socio-economic details see Chapter 7).
Since most of Chaucer’s works were written in the latter half of the 14th century, by this time the educated London dialect must have already been under heavy East Midlands influence. The loss of MID in Chaucer’s English therefore represents a further diffusion of this innovation from the East Midlands into the capital.

5.3.4 Sociolinguistic Solution

After the above analysis, we can return to answer the afore-mentioned five sociolinguistic problems. These problems are repeated below:

– Constraints: Why was MID’s replacement by WID possible? Why did the new feature propagate easily?
– Transition: How did the loss propagate in an idiolect and in a community?
– Embedding: What implications did the loss of MID have for the larger linguistic system in which it occurred? And how was its use connected to different layers in society, i.e. who used the new variant?
– Evaluation: What was the social meaning of the replacement? How did people view it?
– Actuation: Why did this change happen, and why did it happen during the Middle English period?

Firstly, for the Constraints and Transition problems, MID’s replacement by WID was made semantically possible by the L1 transfer from the Norse cognate whose instrumental and comitative semantics were productive. This is the vital reason why WID was able to become a semantic equivalent to MID. This new feature propagated easily due to the concentration of Scandinavian L2 learners in the Danelaw area. Immigrant environment and multi-ethnic social network may have helped the fast spread of such forms even into the Anglo households, aided by the lack of standard English teaching in the early Norman time and the laissez-faire linguistic attitude. The diffusion must have been originally on the local level, before travelling with the Danelaw migrants into the capital. London dialect received these East Midlands features and would further imprint it into the later national standard language.
As for the Embedding problem, the loss of MID simplifies the English prepositional system by eliminating an excessive form. East Midlands speakers spearheaded the use of the new variant and spread it into the 14th-century London dialect by migration. Another factor has to do with the relatively higher socio-economic status and freer movement of the East Midlands sokemen, as will be further discussed in Chapter 7.

In terms of Evaluation, the innovated WID form might at first have been avoided in serious writings due to its colloquialism and low style (as in Ormulum vs. PC). Nevertheless, by the late 14th century, there seemed to be no more stigma of it even in the educated London dialect, as reflected in Chaucer’s language.

Lastly, as for the Actuation, although linguistic variation and change commonly happen throughout history, the large number of Scandinavian L2 learners must have greatly destabilized the original English prepositional system and added to it their native L1 transfer. The lack of regulation on the English language and the absence of English-speaking elites during the early Norman rule might have also greatly contributed to the fast spread of the new feature.

To conclude, from the sociolinguistic perspective, the loss of MID was a highly likely change promoted by different social factors, such as style concern, immigration or language policy. The change stems from the East Midlands and rapidly extends beyond.

5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I introduce the phenomenon of Scandinavianism and its impact on the East Midlands Middle English. Traces of such Scandinavianism could be earliest observed in the late OE period, but it was most obvious in the early East Midland text of Ormulum. The early loss of MID in Ormulum contrasts with its retention in the Peterborough Chronicle. A style concern may be the reason behind. A later text Havelok the Dane also shows the loss of MID in East Anglia before it reached the London dialect via population migration, as manifested in Chaucer’s works. From a sociolinguistic perspective, linguistic innovations are easily brewed
and spread in an immigrant society due to the extensive L2 learners and the multi-ethnic social networks. The laissez-faire linguistic attitude of the early Norman ruler may also help the change.
Chapter 6. West Midlands AB Language

6.1 Norwegian Settlers

As mentioned in the last chapter, there were two distinct groups of Scandinavian settlers in Viking-Age England, one of whom came from Denmark and the other came from Norway. Both groups competed and cooperated with each other during their invasion of the British Isle. Blair (2000, p.41) points out that the Viking settlements in Ireland, Scotland, southern Wales, Cornwall and Northwest England were mainly occupied by Norwegians, while those in the eastern England were mostly by Danish. The Norwegian settlers intermarried with the local Celts, creating a Hiberno-Norse community based in the Viking hub of Dublin whose presence could also be felt in Northwest England.

![Figure 6.1: Scandinavian settlements in 10th-century England](Blair, 2000, p.50)
The Hiberno-Norse settlers were eager to build trade routes across the Irish Sea over to England, especially to Danelaw. A famous Hiberno-Norse historical figure is King Amlaib Cuaran who became the archetype of the hero in *Havelok the Dane*. When the Dublin Norsemen took over the city of York in AD 918, they developed a trade corridor between the Irish Sea and the North Sea connecting the east coast of England to Ireland (Morse-Gagné, 2003, p.65). Linguistically, Danish Vikings spoke East Old Norse while the Norwegian Vikings spoke West Old Norse, but they should be able to communicate with each other (Townend, 2002, p.28). Mixed living was common among the two groups, as records show that many Hiberno-Norse immigrants moved into Danelaw at the height of the Dublin-York alliance (Ekwall, 1936, p.158).

The Norwegian settlements in England mostly clustered around Lancashire, Cheshire, Merseyside and Cumbria, shown as Zone 5 in Fellows-Jensen’s geographical study (1992):

1. Orkney, Shetland and northern Caithness;
2. The Western Isles and the northern and western seaboard of Scotland;
3. Southwest Scotland;
4. Firth of Clyde and the Central Lowlands;
5. Northwest England;
5a. The Isle of Man;
6. Yorkshire and Northumbria;
7. East Midlands;
8. East Anglia.

*Figure 6.2: Eight Viking Zones in Britain*  
(Fellows-Jensen, 1992, p.136)
Another evidence of the Norwegian presence comes from the distribution of Scandinavian Parish names in the 10th century, as Figure 6.3 shows. Names of Norwegian elements, mostly from a later period, are concentrated in Northwest England. In the following section, I will focus on Scandinavianism in the region of Cheshire.

Figure 6.3: Parish names of Scandinavian origin
6.2 Cheshire Scandinavianism

As Figure 6.3 shows, the Norwegian settlement in AD 901 was concentrated on the peninsula of Wirral (historically part of West Cheshire). At a convenient junction with easy access to the Irish Sea, Cheshire first saw Norwegian settlers coming in as refugees to Chester, later removed to the Wirral Peninsula. According to Ekwall, (1936, p.135), a Hiberno-Norse man Ingemund was expelled from Ireland in around 901 with his followers and was given refuge near Chester by Æthelfled, Lady of Mercians. Later in 920, another group of Hiberno-Scandinavian army under King Sihtric temporarily occupied Davenport in Cheshire (Ekwall, 1936, p.150). The strong tie between the kingdom of Dublin and York in the 10th century made Cheshire an important connecting point on the trade route from York to Dublin via Man (Morse-Gagné, 2003, p.40; Dance, 2003, pp.25-26).

The Middle English dialect in this region also reflects this historical Viking connection, with a series of Scandinavianized morphological and phonological traits. Dance (2003, p.19) points out some distinct dialectal features in the Northwest ME dialect, such as the present participle -ande (as opposed to the Southwest Midland -inde) and the loss of the rounded vowel /ø/ (developed from the OE /e(:)ə/). The -ande ending was similar to the Norse ending, while the un-rounding and merger of vowels /ø:/ and /e:/ can also be observed in Ormulum (Cole, 2014, p.142). Bybee (2002: 270) notes that the /ø:/-/e:/ merger in Ormulum started from low-frequency words rather than high-frequency ones, a pattern likely to be driven by imperfect L2 learning rather than by an internal impetus. Warner (2017) summarizes four ME morphological traits linked to Norsification: (1) the loss of -ij- in weak verbs’ Class-2 conjugation; (2) the invariable the; (3) the loss of the accusative masculine singular pone; (4) the loss of -n ending in noun plurality. Under Warner’s examination and comparison (2017, pp.321-332), Cheshire and Suffolk dialects are thought to demonstrate an intermediate degree of Norse influence. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p. 288) also finds a comparable number of Norse-origin grammatical traits in Chester as in the Norfolk ME dialect. All evidence points to a certain degree of Scandinavianism in this dialect.

Cheshire Scandinavianism also influences the local use of MID and WID. There are two early Cheshire texts without any MID in the data pool, which were almost as early as
*Ormulum.* In the following, I list these early WID-only texts in Table 6.1 as well as on the map in Figure 6.4.

Table 6.1: Early WID-only texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>LAEME Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>C12-13</td>
<td><em>Ormulum</em></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cheshire</td>
<td>North West Midlands</td>
<td>C13</td>
<td><em>Ancrene Riwle,</em> language T1</td>
<td>#118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Cheshire</td>
<td>North West Midlands</td>
<td>C13</td>
<td><em>Pe Wohunge of ure Lauerd</em></td>
<td>#122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Ely, Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>C13b2</td>
<td><em>Debate between the Body and the Soul</em></td>
<td>#282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.4: Locations of early WID-only texts
As Table 6.1 shows, all texts fall neatly into the geographical realm of eastern or western Scandinavian settlements in England. Two Northwest Midlands texts, *Ancrene Riwle* (language T1, hereafter AR) and *Pe Wohunge of ure Lauerd* (hereafter Wohunge), were dated slightly later than *Ormulum* but were equally consistent in their absence of MID token. AR is a popular monastic manual with multiple versions across the Southwest Midlands. Wohunge belongs to a ME literature group called the Wooing Group, which is closely associated “by dialect and manuscript tradition” to the Katherine Group\(^\text{10}\) further down south in the Southwest Midlands (Innes-Parker, 2015, p.15). To illustrate the similarity between the use of WID in these texts, Table 6.2 compares the semantic composition of WID in *Ormulum* and Wohunge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Ormulum (sampled)</em></th>
<th><em>Pe Wohunge of ure Lauerd</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WID tokens</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) The Katherine Group includes: *Hali Meiðhad, Sawles Warde, Seinte Juliene, Seinte Margarete* and *Seinte Katherine*. The Katherine Group, together with *Ancrene Wisse (Riwle)* and the Wooing Group, forms the AB Group due to their typical use of a uniform AB language.
As Table 6.2 shows, WID tokens in both texts share a similar percentage in the manner, instrumental and parallel relations, all of which used to be classic semantic fields of OE MID. It suggests that the semantic extension of WID was completed in both texts, whose oppositional sense became equally weak, as well as the spatial use. Although being on two coasts of England, Ormulum and Wohunge did share a striking similarity in the advanced use of WID. This must have to do with the common Danish or Norwegian presence in the texts’ provenance. Such a distributional pattern again confirms the Anglo-Scandinavian contact as the most likely reason behind the change. Cross-linguistically, the only other Germanic languages that saw the loss of MID are Faroese and the deceased Norn, both of which also share a historical Viking connection.

Another text of concern is Ancrene Riwle (language T1) from the Titus Manuscript, the same manuscript in which Wohunge was written. Laing (2004) points out that the Titus language can be divided into two dialectal groups, one of a “T1 language”, a language that “fits near the place where the borders of Salop, Cheshire and Staffs meet” (p.66), the other of a more conservative Katherine Group language. The first group demonstrates several Northwest Midlands characteristics that “include a greater number of Scandinavian words than the other texts”, likely by a Northwest Midlander who “translated the AB-like forms in his exemplar into his own NWML (Northwest Midlands) dialect” (Laing, 2004, p.66). The contrast between the Northwest Midlands dialect and the Southwest Midlands dialect is striking. The AB language in the Southwest Midlands was in general much more conservative than the northern type.

6.3 AB Language

6.3.1 Ancrene Wisse/Riwle

Contrary to the Scandinavianized Cheshire dialect, the Southwest Midlands writers further south used the more conservative AB language, a term coined by Tolkien (1929) to describe
the language of *Ancrene Wisse* (hereafter, AW)\(^\text{11}\) from Corpus Christi MS. Tolkien (1929) comments that this language was “self-consistent and unadulterated…a unity…a faithful transcript of some actual dialect of nearly unmixed descent, or a ‘standard’ language based on one” (p.106). He calls it the “A language”, representing a fine specimen of a form of English “whose development from an antecedent Old English type was relatively little disturbed” (Tolkien, 1929, p.106). “A language”, together with “B language” from MS. Bodley 34, forms a unit “very closely connected both in time and place” with a shared consistency and individuality of spelling that “suggest obedience to some school or authority” (Tolkien, 1929, p.109). Other versions of AW or AR, according to Tolkien (1929), are more or less a blending with the AB language “of ingredients belonging to different times and places” (p.107).

In terms of the MID-WID prepositional usage, a varying nature can indeed be observed across different AW/AR manuscripts in LAEME:

(1)  

\[\text{#245} \quad \text{ȝif eni god mon is of feorrene ikumen: hercneð his speche and } \text{answered} \]  
\[
\text{mid lut wordes to his askunge.}
\]

\[\text{#272} \quad \text{ȝef eani god mon is of feorren icumen: hercnið his speche } \text{saved} \]  
\[
\text{wið lut word to his easkunges.}
\]

\[\text{#273} \quad \text{ȝef ani god mon is of feorren icomen } \text{. hercened his speche } \text{saved} \]  
\[
\text{mid lut wordes.}
\]

\[\text{#118} \quad \text{ȝif ani god mon is of feorre(n) icume(n). hercnes his speche. } \text{answeres} \]  
\[
\text{wið lut wordes to his easkinges.}
\]

(LAEME)

‘If any good man has come from afar, (you should) listen with close attention to his speech and answer with loud words (to his asking).’

\(^{11}\) Both the names *Ancrene Riwle* and *Ancrene Wisse* refer to the same text, depending on different editorial practices (see Dance, 2003, p.39).
As (1) shows, for the same phrase *answer with words*, different prepositions were used across different versions of LAEME#245, #272, #273 and #118. There is even an interesting detail provided by LAEME in text #245: a later hand seems to have underlined the preposition MID in the phrase *answerieð mid lut words*, perhaps a sign of confusion from a later scribe unfamiliar with this obsolete preposition.

Table 6.3 demonstrates the distribution of MID and WID tokens in various versions of *AW/AR* in LAEME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num</th>
<th>WID Num</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ancrene Riwle</em> (245)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>W Worcs.</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Cotton Nero A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrections to <em>Ancrene Riwle</em>, hand B (275)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Ludlow, S Salop.</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Cotton Cleopatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ancrene Riwle</em> (273)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Leominster, N Herefords</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Cotton Cleopatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ancrene Riwle</em> T1 (118)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>S Cheshire</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Cotton Titus D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extracts from <em>Ancrene Riwle</em> (276)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>NW Worcs.</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Gonville and Caius College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be inferred from Table 6.3, different versions have different retention rates of MID, although it is worth noticing that LAEME#275 and #276 are only corrections and extracts of AR, whose data are not representative of the whole text and need to be interpreted with caution. The rest of the other texts are more comparable to each other. I classify them into three types based on their different degrees of conservatism of MID. The most conservative text is *Ancrene Riwle* (#245) from Worcestershire, with a high MID percentage at 93%. On the contrary, the most advanced text is *Ancrene Riwle* T1 (#118) from Cheshire with no MID token. The rest of other versions (#272, #273, #275) shows a varying degree of MID percentage from 6% to 35%, reflecting different intermediate stages. In general, these texts can be regarded as a dialectal continuum within the West Midlands, with the northerly tip of Cheshire being the most advanced type and the southerly one like Worcestershire being the most conservative type with a series of intermediate types in-between.

I further examine the three types by their tokens’ semantics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#118 (Advanced)</th>
<th>#245 (Conservative)</th>
<th>#273 (Intermediate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID%</td>
<td>WID%</td>
<td>MID%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 6.4 shows, the conservative type (#245) and the intermediate type (#273) both still keep a productive instrumental use of MID, although they do not seem to reject instrumental WID either. WID’s oppositional sense was still well-preserved in the conservative type (at 25%), at a much higher percentage than the intermediate and the advanced types (from 1% to 3%). This seems to indicate that the introduction of the instrumental WID might predate its bleaching of oppositional sense in the West Midlands. In terms of spatial relation, none of the three types stands out as prominent.

Two factors may explain the difference of MID’s retention here: time and space. Earlier texts tend to employ more MID tokens than later texts. As Table 6.3 shows, LAEME#245 and #273, both dating to 1235, have a higher MID rate compared to later texts like LAEME#272 (dating to 1275). This shows a time effect in the gradual shift of prepositional dynamics. Another potential factor is space. In Table 6.4, all three texts of #245, #273 and #118 presumably come from the same year 1237, but #245 has a much higher MID retention rate of 93%, as opposed to 35% in #273 and 0% in #118. The difference may be best explained away by their different regional origins. The most conservative text #245 comes from further down south in Worcestershire, while the intermediate type #273 is from Herefordshire near the Welsh border, and the most advanced type #118 is located in Cheshire, an area with historical Viking connection. We can see the geographical distribution from Figure 6.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parallel</th>
<th>6.5%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>9.2%</th>
<th>4.4%</th>
<th>7.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dialectal continuum here highly resembles that in the East Midlands between *Ormulum* and *PC*, where the contemporary text languages also differ geographically. Another social factor may also be in play. Both Worcester and Peterborough were major religious centers in Medieval England, where scribes may presumably have been trained to write in a more conservative register. The contemporaneous countryside dialect outside these religious hubs might already have been more advanced, as implied by the Herefordshire version. Cheshire, with its historical Scandinavian presence and a trade connection with York and Dublin, was likely to be the locus of change for the rest of West Midlands, like *Ormulum* for the rest of East Midlands.

---

12 There is also a special relationship between the sees of Worcester and York in medieval times (see Dance, 2003, pp.33-34).
To conclude, the comparison of different versions of AW/AR shows us the fluid linguistic landscape in the West Midlands. The advanced WID feature was likely to spread from Cheshire in the north to other parts of West Midlands in the south.

6.3.2 Norsification Package

Since Viking settlements can be found in both western and eastern coasts of England, we should be able to unite them within the same theoretical framework. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, pp.282-303) proposes a collection of Norse-related linguistic features circulated from Danelaw to the rest of Midlands. This collection, called the Norsification package, consists of 57 ME grammatical traits ultimately derived from Viking Norse. Table 6.5 demonstrates all 57 of them with a comparison between the forms in Middle English and those in Viking Norse and Old English.

Table 6.5: Norsification package

(Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, pp.293-295)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle English</th>
<th>Viking Norse</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) no i- on perf pcp</td>
<td>no such prefix</td>
<td>je-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) no wk vb class 2</td>
<td>wv2 has vowel -a-</td>
<td>wv2 has -ija-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) /a:/ &gt; /a:/ in</td>
<td>/a:/</td>
<td>/e:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret pl of sv4,5 (EM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Affixes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) umbe- ‘around’</td>
<td>umb</td>
<td>ymbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) -leik ‘-ness’</td>
<td>-leik-r</td>
<td>-la:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) -ande pres pcp</td>
<td>-ande</td>
<td>-ende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) -scap ‘-ship’ (Dei)</td>
<td>-skap-r</td>
<td>-sâp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Phonetic trait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Copula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) × ert ‘(thou) art’</td>
<td>est &gt; ert</td>
<td>aearθ (WM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= arθ (Nhb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= aear (NM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; ere ‘are’ (Dei)</td>
<td>&amp; ero</td>
<td>&amp; aron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) es ‘is’</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) waare/waaren</td>
<td>wa:ro</td>
<td>we:ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Auxiliaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) mun (man Sc, WM):</td>
<td>mun ~ man:</td>
<td>no equivalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
munde
'must, will'
13) × sall:sulde (N) 'shall:should'
skal:skylda  sčal,sčalde (Nhb)
       sčael,sčulde (M)

VI. Pronouns
14) they 'they'
       θεi-r  hi:e, he:o
15) them & their 'them, their'
       θεi-m,  him,bira (Nhb)
       θεi-ra  heom,heora (M)
16) sli:k 'such' (Dei)
       sli:k-r  swelk (Nhb)
       = swylc (WM)
       = 'swylc (EM)
17) × thir(e)
      'these' (N)
       cf θεi-r (#14)  θis(s)- + -e pl
18) same 'same'
       same  ilka, seolfa

VII. Noun Plurals
19) brethren 'brothers'
       brō:ɔr  bro:θor(ɔ)
20) debter(es) 'daughters'
       dōhtər  dohter(o)
21) bend 'hands'
      bend-r  hand(a)

VIII. Strong Verbs
22) give(n):gaf:geeven (EM goaven):geten
        'to give' sv5
       EVN gifa,gaf,
       ga:fo,gif-n
       je:fa(n)/jifan,jaef,
       je:fon,jifen
23) gete(n):gat:geeten (EM goaten):geten
        'to get' sv5
       geta,gat,  jeta(n)/jitan,jaet,
       ga:to,geten-n  je:ton,jiten
24) ligge(n):lay:
        lecyen:lein
        'to lie (down)' sv5
       leggja,lab,  liggja(n),laej,
       la:go,legen-n  le:gon,lej(e)n
25) renne(n):rann:
        runnen 'to run' sv3
       renna,rann,  iorna(n),arn,
       runno,runnen-n  urron,uren
26) breste(n):brast:
        bruisten:brosten
        'to burst' sv3
       bresta,brast,  bersta,baerst,
       brusto,brosten-n  burston,borstten
27) late(n):leat:laten
        'to let' sv7
       la:ta,le:t,la:ten-n  le:ta(n),leort (Nhb)
       = le:t (M),le:ten
       cf teren sv4
28) riive(n):raaf:roaf:
        riven 'to tear' sv1
       ri:fa,reif,  aeftaθa (Nhb)
       rifo,rifen-n
       (Nhb hundraθ is from Norse)
It is worth noting that these 57 Norse-related features do not appear all in one dialect, but form a common feature pool partially shared by several Midlands or northern dialects. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.339) even manages to map the number of these traits in various dialects across the Midlands and the North, with potential directions of diffusion, see Figure 6.6.
In Figure 6.6, each number on the map indicates the number of retrievable Norsification features in that specific local dialect. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.339) pinpoints the origin of this Norsification package to Lincolnshire where the Anglo-Scandinavian contact was the most intense. Albeit the package started with only 43 features from Lincolnshire, it absorbed 14 more new features travelling north into Yorkshire, becoming a new package of \( \{ \frac{14}{43} \} \). However, when the package diffused further south into East Anglia, its feature number reduced due to attrition, from 41 to 28 remaining. According to the map, the West Midlands received two packages respectively from the East Midlands and the North, joining first at Cheshire \( \{ \frac{4}{32} \} \), before going further south into the Southwest Midlands as a collection of 24, 19 and 8 features. This is in line with the previous north-south divide in the West Midlands.

Thomason & Kaufman (1988, pp.287-290) even estimates the years in which the presumed Norsified English arrived in different regions, see Figure 6.7. The cross (\( \times \)) represents the locations where Norse may have coexisted with the Norsified English. The earliest
appearance of Norsified English, accordingly, was from Lincolnshire during 920 and 950, possibly after the death of Erik Bloodaxe. The time frame shows that the package then gradually spread into central Danelaw, and then into Yorkshire and East Anglia, before reaching Northumbria. Lancashire, Cheshire and Cumbria were all late receivers of the package, after 1070 according to the dating.

Figure 6.7: Estimated years of Norsified English and its diffusion

(Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.338)
Norsified English, an English dialect heavily influenced by Norse, was circulated from Danelaw to the north and to the west, reaching as far as Cheshire and Southwest Midlands. This theory unites the common linguistic developments in both Midlands under the same framework and has a great explanatory power.

6.3.3 Norse Spillover in the AB Language

As mentioned, Southwest Midlands is home to the AB language, a uniform and largely conservative dialect. In spite of this, the Norsification map in Figure 6.6 implies that some Norse spillovers must have also infiltrated this area.

Norse loanwords in the AB language have been carefully studied by Dance (2003, p.289), who, based on Rynell’s (1948) study, estimates that no more than 5.6% of total vocabulary in the Southwest Midlands texts can be traced back to ON. This indicates only a mild Norse lexical influence and “transference of (loan) words from dialects of the North/NEM (North East Midlands) area” was either limited to legalistic terms or reflected a general diffusion of common items at a “fairly low level of lexical field penetration” (Dance, 2003, p.328). Therefore, lexically the Norse influence on the AB language appears not to be prominent.

Thomason & Kaufman (1988, pp.74-75) proposes a borrowing scale, in which the deeper was the contact level, the more likely grammatical structures as well as lexical structures would be borrowed into a language. Since only a few content loan words from Norse existed in the AB language, it seems to indicate only a casual or distant type of Anglo-Scandinavian contact in this region.
Table 6.6: Thomason & Kaufman’s borrowing scale (1988, pp.74-75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casual Contact</th>
<th>Category 1:</th>
<th>content words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2:</td>
<td>function words, minor phonological features, lexical semantic features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3:</td>
<td>adpositions, derivational suffixes, phonemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 4:</td>
<td>word order, distinctive features in phonology, inflectional morphology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intense Contact | Category 5: | significant typological disruption, phonetic changes |

However, some other scholars find evidence of a deeper level of contact in the syntactic structure. Trips (2001, pp.121-129) compares the number of post-verbal particles (diagnostic of an underlying VO order) against the post-\textit{Infl} particles (diagnostic of an underlying OV order) in \textit{Ormulum}, the Katherine Group and the Southeastern texts, see Table 6.7.

Table 6.7: Particle position in three text groups

(Trips, 2001, p.124, p.129)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts from</th>
<th>Post-\textit{Infl} (OV)</th>
<th>Post-verb (VO)</th>
<th>% Postverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Ormulum}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the data, Trips (2001, p.130) concludes that “Northeast Midlands texts (Ormulum) show the same frequency of underlying VO word order as the West Midlands texts”, possibly due to a deep contact with the Norse VO grammar, while this feature was not reflected in the contemporary southern text. This implies an intense level of contact at least of category 4 or 5 in Thomason & Kaufman’s borrowing scale and seems to go against the previous lexical observation.

It may have to do with the conditioning effect in the lexical field. Dance (2003, p.309) notices an unusual Norse-derived verb DEIEN ‘to die’ to be used more often in the AB texts than in Ormulum. The native Anglo-Saxon verb SWELTEN ‘to die’ was surprisingly less used in some AB texts than in Ormulum. Based on this observation, Dance (2003, pp. 310-312) proposes that many Norse loans might have already existed in the West Midlands dialect but were generally avoided due to their “lowly” and “marked” lexical status. In the case of DEIEN, its linguistic markedness was, for some unknown reason, rendered less pronounced than the native alternative SWELTEN in the West Midlands scribal circle, leading to its higher frequency there than in the heavily Norsified Ormulum. Different linguistic variants, as Dance (2003) puts it, are “available to be conditioned by factors such as social/stylistic level, perceived dialectal flavour, or...contexts and uses with which the different forms in question happen to have become associated by a particular speaker” (pp.311-312). Therefore, the AB language may actually be a highly-conditioned linguistic product, with a hidden Norse undercurrent, as also hinted by the advanced use of instrumental WIÐ in even the most conservative type of texts in Table 6.4.

To conclude, the Norse spillover in the AB language may be more penetrative than we originally expected, but they were generally avoided due to their linguistic markedness. The linguistic situation in the West Midlands was very complex. The superficial conservatism in this dialectal region may be a contrived scribal product that does not necessarily reflect the true nature of the local dialect. The previous logistic regression (in Table 3.1) also shows West Midlands with a moderate factor weight of 0.68 in the predictive power for WIÐ, definitely not a low number compared to Kent (0.0219). Both Midlands also show a similar prepositional preference pattern in the previous mosaic and association plots in Chapter 3, again indicating an undercurrent of Norsification.
6.4 Diction and Style

Linguistic markedness is closely related to literary diction and style. Most of the Southwest Midlands texts were written in an alliterative diction, particularly evident in the Katherine Group, but not in the whole AB Group. Behtrum (1935) points out that “there is wanting in the Ancrene Riwle the regular use of alliteration which is so characteristic a feature of saints’ lives (in the Katherine Group)” (p.556). Only the three saints’ lives (Seinte Juliene, Seinte Margarete and Seinte Katherine) regularly make use of the alliteration device like the late OE writers.

Alliterative prose, also called poetic prose or rhythmical prose, refers to a prose genre intensively using the poetic device of alliteration. Late OE ecclesiastical works such as Ælfric’s Lives of Saints are said to have greatly inspired the thirteenth-century West Midlands alliterative prose (Bethurum, 1935, pp.557-558). The strict division between poetry and prose might not be very evident in medieval times, as Blake (1969) comments that “the writers in the twelfth century would not have thought of some lines as verse and others as prose; they would have regarded different passages as being in a high or low style” (p.120). Therefore, style may be more carefully weighed than diction in the ME writing.

It is therefore an interesting question to consider whether different dictions or styles may influence the choice of MID and WID in these alliterative prose texts. Dr. Ann Taylor (personal communication, June 23 2021) suggests that prepositions generally do not receive stress in the alliterative prose unless in a rare contrastive or emphatic context, therefore as unstressed elements they do not participate in alliteration like nouns, adjectives or non-finite verbs do. The choice of these words was therefore not likely to be influenced by alliterative consideration (such as the starting consonant, /m/ for MID and /w/ for WID). Also, the meter in the alliterative prose was loose enough that the number of unstressed syllables, like prepositions, between the stresses is not strictly regulated. Hence, there is no reason to assume an impact of the alliterative diction on the prepositional choice.
Other considerations, such as the metrical foot, do not seem to play a role either. We can compare *Ormulum* to *Poema Morale*, both using a 15-syllable iambic (X/weak-strong) structure with a caesura after the 8th syllable (Trips, 2001, p.38), as in Figure 6.8:

\[
\text{*Piss boc is nemmned Ormulum. Forri þatt Ormm itt wrohhte*}
\]

\[
\text{X / X / X / X / X / X / X / X / X / X}
\]

Figure 6.8: Metrical foot of *Ormulum*

With the same metrical foot as *Ormulum* (Daiches, 1979, p.42), *Poema Morale* was still able to freely deploy MID in a variety of versions, see Table 6.8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>MID Num</th>
<th>WID Num</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Poema Morale</em> (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(W Essex)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.14.52, fols. 2r–9v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poema Morale</em> (8)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodley Digby 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fols. 97r–110v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poema Morale</em> (5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>London, Lambeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (6)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68.42%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>West Midland (SW Worcs.)</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Palace Library 487, fols. 59v–65r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (7)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74.36%</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>West Midland (SW Worcs.)</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>London, British Library, Egerton 613, fols. 64r–70v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormulum (sampled)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Bodleian Library MS Junius 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the choice of prepositions is certainly independent of the metrical foot of the verse. Another influencing factor may be the requirement of rhyming, which indeed plays a role in a northern poem, *Cursor Mundi* (see Chapter 8 for details).

As for style, it does significantly impact the prepositional choice. As previously mentioned, the high retention rate of MID in the *PC* can be linked to its formal register and style. Style has nothing to do with genre or diction. A poem can have a low style serving a common audience, like *Ormulum* and *Havelok*, while a prose can also have a very formal style with an elevated choice of words, like the *PC*. 
Laȝamon’s Brut (hereafter LB) is another good example of the high style. It is a West Midlands chronicle poem written by the priest Layamon using a loose alliterative diction, like the three saints’ lives. However, LB has a more solemn and serious style than the Katherine Group, as Dance (2003, p.320) points out “one cannot, indeed, escape the impression on reading LB that it is written in a manner better suited to the conservative, stately progression of a historical chronicle” as against the “stylistic effect or explosive (use) with esoteric lexis” in the Katherine Group. This style difference gives rise to the prepositional difference as well:

As Table 6.9 shows, although sharing the same alliterative diction and regional provenance, LB and the three saints’ lives vary greatly in their retention rates of MID. Albeit from a later
period, all three versions of LB (LAEME#277, #278 and #280) have a high percentage of MID ranging from 89% to 95%, while three saints’ lives only see a low MID percentage from 8% to 19%. What is more, semantically, the use of MID in LB was more conservative than that in the three saints’ lives, especially in its unique governing of the instrumental relation, as opposed to the common use of instrumental WID in three saints’ lives. The contrast clearly indicates that stylistic consideration may be more influential than diction. LB is a historical chronicle demanding a more elevated and archaic tone, while the three saints’ lives are religious writings intended to reach a wide variety of audiences from different backgrounds with a more accessible style. This explains the different MID uses between them.

The use of MID in the late ME time must have carried a more solemn and formal style (if not archaic), sometimes lavishly used to impress a cultivated audience. The style consideration certainly affects the choice between MID and WID.

6.5 Conclusion

This Chapter introduces the historical Hiberno-Norse settlements on the northwestern coast of England and the Scandinavianism in the Cheshire Middle English, especially its early loss of MID. The AB language further south was generally more conservative, retaining more MID tokens to a varying degree, albeit with certain Norse spillovers. The theory of Norsification package unites the common linguistic developments across both Midlands and demonstrates the possible historical paths of diffusion for Norsified features. Linguistic markedness may be an important factor in the conditioning of Norse elements in the Southwest Midlands dialect. Style is proved to be more influential than diction in the preservation of MID.
Chapter 7. Southern and Kentish Region

7.1 Introduction

The Southern and Kentish Middle English saw a relatively smooth continuation from their OE predecessors, albeit with some French influence (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.313). The Kentish ME dialect was particularly archaic, especially in its consistent use of MID up until the 14th century. This high degree of local conservatism may have to do with the prominent presence of free peasants there. Free peasantry widely existed in both medieval Kent and Danelaw, two most active regions in this historical change. The common social factor points to the linguistic advantage of medieval free peasantry.

7.2 Southern Text

7.2.1 OE Period

Southern Middle English is directly related to the West Saxon Old English. The Wessex Kingdom originally ruled over present-day Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Wiltshire and Hampshire before it gradually expanded into Cornwall, Sussex, Surrey, Berkshire, Kent and Essex after AD 825, see Figure 7.1.

West Saxon Old English can be split into two periodical groups, the early West Saxon and the late West Saxon dialects. The former type was promoted under the patronage of Alfred the Great, hence also called the Alfredian Old English, featuring a prominent mix of Mercian or Anglian features. The latter type was a more focused form used in the 10th century, promoted by religious scholars like Æthelwold of Winchester or Ælfric of Eynsham.
Many surviving late OE texts were produced by Ælfric alone, to the extent that his proportion of works could skew the whole OE corpus (Cichosz & Pęzik, 2021, p.224). As has been discussed in Chapter 4, Ælfric had his own idiosyncratic use of MID and WID as opposed to the WSG. Cichosz & Pęzik (2021) also studies Ælfric’s lexical and stylistic features by a stylometric model, through which they identify a number of topic- and genre-independent markers specific to the Ælfrian writing, such as the preference for a passive construction of *weorþan... þurh* (‘become…through’), the tendency to use *to* in addressing the recipient of a quotation and the frequent use of MID in some set phrases.

Below is a selection of frequent MID set phrases in the Ælfrian Old English.
Table 7.1: Frequent MID phrases in the Ælfrician OE  
(Cichosz & Pęzik 2021, p.236)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>phrase</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>Ælfric</th>
<th>other texts</th>
<th>zeta</th>
<th>surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seg.</td>
<td>prop.</td>
<td>seg.</td>
<td>prop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid micclum N</td>
<td>with great N</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.0350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid soðum N</td>
<td>with true N</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mid soðum geleafan)</td>
<td>with true faith</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mid soðre dædbote)</td>
<td>with true repentance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid geleafan</td>
<td>with faith</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.0183</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid gode/ godes N</td>
<td>with God/ God's N</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid weorcum</td>
<td>with deeds</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.1 shows, MID frequently appears in Ælfrician set phrases like *mid micclum N* ‘with great (noun)’, *mid geleafan* ‘with faith’ and *mid soðum N* ‘with true (noun)’, as the high surplus numbers indicate. Such a high degree of collocational concentration may imply MID’s falling lexical productivity in Ælfric’s idiolect.

Besides, there is a genre effect in the distribution of MID in southern OE. Table 7.2 summarizes the MID and WID tokens in various late OE southern texts. Although a high percentage of MID use was observed across all texts, the chi-square test indeed shows a genre bias: southern OE MID was significantly correlated with prose rather than with verse, $X^2 (1, N = 985) = 5.9895$, $p = .014392 < .05$, see Table 7.3.
Table 7.2: MID and WID tokens in late OE southern texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num</th>
<th>WID Num</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Saxon Gospel</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.88%</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Winchester authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ælfric’s Lives of the Saints</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87.39%</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Ælfrician authorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late OE Poems</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77.46%</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Unknown authorship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Chi-square test for southern OE tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Prose</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>55 (61.70) [0.73]</td>
<td>801 (794.30) [0.06]</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>16 (9.30) [4.83]</td>
<td>113 (119.70) [0.38]</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>914</strong></td>
<td><strong>985 (Grand Total)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the effect size of this correlation is very small, \( \phi = \sqrt{X^2 / n} = \sqrt{5.9895 / 985} = 0.0779 < 0.1 \), it still implies a mild specialization towards one of the genres. Southern OE MID was perhaps already on path to becoming more restricted in use. This establishes the pre-Conquest southern situation.
7.2.2 ME Period

French lexical influence prominently came in after the Norman Conquest, especially in the south. However, the French superstratum influence did not appear to have caused any form of simplification in nominal and verbal inflection in Southern Middle English (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.308). As an elite language, French was never spoken en masse by the common English folk and many Norman aristocrats shifted to English-speaking by about 1265 (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.126). It is therefore unlikely to adduce French influence to explain the loss of MID in English, since the French counterparts of avec (‘with’) and contre (‘against’) are entirely unrelated to the English forms.

The ME southern data are listed in Table 7.4. Some texts have a strikingly high MID retention rate, such as Poema Morale, while some have a particularly low rate, such as Kyng Alisaunnder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>W Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 2 (157)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Wells, Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 1 (156)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Wells, Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Christ, Infancy of Christ, South English Legendary (1600)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>93.84%</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>West Oxfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poema Morale</td>
<td>Kyng Alisaunder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MID%</td>
<td>WID%</td>
<td>MID%</td>
<td>WID%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, time is an important factor. Earlier texts tend to have a higher MID percentage than later texts, as we compare the 12th-century *Poema Morale* to the 14th-century *Kyng Alisaunder*. Their prepositional semantics are rather different too, as indicated in the semantic comparison in Table 7.5:

As Table 7.5 shows, *Poema Morale* is apparently more conservative in that all its WID tokens uniquely serve as an oppositional device, while all instrumental tokens belong exclusively to MID. On the other hand, in *Kyng Alisaunder*, WID’s oppositional use only
takes up 2.5% of total tokens and both prepositions can freely govern the instrumental relation, even used interchangeably in adjacent phrases, as (1) shows:

(1)

Myd berfreyes. with alle gyn, gef they myghte the cite wynne

With movable-towers with all skill, if they might the city capture

‘With the movable-towers and with all skills, they might capture the city’

(Kyng Alisaunder, [Chap_11]1631, PCMEP)

The time difference between both texts is certainly to blame, however, we should also take into consideration the fact that Kyng Alisaunder was copied in London where the local dialect must have been more advanced than the southern countryside of Essex. However, another contemporary text from London, Adam Davy’s Five Dreams, also has a high MID retention rate of up to 70%. This brings about another factor, the style. According to PCMEP (M2b.DavyDreams), the poet of Adam Davy’s Five Dreams possibly wrote the poem to please King Edward II during his rule from 1307 to 1327, therefore a high and formal style was to be expected.

Another text, LAEME#1600, is from a West Oxfordshire manuscript dating to 1300, comprising writings of Life of Christ, Infancy of Christ and South English Legendary. It has a low MID token percentage of only 6%. The semantic data also show a highly synonymic nature of MID and WID therein, see Table 7.6:
As Table 7.6 shows, both MID and WID tokens from LAEME #1600 have similar proportions of semantic relations. Such a highly homogeneous nature hints at the replacement of MID by WID proceeding into the final stage in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, even in southern countryside like Oxfordshire. In fact, many 14\textsuperscript{th}-century southern texts in the PPCME2 do not yield a single MID token, such as John of Trevisa's Polychronicon (AD 1387), The New Testament of Wycliffe (AD 1388) and Purvey's General Prologue to the Bible (AD 1388). These texts were excluded from the current dataset due to their lack of MID.

### 7.2.3 London Dialect

As mentioned in Chapter 6, the 14\textsuperscript{th}-century London dialect gained a lot of Midlands features from the population migration. Due to the population inflow from East and Central Midlands, “written English used in London from about 1380 to 1430 was not uniform...some writers used a preponderance of Southeast Midland (Leicester and Northampton etc.) traits, while

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAEME (1600)</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>MID%</th>
<th>WID</th>
<th>WID%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumentality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
others had a healthy percentage of generic Southern features and…the Essex dialect, London’s indigenous dialect” (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.305). As mentioned, Chaucer is a fine specimen of immigrant descendants who used an advanced type of English. The linguistic competition between the Midlands features and the southern features must have been fierce in London, as Table 7.7 shows:

Table 7.7: Feature competition in London English 1385-1425
(Thomason & Kaufman, 1988, p.305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Feature</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Midlands Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aye(i)n</td>
<td>‘again’</td>
<td>agein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aye(i)ns</td>
<td>‘against’</td>
<td>agein(e)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yildhall(e)</td>
<td>‘guildhall’</td>
<td>gildhall(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suster</td>
<td>‘sister’</td>
<td>sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theih</td>
<td>‘though’</td>
<td>thouh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hem</td>
<td>‘them’</td>
<td>theim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td>‘their’</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiy</td>
<td>‘they’</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eth</td>
<td>present indicative plural</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see from Table 7.7 that almost all Midlands features, except for the last one (which is no longer marked in Modern English), succeed into present-day English, replacing the original southern forms. These Midlands features are clearly Scandinavian in origin, including all third person plural pronouns (*they, them, their*), a grammatical word (*though*), a familial word (*sister*) and words with a hard-g consonant (*again, against, guildhall*). London English later passed on these features to Standard English.
In spite of this, many more Scandinavianized features in fact did not travel deep into the South, such as the Nordic spatial prepositions *till* (‘to’) and *fra* (‘from’) or the ON infinitival marker *at*. Feature maps from eLALME (*A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, Benskin et al., 2013-) show that these features were mostly absent from the South during the late ME period:

Figure 7.2: TILL distribution (from eLALME)
Figure 7.3: FRA distribution (from eLALME)

Figure 7.4: Infinitival marker AT distribution (from eLALME)
Figures 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 show that rather than penetrating southward, these Norse-related elements spread northward into early Scots. Therefore, the dialect of London, albeit slightly Norsified, was never as Scandinavianized as the Danelaw or northern English. Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.275) also points out that London English was essentially still a local Southern (Essex) dialect with a large number of Midlands inputs.

7.2.4 Southwestern Dialect

In contrast to the mixed features in London dialect, other far-flung southern counties in the west preserved the use of MID into a much later period. LAEME only contains two texts (with a dual presence of MID and WID) from the West Country\textsuperscript{13}, namely LAEME #156 and #157.

Table 7.8: Two ME southwestern texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name (LAEME Num.)</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 1 (156)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus I, language 2 (157)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} The term West Country here generally includes Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire.
Both texts are only short fragments of English writing in-between the Latin texts, therefore not yielding many meaningful tokens. LAEME comments that #157 represents a form of language only slightly modified from Old English, while the same hand wrote #156 in a somewhat later kind of language, although their MID percentages are not essentially different, see Table 7.8.

Although it is hard to find other ME texts from the southwest, the *Oxford English Dictionary* happens to quote a very late remnant use of MID in a 16th-century book called *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge* (“mid”, OED). MID can be seen in a piece of verse mimicking the contemporary Cornish dialect:

(2)

*Iche pray God to coun him wel to vare,*

*That, whan he comit home, myd me he do not starre.*

...

*And now come myd me, gosse, I thee pray*

*And let vs make mery, as longe as we may*

*(Furnivall, 1870, pp.122-123)*

As (2) shows, the use of MID in these lines is rather fixed, mostly occurring in the set phrase *myd me*. It reflects a lack of lexical productivity of MID, perhaps existing only as a fossilized use. Since Cornwall is situated at the far-end of Southwest England rather isolated from the rest of the country, its vestige of MID in colloquial speech was kept much longer, although literary MID was *de facto* gone in the English writing beyond the 14th century.
7.3 Kentish Conservatism

As the logistic regression in Chapter 3 shows, Kentish was a very conservative dialect in the historical shift towards WID. Kentish texts retained a frequent use of MID as late as the mid-14th century (in Ayenbite of Inwy). Its marked conservatism even overshadows other southern texts. As Table 7.9 (re-attached from Chapter 3) demonstrates, Kent scores a very low factor weight of 0.0219 in the prediction towards WID, much lower than even the adjacent southern region (0.645).

Table 7.9: Kentish conservatism in logistic regression

```model formula:  Prep ~ Genre + Region + Relation + Year
+ Relation:Year
```

### model.basics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total.n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>intercept</th>
<th>input.prob</th>
<th>grand.proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7349</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-21.047</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### model.fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>deviance</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>AICc</th>
<th>Somers.Dxy</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6593.861</td>
<td>6623.861</td>
<td>6623.927</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logodds</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>proportion</th>
<th>factor.weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>0.2220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high retention rate of MID can be observed in all the Kentish ME texts:

Table 7.10: High retention rate of MID in Kentish texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentish Homilies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poema Morale (8)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentish Sermons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayenbite of Inwyt</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88.33%</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.10 shows that MID’s relative percentages range from 67% to 100% in all Kentish texts. The last text of the list, *Ayenbite of Inwyt* (hereafter *Ayenbite*), still kept an active MID usage rate of 88.33%, not much of a fall compared to the *Kentish Homilies* in 1150. *Ayenbite* is a holograph written by a Canterbury monk, Dan Michel, in 1340 when he was about 70 (PPCME2, cmayenbi-m2), so the text language might be representative of an earlier period, perhaps the late 13th century. *Ayenbite* has some highly archaic features, such as the retention of a neuter gender and the dative case, as well as preserving “the Old English pattern of V2 nearly intact” except some “further erosion in the exceptional status of then and now and a generally freer attachment of adjuncts to CP” (Kroch, Taylor & Ringe, 2000, p.13).
As Table 7.11 shows, pronoun subjects in *Ayenbite* generally have a very low inversion rate (except the exceptional cases of *then* and *now*) ranging from 0 to 10%. This represents a natural continuation from the West Saxon OE pattern. Its marked conservatism is also reflected in the semantics of MID and WID, almost unchanged from the late OE *Ælfric’s Lives of Saints*.

### Table 7.12: Semantic composition of *Ayenbite* and *Ælfric’s Lives of Saints*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Ayenbite of Inwyt</em></th>
<th><em>Ælfric’s Lives of Saints</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MID%</td>
<td>WID%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>instrumental</strong></td>
<td>27.85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interactional</strong></td>
<td>14.75%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>manner</strong></td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opposition</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallel</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.12 demonstrates, MID’s semantic composition remains very stable between *Ayenbite* and *Ælfric’s*. Instrumental relation remains MID’s near-exclusive monopoly in both texts, while oppositional relation is exclusively governed by WID tokens, despite at a lower percentage in *Ælfric’s Lives of Saints* than in *Ayenbite*. The semantic merging of MID and WID as seen in other Midlands or Southern texts is not to be found here. It is worth pointing out that there was no spatial token recorded in *Ayenbite* in spite of its productive use of MID, greatly undermining Groussier’s claim (2001) on the link between MID’s loss and its lack of spatial usage.

Thomason & Kaufman (1988) comments that “since 1430 the dialect of the Southeast (Kent) became extinct” (p.270). The Kentish dialect itself of course did not die out overnight, but its written form must have been gradually replaced by the coming Standard English, especially after the invention of printing in the late 15th century (Freeborn, 1992, p.110). The last Kentish text collected in PPCME2, *The Caxton abstract of the Rule of St. Benet* (dating to c.1490, 150 years behind *Ayenbite*), no longer sees any token of MID.

### 7.4 Free Peasantry’s Linguistic Advantage

As mentioned in Chapter 5, the loss of MID in London English was propelled by the population migration from the East Midlands. It naturally raises the question as to why East Midlanders could become the main migration force in the High Middle Ages when most others were still tightly tied by the feudal land system. Previous logistic regression shows that East Midlands and Kent represent two extremes in the historical change. It happens that both regions had a high percentage of free peasants after the Conquest. The class of free peasants,
with a freer bond to the land and more socioeconomic freedom, could gain a unique linguistic advantage to spread or preserve their own dialects.

7.4.1 Social Structure of Medieval England

In the Middle Ages, city dwellers were few in number compared to the broad agricultural population. The possession of land was closely linked to a person’s title, economic status, as well as juridical status in the Middle Ages (Stafford, 1985, pp.156-157). Therefore, it can also be an important sociolinguistic factor in the historical linguistic change. For example, the Norman French aristocrats, as the biggest landowners of the country, exerted a disproportionate impact on the English language especially in the lexical field, despite their small population. However, another social group also deserves our attention, the much more numerous class of free peasants, who had an uneven distribution in the Norman society.

In medieval England, there were five ranks of peasants based on different land ownerships, as the 11th-century *Domesday Book* suggests, namely slaves, villeins, bordars, sokemen and freemen (Stafford, 1985, p.158). They can be further split into two groups: the free ones (freemen and sokemen) and the unfree ones (slaves, villeins and bordars).

While slaves or serfs were apparently the most oppressed and disadvantaged class, many more people belonged to the group of tenant peasants, namely villeins and bordars, a class better than slaves but still heavily bound by labor and service to the local lords. Therefore, villeins and bordars were still highly controlled by the manorial system. Postan (1975, pp.143-144) points out that unfree peasants were not allowed to migrate freely out of the manorial territory, nor were they allowed to sue their lord in king’s courts, and they needed the lord’s permission (or by means of paying a fine) to decide on personal matters in life, such as marrying off their daughters, bequeathing or inheriting a property etc. Although manumission, the purchase of freedom, was possible, but it was by no means frequent throughout the Middle Ages. Economically, the burden on villeins was much greater than that of freeholders, since they “had to part in favor of the lord with a far greater proportion of their output than freemen” to the extent that a villain with a much larger land might actually
be much poorer than a freeholder with a smaller land (Postan, 1975, p.146). Therefore, villeins and bordars were more repressed in the system and enjoyed little prestige.

Freemen, on the other hand, were small landowners who were not subject to any (or only minimally) manorial control. Freemen can be found all over England, but most prominently in Kent, as Postan (1975) comments “the Kentish freedom was widespread and clearly set the region apart from the rest of England” (p.146-147). This is thanks to a unique land inheritance system of Gavelkind in Kent, which passed on the household land to all family members rather than only to the eldest son like most other areas in Norman England, sparing the rest of the family from going into tenancy or serfdom with the local lords.

Another group of peasants with relative freedom is sokemen, who were mostly found in Danelaw. They were not as completely free as freemen in that they were still partly bound by customary payments and services to the local lords, albeit much less than those of villeins and bordars. Sokemen also enjoyed many personal rights unavailable to villeins and bordars, almost to the extent of a freemen:

*He* (a sokeman) *had his own recognized place in the courts of wapentake and shire. He could alienate his land or any portion of it by gift, sale, or exchange. He paid his taxes, such as Danegeld or the sheriff’s aid, directly to the officers of the king or the sheriff. Above all, he was usually free from the villein’s duty of working two or more days each week on his lord’s land. He was therefore free from the compulsion of manorial discipline.*

(Stenton, 1969, p.4)

In terms of duty, sokemen did not have to observe the harsh manorial discipline nor contribute as much labor as villeins and bordars did. For example, Stafford (1985, pp.159-160) cites that at Collingham in Nottinghamshire, a villein needed to do one day’s work each week for the local lord, while a sokeman only owed six days a year to the lord. As Sayles
(1961) also comments that “the connexion between them (sokemen and their lord) remained personal and did not degenerate into a servile relationship” (p.136). In terms of property, sokemen were free “to sell land, (or) to go with one’s service to a new lord” (Stafford, 1985, p.161). As a matter of fact, the Danelaw sokemen were so free and wealthy that there was a time when the Archbishop Wulfstan of York feared for the gradually blurring distinction between the growing class of sokemen and the proper nobility (Stafford, 1985, pp.156-161). What is more, sokemen’s land, like Kentish freemen’s, also went into partible inheritance for all surviving children, unlike the primogeniture principle the Anglo-Saxon peasants adopted from the Norman feudal system (Postan, 1975, p.146). This may be due to the continuation of the Scandinavian inheritance customs in the region. Therefore, the number of sokemen would grow after each split of the land, enabling more and more family members to support themselves as free tillers. Even though the size of land would decrease as years passed by, they would still be able to capitalize the inheritance and move into the city for other businesses if needs be. For these reasons, sokemen had a higher degree of status, prestige and freedom than most other non-Kentish Anglo-Saxon peasants.

To conclude, medieval England was highly stratified with a strict class boundary in the countryside. Unfree peasants like villeins and bordars were highly restricted and controlled by the manorial system. On the contrary, freemen and sokemen enjoyed a much higher status and freer access to movement and property inheritance. Therefore, their linguistic features tend to stay stronger or spread farther than the others. The following sections will compare them in more details.

7.4.2 Danelaw Sokemen

The sokemen class could trace their historical origin to the Scandinavian armies. Stenton (1969) remarks that “the most distinctive feature of the early medieval economy of the part of England known as the Danelaw is the great body of peasants who individually enjoyed personal independence” (p.1) and these free sokemen “represent, as a class, the rank and file of the Scandinavian armies which had settled this district in the ninth century” (p.10). Postan (1975) also suggests that the tradition of sokemen freedom might have been “imported from…the Danes who invaded the region and settled in some parts of it three or four
centuries later” (p.147). The relatively late exploitation (or reclamation) of wetlands in the East Midlands, especially in Lincolnshire, must have aided the widespread freehold of land there. Sokemen’s prominent Scandinavian identity lasted very long, as Ekwall (1936, p.160) notices a high percentage of Danish names still existing in some 12th- and 13th-century Danelaw charters of small landowners.

The number of sokemen varied in different shires of Danelaw. Ekwall (1936) comments that “on an average, about half of the recorded rural population (in Danelaw) consisted of sokemen” (p.161), especially Lincolnshire. Sayles (1961, p.136) estimates that half of the population in Lincolnshire, one third in Leicestershire and nearly one third in Nottinghamshire were sokemen. The sokemen demographic is well reflected in the Domesday statistics, see Table 7.13:

Table 7.13: Social statistics from *Domesday Book*

(Stafford 1985: 158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Villeins</th>
<th>Bordars</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Sokemen</th>
<th>Freemen</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds.</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darbys.</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts.</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincs.</td>
<td>7029</td>
<td>3379</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>3874</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Others category mostly includes priests and Frenchmen.*
According to Table 7.13, Lincolnshire had an extremely large number of sokemen, exceeding half of the local population. Other adjacent counties, such as Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire also had a significant sokemen presence, albeit not as much as Lincolnshire. Stenton (1969) comments that “the great strength of that Scandinavian settlement from which the free peasantry of the Danelaw is ultimately derived lay in central Lincolnshire, that the invaders thinned out to north, south, and west” (p.13).

Linguistically, Lincolnshire was the earliest region to see the loss of MID and the advancement of the semantically-versatile WIÐ (as in *Ormulum*). The distribution of Norse-related linguistic features matches perfectly the historical demographic in that region. The heavy Scandinavianism in the Lindsey English and the later spread of the Norsification package could all be linked to the local sokemen with a Scandinavian heritage, who were able to freely travel around as free peasants. Migration was a privilege in the Middle Ages when most Anglo-Saxon tillers lived under the yoke of the manorial system. Such a privilege gave them a unique advantage to spread their dialectal features.

Also, since sokemen were small landowners capable of selling and buying properties, they could also donate land to the local church as grantors. As Stenton (1969) notices, many grants of land to ecclesiastical establishments were from donors of Anglo-Scandinavian names (p.14). This must have in turn given them a higher prestige to propagate their dialects, as local scribes may consciously or unconsciously recognize their patronage by adopting more Norse forms in the local ecclesiastical texts.

To conclude, Danelaw sokemen’s unique social status enables them to easily gain an upper hand in the dialectal competition by spreading their Scandinavianized features to other Anglo-Saxon areas.
7.4.3 Kentish Free Peasant

Historically, Kentish were the first English people to confront the landing Norman armies, therefore winning a privilege to retain their ancient customary rights, including the land inheritance system of Gavelkind.

Gavelkind distributes land and property equally among all surviving heirs, as opposed to the primogeniture principle introduced by the Norman feudal system. Under Gavelkind, small free landowners were protected in Kent, creating a major concentration of free peasants in the southeast as opposed to the rest of Norman England (Postan, 1975, p.146).

Gavelkind differed from other tenures in various ways, the most important of which was that when an owner died without leaving a will his land was divided equally between all his surviving sons instead of passing wholly to the eldest son (the system known as primogeniture which, after Norman Conquest, became general in England)... The medieval open-field system, typical of Midlands, never prevailed in Kent.

(Jessup, 1966, p.36)

The similarity between the Danelaw sokemen and the Kentish free peasants is striking. Davis (1955) observes a remarkable parallel between the socage tenure in Danelaw and the Kentish Gavelkind, in both of which “the tenure was free and the inheritance partible” (p.33). Hadley (2000) also mentions that both tenures appear “to have their origins in freehold land held under payment of tribute to the king”, possibly coming from the Anglo-Saxon class of a “ceorl (freeman) who sits on gafolland (rented land with tribute due to the king)” (p.22). Both the Kentish and Danelaw local societies stood in sharp contrast to the rest of feudal England. Postan (1975) comments that “the ‘free’ societies of Danelaw or East Anglia or Kent contained relatively larger numbers of smallholders than the fully manorialized counties of the Midlands or the Thames valley” (p.146).
This social-economic situation in turn creates a sense of selfness and otherness among the Kentish community. Many historians (Wedd, 2019, pp.1-3; Everitt, 1966, pp.46-47, p.228) view Gavelkind as a factor in making Kent a “socially distinctive county in which kinship and the rule of partible inheritance shaped local loyalties and significantly affected the course of events”, especially in reinforcing the dominance of yeoman (a freeholder of land), strengthening clan and family ties, creating a flatter social structure and a more tight-knit community. Everitt (1986, pp. 179-180) links the Gavelkind system to the singular independence of Kentish identity in terms of local economy, gentry and social network.

Without doubt, identity and language often come into interplay. The prominent class of free peasantry in Kent creates a sense of regional independence in the Kentish community, also propelling the strong conservatism of the local dialect. The high retention rate of MID in Kentish, as well as other archaic linguistic features, may then be explained by this strong local pride.

7.4.4 Summary

Postan (1975) notices that in the West Midlands and the southern counties (outside Kent), serfdom in its varying degree “was the lot of most of the countryfolk” (p.147), while in both Danelaw and Kent, the widespread free holding of land gave rise to a special class of free peasants unbound by the feudal system. All across England, the pure number of native Anglo-Saxons must have greatly outweighed the Scandinavian sokemen and their descendants, yet the feudal system tightly controlled many of them (except in Kent) and led to an imbalanced linguistic competition.

The loss of MID firstly occurred in Danelaw and the preservation of MID lasted the longest in Kent. Albeit seemingly at two ends of the same linguistic change, both regions were driven by a common social class of free peasantry. The replacement of MID by WIÐ started from Danelaw and penetrated into the South via population migration. Sokemen had a unique advantage to spread their linguistic features, due to free movement or better socio-economic conditions. The Kentish free peasants, on the other hand, formed a close-knit community and
maintained high local pride as well as a prominent linguistic conservatism. Both groups represent active players of opposite camps in the historical change.

7.5 Conclusion

This chapter investigates the Southern and Kentish Middle English. In southern Old English, some lexical restriction was already observed in the use of MID. Later in the ME period, many Southern texts followed the national trend to gradually replace MID with WID, except for some colloquial vestige in the southwestern countryside. London English, being the most advanced type in the South, received many Norsification features from the Midlands immigrants.

Kentish dialect was particularly archaic with a high retention rate of MID into the 14th century. It may have to do with the local social structure in medieval Kent, marked by a prominent presence of free peasants. The situation was also similar in Danelaw, where sokemen enjoyed a high degree of socio-economic and personal freedom. The free peasantry possessed a unique linguistic advantage to propagate or preserve their local dialects in the medieval society.
Chapter 8. Northern English, Scots & Norn

8.1 Introduction

The linguistic situation in Northern England has been obscured by the lack of written materials in the 12th and 13th centuries. After William’s hard-handed harrying of the North in the 11th century, the North suffered a great economic and population loss, leading to a major text vacuum. Some 14th-century northern texts kept the use of MID for the rhyming purpose, although many more texts saw no more signs of it. Northern Middle English and early Scots share a similar historical origin and MID was lost in Scots from the earliest written record. At the northern tip of Scotland lie the islands of Orkney and Shetland, whose residents originally spoke a Nordic language called Norn. The historical materials in Norn also show no trace of MID there. The shift from Norn-speaking to Scots-speaking in the Northern Isles sheds some light on the possible historical shift in medieval Danelaw.

8.2 Northern Middle English

Northern Middle English is the variety of Middle English spoken in regions north of Humber, “corresponding to Northumbria and ranging from mid Yorkshire northward into Scotland” (Milroy, 1992, p.172). Albeit covering a broad area, the actual available Northern texts are very few and mostly concentrated in the late ME period.

In the current dataset, northern data are mostly to be found either at the beginning or at the end of the change, namely in the 10th or the 14th centuries. The 10th-century northern texts include the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual glossed in Northumbrian Old English. The 14th-century northern texts include Cursor Mundi and The Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton Ms.). All of the texts, except for Mirror of St. Edmund, have a dual presence of MID and WID. In the following section, I will first explore the historical reason behind the data gap in the North during the 12th and the 13th centuries.
8.2.1 Harrying of the North

Following William’s Conquest in 1066, outbreaks of rebellions were plotted in Northern England under Scottish support. Edgar Atheling, the last claimant to the Wessex throne, incited the Anglo-Danish rebels in Yorkshire to defy the Norman rule from his refuge in Scotland. The regions of rebellion also include Durham, Northumberland, Lancashire, parts of Cumberland and Westmorland (Kapelle, 1979, p.5). The much-angered king of William therefore decided to crush the rebels hard-handedly, laying waste to the North using a cruel scorched-earth tactic in 1069. It caused tremendous civilian damage in the northern region, especially in Yorkshire. According to Douglas (1964), William the Conqueror, marching north to subdue the rebels, “savagely devastated the land through which he passed, sparing no male and leaving nothing behind him which could support life” (p.220). Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.287) also estimates that half of the population in Yorkshire were killed or made refugees. The Norman troops further split up into smaller bands and executed a systematic harrying as far west as to Merseyside and as far south as to Derby.

The Harrying of the North delivered a devastating blow to the northern society. Stenton (1969) notices the disappearance of sokemen in Yorkshire as the consequence of the harrying in the winter of 1069, “it is safe to assume that…innumerable free peasants lost their independence as a result of the poverty into which they were thrown by the burning of their farms and the destruction of their stock” (p.11). The local farmers were forced to migrate out of famine, which caused a drain of local population in that area. According to Kapelle (1979), the Yorkshire population was greatly reduced to an extent that “Yorkshire was still nearly an empty land seventeen years after the harrying, and oxen were as rare as men” (p.162). Douglas (1964) also finds description of the aftermath in a contemporary writing, “(there were) the rotting and putrefying corpses which littered the highways of the afflicted province…(and) pestilence inevitably ensued” (p.221). Stenton (1969, p.11) estimates that the full force of the great harrying of the North could still be felt as late as in 1086.

This could partly explain the northern data gap in the early ME period. Not only were the Anglo-Danish rebels entirely forced out of the region, but great sufferings were inflicted upon
civilians, many of whom fled from their land due to starvation and plague. The great loss in northern society certainly took a toll on the local literature production. In medieval times, the production of literature would have demanded a sustained input of resources from the local authorities. According to Stafford (1985), to produce a book like the Lichfield Gospels “it would have required the slaughter of 120 animals to provide the vellum alone” and the libraries of major monasteries like Peterborough would have “required a massive investment of local resources” (p.32). This must have been impossible after the great population and economic loss after the harrying. This is a major historical reason why northern literature became so rare in the 12th and 13th centuries.

8.2.2 Northern Texts

While MID was still productively used in the 10th-century northern gloss (see Chapter 4), the 14th-century northern texts resurfaced with only very few MID tokens, all of which are from Cursor Mundi, see Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: MID and WID tokens in diachronic northern texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindisfarne Gospel</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91.63%</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Ritual</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84.17%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursor mundi (sampled)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton Ms.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.1 shows, Cursor Mundi records only three tokens of MID (searched throughout the text), while The Mirror of St. Edmund records none of it. Cursor Mundi (hereafter CM, meaning “messenger of the world”) is a poem written in eight-syllabled couplets, with a
lengthy religious narration running from Noah’s time to the final Judgement Day. Multiple versions of *CM* exist and only the version from Cotton Vespasian A.iii, presumably written in Yorkshire, is included in the current dataset. The three tokens of MID are quoted below:

**MID in Cursor Mundi**

(1)

"*Iesus,* þai said, "*yee to ded did,*

Jesus they said you to dead did

*Sitand his disciplis mid* 17482

sitting his disciples with

(2)

*I am his moder, wel he me kid*

I am his mother well he me knows

*I am ful fain yee ar me mid, 20452*

I am full joyful you are me with

(3)

*Til alixandre to send þe thred,*

to Alexander to send the third

*Þe feurth to ber hir-self mid, 21590*

the fourth to bear herself with
In all of the above lines, MID appears in postposition, which is syntactically highly unusual. Such deployment was very likely driven by the rhyming requirement. Since CM makes use of rhyming couplets, it demands the author to rhyme the last words of every two lines. As can be seen from (1) and (2), MID rhymes perfectly with did and kid in the previous lines. As for (3), thred does not seem to be as perfect a match to MID as the previous two, but they still share a rather similar phonological quality.

A comparison can be made from postposed WID tokens in the poem as well. For example, in (4) the postposed WID rhymes perfectly with grith and in (5) it rhymes, less ideally, with kyght.\(^\text{14}\)

**Rhyming WID in Cursor Mundi**

(4)

\[
\text{zee sal alsua tak zow with 1711}
\]

you shall also take you with

\[
\text{Beist and fouxul ȝat sal haue grith}
\]

beast and foul that shall have peace

(5)

\[
\text{Sin godd ȝe chese for kin  o kyght,}
\]

since god thee chose for kin of kight

\(^\text{14\ It is noteworthy that WID in CM is sometimes written as wit.}\)
His hert has euer ben be with, 7994

his heart has ever been thee with

(Cursor Mundi, Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse)

Therefore, the rhyming requirement of CM may have promoted the postposition of prepositions in the text. The use of MID in CM is only restricted to such contexts, a reflection of its possibly archaic and uncommon nature, deployed out of metrical consideration rather than communicational consideration.

In fact, we can compare three other northern versions of CM (Morris, 1874). These versions include Fairfax MS. 14, Göttingen MS. Theol. 107 and Trinity MS. R.3.8. Table 8.2 below compares the Vespasian MID tokens against three other versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line number in Vespasian</th>
<th>Cotton MS. Vespasian Aiii</th>
<th>Fairfax MS. 14</th>
<th>Göttingen MS. Theol. 107</th>
<th>Trinity MS. R.3.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17482</td>
<td>Sittand his disciplis <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>Syttyng his dissiplis <strong>amyd</strong></td>
<td>Sittand his dissiplis <strong>emid</strong></td>
<td>Sittynd his disciplis <strong>amydde</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20452</td>
<td>I am ful fain yee ar me <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>his loue to me was neuer hid</td>
<td>I am ful fain ȝe er me <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>wel is me now ȝou to se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21590</td>
<td>þe feurth to ber hir-self <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>þe firþ to ber hir-seluin <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>þe feird to bere hirseluen <strong>mid</strong></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2: Comparison of MID in four northern versions of CM
(Morris, 1874)
Table 8.2 shows that MID could be alternatively replaced by another preposition AMID in three other versions (see Line 17482 of Fairfax, Göttingen and Trinity MS). There is indeed some semantic intersection between AMID ‘in the middle of’ and MID ‘along, with’ in the plural setting, as in *sit MID/AMID his disciples*. Metrically, AMID can also meet the rhyming requirement.

In Line 21590, the Fairfax and Göttingen scribes follow the Vespasian one in using MID, but the Trinity version simply avoids it. It indicates that MID was not accepted by all northern scribes. In Line 20452, the use of MID was also limited to the Vespasian and the Göttingen versions only. To sum up, MID’s availability in the ME northern texts varied from scribe to scribe.

Many reasons could explain the variation here. Stenton (1969, p.11) mentions that the harrying dissipated the original Anglo-Scandinavian farmers in Yorkshire and gave rise to a class of free peasants “of native (Anglo-Saxon) ancestry” in the 12th century. It is likely that the reintroduction of Anglo-Saxon tillers from other regions into Yorkshire helped preserve some archaic features in the Northern Middle English, but not across the board. Another reason could be the different copying practices adopted by different scribes. Some scribes might be copying the text from an earlier version without too much correction, while some might tend to normalize the manuscript language based on their own. Due to the limited historical background, it is hard to reach a definitive conclusion.

Another 14th-century northern text, *The Mirror of St. Edmund* (Thornton Ms.) is a translation of the Latin *Speculum S. Edmund* from around 1350. It also has another version (Vernon Ms.) from Worcestershire dating to 1390 included in the dataset.
As can be seen from Table 8.3, both versions record no token of MID. This is not surprising, since both texts are from a later period than CM. If the use of MID in CM was already archaic and only motivated by metrical concern, later texts would naturally have few chances of preserving it.

In terms of diachronic semantic change, I compare two northern texts, the 14th-century *Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton)* against the 10th-century *Durham Ritual*:

Table 8.4: Semantics of MID and WID in two diachronic northern texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>MID Num.</th>
<th>WID Num.</th>
<th>MID %</th>
<th>WID %</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Mirror of St. Edmund</em> (Vernon Ms.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Mirror of St. Edmund</em> (Thornton Ms.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1350?</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton Ms.)</th>
<th>Durham Ritual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>MID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 8.4 indicates, the 14th-century WID in *Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton)* already gained a full instrumental and manner usage, as opposed to the single oppositional use in the *DR WID*. The diachronic semantic development of WID in the North mirrors closely the national trend. The semantic expansion of WID must have become a universal national phenomenon in the 14th century.

### 8.2.3 Summary

Northern Middle English texts are unevenly distributed, partly due to the great social and economic turmoil brought by the Harrying of the North. The 14th century saw a sparse use of rhyming MID in *Cursor Mundi*, but many more northern texts like *Mirror of St. Edmund* were already free of MID. Since the northern data gap between the OE and the ME periods is regretfully large, I attempt to bridge the gap by looking into complementary evidence from Scots and Norn.

### 8.3 Scots

The Scots language is closely related to Northern English. Historically, the Southeast Scottish lowland started being settled by the Angles in as early as the 6th century under the kingdom of Bernicia (King, 1997, p.156). Later, the kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira were unified into the kingdom of Northumbria spanning from northern England to southern Scotland. While the Scottish Highlands remained largely Celtic-speaking, the Lowlands widely used the *Inglis* ‘English’ tongue, especially with the incoming Northern English immigrants into the
metropolitan Scottish burghs in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century (Oram, 2006, pp.281-283). The \textit{Inglis} spoken in southern Scotland was renamed as Scots after 1500 (Freeborn, 1992, p.59).

Early Scots has a multifold lexical composition of English, Romance and Scandinavian lexis, see Table 8.5:

Table 8.5: Lexical composition of Early Scots

(Macafee & Aitken, 2002, §4.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>all</th>
<th>more frequent</th>
<th>less frequent</th>
<th>originals</th>
<th>derivatives*</th>
<th>compounds*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total French</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total F/L</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr/Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Latin</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Romance</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Scand</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flem/Du/LG</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gael</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Celtic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total multiple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomatopoeic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper names</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand total</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5 shows that English lexis makes up 34.6\% of the total Early Scots lexis, while Romance (including French and Latin) also mounts up to a high 46.7\%. This is due to the “long-lasting Franco-Scottish political and military alliance” in the Middle Ages (McClure, 1994, p.56). Scandinavian element is also prominent (up to 8.4\%) in the pool. According to
Macafee (1997, p.201), Old Norse loans in Scots are exclusively filtered through Northern English spoken by the Anglo-Danish migrants, but Kries (2007, pp.113-114) discerns two layers of Scandinavian influence in Scots, one of the West Scandinavian origin and the other of the East Scandinavian origin. The former type was mainly from Norwegian Vikings who settled in the southwest Scotland (Galloway) and the Northern isles of Shetland/Orkney since the end of the 8th century, while the latter type, the dominant type, was from the Anglo-Danish migrants in the Central Belts area of Scotland. The Anglo-Danish brought to Scots a range of shared linguistic features with the Northern Middle English, such as the non-palatalization of the /k/, /g/ and /sk/ consonants (as in kirk ‘church’, brig ‘bridge’ and skirl ‘shrill’), the retention of the Germanic au (as in loup ‘to leap’ and coup ‘to fall’), the third person plural pronouns thai/thair/thaim ‘they/their/them’, the demonstrative thae ‘those’, the prepositions fra/til ‘from/till’, the modals man/mon/maun ‘must’ and the present participle ending -and. (McClure, 1994, p.57; Macafee, 1997, p.203).

Moreover, Scots also saw no trace of MID. Dictionary of the Scots Language (2004) does not record any token of the preposition MID. The closest available forms are simply MID (n.) and MID (adj.) meaning ‘middle’:

**MID (n.)**

1) Middle.

*In mid of the barrace, sat in the mid the deis*

**MID (adj.)**

1) Signifying that the thing in question is situated in the middle position; central, middle.

*Two chambers, one high and a mid one.*

(“mid”, Dictionary of the Scots Language)
Since the earliest written record of Scots could only be traced back to the mid-14th century, it is hard to trace the change to an earlier period. It is likely that the loss of MID was completed much earlier, maybe along with the influx of Anglo-Danish immigrants in the 12th century. There is no definitive conclusion due to the lack of historical materials.

8.4 Norn

8.4.1 Orkney and Shetland

Norwegian Vikings started settling in the Shetland and Orkney Islands from as early on as the AD 800. According to Sigurðsson (2000, p. vii), many powerful Norwegian elites took refuge in Orkney and Shetland to escape persecution from the Norwegian king Harald Fairhair in the 9th century and many Icelandic sagas mentioned Shetland/Orkney in the writings (such as Egils saga, Njál saga and Orkneyinga saga). Orkney and the Shetland remained part of the Norwegian colonies until the 15th century and “(some form of) Norwegian was still spoken in the Shetlands until the close of the eighteenth century” (Sayles, 1961, p.89). The local “Norwegian” language spoken in these two islands is called Norn, a descendant of the West Old Norse alongside Norwegian, Icelandic, and Faroese.

The Norn language left very few written materials. In 1774, a Scottish clergyman George Low recorded, by untrained ear-transcript, a Lord’s Prayer in Norn, as well as a simple Norn wordlist and a Norn ballad from the Foula Island (Steintún, 2016, p.7). As Figure 8.1 shows, the Foula Island is rather isolated from mainland Shetland, which might have helped the preservation of its local dialect.
8.4.2 Ballad of Hildina

The Norn ballad recorded by George Low is called the *Ballad of Hildina*. It is by far the longest existing text in Norn consisting of 35 stanzas. The use of Scandinavian suffixed article can still be observed in the ballad language, although levelled to a -na form, a sign of archaism even for its contemporary producer (Steintún, 2016, p.111). The fact that the reciter of the ballad, William Henry, was unable to provide a full translation to the ballad may also indicate his unfamiliarity of the ballad language (Knooihuizen, 2008, p.103).

Later, Norwegian linguist Marius Hægstad made a further amended transcript based on Low’s version. An additional Old Norse and English translations are also cited from Steintún (2016, p.58, p.68) and an online archive (https://nornlanguage.x10.mx/shet_txt_hild.htm). No MID token is found in the Norn ballad, but there are three WIÐ tokens.
Table 8.6: WID tokens in multiple versions of *Ballad of Hildina*
(Steintún, 2016, p.58, p.68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ Stanza</th>
<th>George Low’s version</th>
<th>Marius Hægstad’s correction</th>
<th>Translation into Old Norse</th>
<th>Translation into English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trettì merkè <em>vath</em> ru godle Da skall yach ger yo U all de vara sonna less So linge sin yach livamo.</td>
<td>“Trettì merkè <em>vath</em> ru godle, da skall yach ger yo u alde vara sonnaless, so linge sin yach livamo”.</td>
<td>“Þrjátíu merkr við [með] rauðu gulli, þá skal ek þér ljá ok aldrig vera sonalauss svá lengi sem ek lífa má.”</td>
<td>“Thirty marks of the red gold, This to thee will I give, And never shalt thou lack a son As long as I may live.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ði lava mir gugna Yift bal yagh fur o lande Gipt mir nu fruan Hildina <em>Vath</em> godle u fasta bande.</td>
<td>“Ði lava mir gugna, yift bal yagh fur o landi; gipt mir nu fruan Hildina <em>vath</em> godle u fasta bande.”</td>
<td>“Þú lofar mér gagna [eigna, unga?], ef baldr ek fór af [ór] landi; gipt mér nú frúna Hildina við [með] gulli ok førstu bandi”.</td>
<td>You promised me marriage if I boldly voyaged from our land Now let me marry Hildina, with golden dowry and solid pact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nu tachtè on heve fwelsko Ans bo <em>vad</em> mild u stien Dogh skall aidè misè Koningsnsens Vadna vida mien.</td>
<td>Nu tachtè on heve fwelsko ans bo <em>vad</em> mild u stien. “Dogh skall aldè mirè Koningsnsens vadne vida mien”.</td>
<td>Nú þakt hún hefir fólska hans bæði við [með] mold og steini. “Þú skalt aldrig meira konungsins barni valda men[í]”.</td>
<td>Now she has covered his falseness both with earth and stone. “You will do the King’s children, no harm ever again”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be observed in Table 8.6, the Norn ballad uses the preposition *vath* or *vad*, presumably a local form of *WÍÐ*, but without any token of *MÍD*. It is likely that Norn by that time had already got rid of *MÍD* as Faroese.

*The preposition *vath* or *vad* seems to have taken over the function of Old Norse *með*, which is not found at all in the ballad. The same pattern is seen in both English and Faroese, where *with* and *við*, respectively, have supplanted *með*.*

(Steintún, 2016, p.54)

The Foula forms of *vad* or *vath* clearly correspond to the historical ON *við*, but have a vowel quality closer to the ON *með*. The forms of *vath* or *vad* therefore look like a phonological mix of both ON *með* and *við*, besides their semantic mix.

Faroese and Norn form part of a dialectal continuum stretching from the Norwegian west coast to various North Atlantic Viking colonies. Jakobsen (1921, pp.14-15) points out the close affinity that Norn bears to dialects in south-west Norway and other Insular Scandinavian languages like Icelandic and Faroese. Some common phonological changes are summarized below:

Table 8.7: Common sound changes in Norn, Faroese and western Norwegian dialects

| (i) | Retention of the weakly stressed /al/ (ON *bera* > Nor. *bera*, Norn 〈*bera〉). |
| (ii) | /pl/, /l/, /kl/ > /bl/, /dl/, /gl/ in intervocalic and final postvocalic position (ON *lítit* > Nor. /lːːde/, Norn 〈*lide〉). |
| (iii) | /rn/ > /dn/ (ON *børn* > Nor. /bɔːdn/, ON *barni* > Norn 〈*vadne〉). |
| (iv) | /nː/ > /dn/ (ON *finna* > Nor. /fɪdna/, ON *renna* > Norn 〈*ridna〉). |
| (v) | /lː/ > /dl/ (ON *völlin* > Nor. /vodlen/, Norn 〈*vadlin〉). |
| (vi) | Intercalation of /g/ (ON *sjór* > Far. *sjógvur*, Norn 〈*sheug〉). |
(vii) /m/ > /n/ in weakly stressed final position (ON honum > Far. /honun/, Norn /honon/).

(viii) /þ/ > /h/ in some demonstratives and adverbs, e.g., ON þetta > Far. hetta, Norn /itʊ/ (< *hitta).

*Far: Faroese; Nor: western Norwegian dialect.

(Steintún, 2016, pp.18-19; Barnes, 1998, p.17)

Faroese and Norn certainly have a deep historical connection. In the 9th century, many Norwegian settlers stopped by Shetland en route to the Faroe Islands or Iceland and “the Faroe Islands and Shetland maintained close contact in the Middle Ages” (Sigurðsson, 2000, p. vii). Furthermore, there were historical records of Faroese fishermen being cast ashore and settling down on the western coast of Shetland, despite the 300-kilometer distance (Barnes, 1998, p.18). Occasional maritime contact might have introduced linguistic exchange between Norn and Faroese in the Middle Ages, leading to some form of common development, one of which may be the loss of MID15.

There are other forms of Norn WID recorded in the Etymological Dictionary of the Norn Language in Shetland by a Faroese linguist Jakob Jakobsen (1928). A form of wi or vi was collected by him at the end of the 19th century from Shetland:

**Vi or Wi**

1) Preposition *with*. The variant form *vi* is noted down in rhyme, while the *wi* form is more often used.

2) The uses and meanings that come from the ON prepositions *við* or *med*, which include: along (with the wind); in line with a landmark

---

15 Due to the limited available historical materials in Faroese, it is equally hard to trace the loss of MID there.
during fishing or seafaring; adverbial use in set phrases, such as *sae wi* ‘so with, doing nothing’.

...  

(Jakobsen, 1928, pp.1043-1044)

As mentioned above, Jakobsen notices a spatial use of the Norn *vi/wi* as in ‘along (with the wind)’ or ‘in line with a landmark’, especially in fishing or seafaring practice. This reminds us of the Scandinavian spatial *WID* in Chapter 4. Viking language deeply influenced the nautical expressions in the British Isles, such as the borrowing of Norse words like *cnearr* ‘small warship’, *scegþ* ‘vessel’, *liþ* ‘fleet’ or *batswegen* ‘boatman’ into Old English (Trips, 2001, p.31). The Norn spatial *WID* may be one of those nautical legacies.

8.4.3 The Shift from Norn to Scots

After the 15th century, both Shetland and Orkney changed political allegiance from Norway to Scotland. According to Steintún (2016, p.12), the Scottish clan Sinclairs gained the earldom of Orkney in 1379 and both Orkney and Shetland were brought under the Scottish crown in the second half of the 15th century. At the same time, the linguistic shift from Norn to Scots began in the 15th century, firstly in Orkney, later in Shetland, with Scots assuming a higher prestige over Norn in being the administrative language. The coexistence of both languages must have lasted a few hundred years before Norn officially became extinct. According to Knooihuizen (2008, p.104), Norn can still be heard spoken among Orcadian children in 1725 and by older people in the mid-1750s. However, later users after that period might only have limited access to Norn as a “rememberer” of the language rather than a fluent speaker, just like the ballad reciter.

The shift from Norn to Scots closely resembles the one vital to our discussion, the historical shift of the Norse speakers to English-speaking in Danelaw16. By far, this is the closest case study we can find in the British Isles.

16 Although a dialect mixing scenario could occur alongside the language shift, see Chapter 5.
According to Barnes (1998, p.26), the death of Norn can be dated to the middle of the 18th century for Orkney speakers and perhaps to “as late as 1800” for Shetland speakers. Under the new Scottish rule, Barnes (1998) proposes that in the Northern Isles “by the 17th century most if not all the inhabitants (in Orkney and Shetland) could speak fluent Scots” and the motivation “to perpetuate a low-prestige vernacular (Norn) with no official status or written form disappeared” (p.26).

*Languages with no official status very often have a lower prestige than the official language, and thus have a tendency to be more influenced by the other. On the other hand, the dominant language with official status in legal matters, religion and politics has a high prestige and typically attracts speakers from the inferior language... Thus, the position of the official language is much stronger than the position of the unofficial. For several centuries while Norn was active, Scots was the language of administration in the Northern Isles, and thus the language of authority and prestige. This factor as well as alleged oppression of the natives has been allotted major explanatory power by the early researchers of Norn.*

(Steintún, 2016, p.22)

We can similarly relate this to the Scandinavian descendants in Danelaw who must have undergone a language shift motivated by the linguistic prestige and the power structure. Norse must have co-existed for a while with English, although not as long as the Norn case (15th-18th century) due to Danelaw’s closer land connection. Many Danelaw Norse speakers would have become bilingual in the first or second generation under close economic and social contact with the locals, especially after the withdrawal of Scandinavian power from England.

The death of Norn, as Barnes (1998, p.27) suggests, is reflected in a range of decaying symptoms: the loss of functions, usually ending up as a private language of the family; the loss of structures, due to the breaking down of the regulatory mechanism; and the free
adoption of the speech of the linguistically dominant group. In general, Norn left very few linguistic materials, and neither did Danelaw Norse. It may be due to the social demographic in these regions. Since most of the Danelaw and Orkney/Shetland settlements were populated by Scandinavian armies or farmers, who were most likely illiterate as well as pagan, therefore any literature production out of religious or upper-class purposes was essentially absent in these places. Neither was there any institutional support in place to support local literature, as Barnes (1998) comments, “in terms of schools, scriptoria and literary tradition, the situation in the Northern Isles resembles that in Faroe rather than Norway or Iceland: signs of activity are few and far between” (p.10). This may also be the reason why MID was so easily lost in Norn or Faroese compared to Icelandic or Norwegian.

The intergenerational linguistic deterioration could progress very fast in this scenario, where the demise of a local tongue can be finalized in the course of three generations.

_The first generation are native speakers of the decaying language who have learnt the new tongue for reasons of necessity, but mostly remain more proficient in the old. The next generation, largely because of greater exposure at a younger age—often from their own parents—become truly bilingual or in some cases more proficient in the new language. The children of these bilinguals are seldom exposed to the old language even in the home, and end up at best with only a very imperfect or passive knowledge of it..._

(Barnes, 1998, p.27)

Without doubt, the same process could have happened in Danelaw, where bilingual Norse descendants would gradually shift to monolingually English-speaking after a few generations, due to the lack of economic incentives or the lack of social needs.
There was probably a period of stable bilingualism, in which succeeding generations learnt Scots for reasons of economic and social necessity, but continued using Norn as their everyday medium of communication. Then, as social and economic conditions changed, there came a generation that saw Scots as the language of the future and Norn as an unhelpful relic of the past. Such a generation would have had no incentive to perpetuate the use of their native Scandinavian and so will simply have neglected to pass Norn on to their children.

(Barnes, 1998, p.27)

Barnes’ comments may be too strong here. It may not be the case that the last generation of Norn speakers abandoned their own native tongue willingly for a new language with more future, but the institutionalized pressure on the locals to learn Scots could be so great that it even squeezed out the use of Norn in the private family setting, to the extent that many native children would not have had enough input and output to master their native tongue fluently, as implied by the example of the Foula ballad reciter. Similar phenomena can also be observed in the gradation of Welsh- or Irish-speaking communities under the dominance of English. The death of a language may not be a voluntary choice of the local, but a forced outcome under great circumstantial pressure.

Some vestiges of Norn remain in the later Shetland and Orkney Scots. Melchers (1981, p.260) finds Norn substratum in the Shetland and Orkney Scots vocabulary, especially in the areas of nature and agriculture. Knooihuizen (2008, pp.106-107) also notices that certain Scandinavian lexis were retained in the later Shetland Scots as a fishing jargon or “secret code” among fishermen. The same also applies to the Danelaw Middle English, where a marked Scandinavianism has remained in the local dialect.
8.5 Conclusion

This chapter focuses on the development of Northern Middle English. William’s harrying of the North brought great socio-economic turmoil to the North, leading to a major text vacuum in the 12th and 13th centuries. Northern texts re-appeared in the 14th century, with MID being used as an archaic rhyming device in *Cursor Mundi* but not elsewhere in the north. Scots, closely related to Northern Middle English, also records no token of MID from the earliest written materials. Norn, a local Scandinavian language spoken in the Northern Isles of Scotland, also saw no vestige of MID left. The historical shift from Norn-speaking to Scots-speaking in Shetland and Orkney offers a valuable glimpse into the potential historical circumstance in the post-Viking Danelaw.
Chapter 9. Germanic Variation

9.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the concept of North Sea Germanic sprachbund, a group of Germanic languages along the North Sea coast sharing common phonological and lexical features due to geographical contact. Feature drift in this sprachbund may have brought some North Germanic characteristic to the Anglo-Saxon use of the MID-WID pair. The 10th-century Anglo-Viking contact may have further led to a process of koineization (dialect-mixing), which eventually caused the loss of MID in Middle English. Some potential influencing factors include stem confusion, morphemic productivity and case preference.

9.2 North Sea Germanic Sprachbund

Sprachbund refers to a group of adjacent languages that share common features resulting from close geographical contact. These languages may or may not be directly related, yet some common areal features may be circulated among them. In the pre-Migration Period, different Germanic tribes cohabited along the North Sea coast, including Frisians, Saxons, Angles, Jutes, coastal Dutch dialect speakers and southern Scandinavians, for whom a separate concept of “North Sea Germanic”17 is proposed:

Linguistic studies identify a series of sounds and words along the littoral of the southern North Sea which do not fit in the development from Lower Frankish to modern Germanic languages, including Dutch. They do, however, fit with phenomena in modern Frisian and English, as well as (largely extinct) dialects of the provinces of Flanders, Zeeland and North and South Holland, and to a lesser extent

17 Traditionally, the concept of North Sea Germanic does not include Old Norse, yet based on the geographical adjacency and common phonological development (see Table 9.1), I regard Old Norse (or its ancestor) to be part of the sprachbund here.
This collection of North Sea Germanic shares many phonological and lexical commonalities. Versloot & de Vaan (forthcoming, via personal communication on 25 February 2022) observes a list of common early sound changes entirely or partially shared among Old English, Old Frisian, Old Norse, Old Saxon and a variety of coastal Dutch dialects:

Table 9.1: North Sea Germanic common sound changes  
(Versloot & de Vaan, forthcoming, §7.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Sea Germanic changes</th>
<th>Date (PPr.)</th>
<th>Examples from modern English / modern West Frisian &lt; Proto-West Germanic</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rounding of /a/ and /ā/</td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>month/meen &lt; *mānōp-</td>
<td>OF- AK(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fronting of ā &lt; PGmc ā</td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>sheep/skēp &lt; *skāpō-</td>
<td>OE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fronting of PGmc ā</td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>tail/teil &lt; *tegl- &lt; *tugla-</td>
<td>OE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monophthongization of PGmc ā⟨u⟩ &gt; ā</td>
<td>early 6th c.</td>
<td>toe/tea &lt; *taixwō-</td>
<td>OE [OF] [H] [EF] [WF] [ON]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Loss of nasals before spirants</td>
<td>400–600</td>
<td>us/us &lt; *uns</td>
<td>OE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Palatalization of YG/ and /A/ (various contexts)</td>
<td>6th c.</td>
<td>yield,church,day/jilde,tijerke,dei &lt; *geladen,*kvrūkā,*daga-</td>
<td>OE [FZH] EF (ON?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. i-mutation (‘primary’)</td>
<td>c. 600</td>
<td>stead/stêd &lt; *stadi-</td>
<td>OE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. i-mutation (‘secondary’)</td>
<td>c. 600</td>
<td>green/grien &lt; *grôn-</td>
<td>OE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rising diphthongs</td>
<td>early 7th c.</td>
<td>steer/stjoere &lt; *steurijan-</td>
<td>[OE] OF H _ ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. OFr. Breaking</td>
<td>7th c.</td>
<td>right,sing,rijocht,songe &lt; *retua,*singvan-</td>
<td>[OE – K] OF H _ [ON]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. OEng. Breaking</td>
<td>7th – 9th c.</td>
<td>yolk/(ea)/geed &lt; *gelwa-</td>
<td>OE _ _ _ ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shortening of ai &gt; æ</td>
<td>late 7th c.</td>
<td>ladder/ljeder &lt; *laidroð-</td>
<td>_ OF ZH EF,WF _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Raising of æ</td>
<td>&gt; 700</td>
<td>meadow/mitie &lt; *māþwō-</td>
<td>OE- AK OF- S FZH EF _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Delabialization of mutated vowels</td>
<td>8th – 10th c.</td>
<td>brito/brið &lt; *brāli-</td>
<td>OE OF FZH _ _</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.1 shows that Old English, sometimes the Anglian and Kentish dialects to be exact, was highly consistent in a series of common sound changes with Old Frisian and coastal Dutch, to a lesser degree with Old Saxon and Old Norse, between the 5th and the 10th centuries. Some common linguistic exchange must have occurred from the pre-Migration Period up until early Middle Ages along and across the North Sea.

Some shared North Sea lexical traits can also be found in the early Anglo-Saxon runes, such as the 8th-century Ruthwell Cross. It is an early runic inscription written in Northumbrian Old English. The runic text contains part of *The Dream of the Rood*, a highly celebrated Christian poem in the OE time also with a later West Saxon version. Page (1987) dates the rune language to the first half of the 8th century based on “its treatment of PrOE (Proto Old English) unstressed e” (p.34). The runes of the Ruthwell Cross are as follows:
In the Ruthwell text, there is an instance of the spatial preposition *til* ‘to’ governing a dative case, see (1). This is by no means a single case, since another early Northumbrian poem, the 7th-century *Cædmon’s Hymn*, also records a token of *til*. This is a spatial preposition unseen in the West Saxon dialect, normally replaced by *to*.

(1)

*Til in Ruthwell text*

_Hweþræ þer fusa fearran kwomu, æphila til anum_

yet there eager from-far came noble to one

‘But eager ones came thither from afar, noble ones came together’

(Page, 1987, p.39)
Til in Northumbrian Cædmon’s Hymn

Heben *til hrofe* | *haleḡ scepen*  
heaven to roof  holy creator  
‘Heaven as a roof, the holy creator’  

(Cædmon’s Hymn, Smith, 1933, pp.38-39)

On the other hand, *to* was also used once in the early Northumbrian OE, although as an infinitival marker, see (2) from the 8th-century Northumbrian *Bede’s Death Song*:

(2)

**To in early Northumbrian OE:**

*to ymbhycggannaæ | aer*  *his hiniongae*  
to think  before his departure-from-here  
‘To think, before his departure from here’  

(Bede’s Death Song, Smith, 1933, pp.42-43)

In the late 10th-century *Lindisfarne Gospels*, *to* became the norm for both functions, although there was another case of *til* governing an infinitival gerund.

(3)

**Infinitival til in late Northumbrian OE**

*huer*  *wiltu  þæt we gearuiga de*  *til eottanne eastro*  
Where will-thou that we prepare  you to  eat  passover  
‘Where do you want us to make preparations for you to eat the Passover?’  

(Matthew 26: 17, Lindisfarne Gospels)
The use of spatial preposition *til* is not common in the West Germanic languages, but is attested in Old Norse and Old Frisian. However, the ON *til* governs the genitive case, not the dative case, and neither does it use *to* or *til* as an infinitival marker.

On the other hand, Old Frisian *til* governs the dative case exactly like the Northumbrian OE. According to Versloot (personal communication, 25 February 2022), the Old Frisian dialect in Ms. Hunsingo also saw *til* used as a directional preposition and an inflected infinitive (gerund) marker (*til* + *ane*), in interchangeable use with *to*. This corresponds very well to the Northumbrian usage in (1), (2) and (3). It indicates a subtle lexical connection between the Northumbrian OE and Old Frisian (and perhaps Old Norse to a lesser degree), dating perhaps to the pre-Migration or early post-Migration period. It is also noteworthy that such a *til* use was never found in the West Saxon OE or Old Saxon.

Another potential North Sea feature is the fricativization of MID. Both the early Ruthwell runes and the later *Lindisfarne Gospels* have MID tokens recorded as *miþ*, contrary to the West Saxon *mid*, for example:

(4)

Ruthwell *miþ*:

_Ic (wæs) miþ blodæ bistemid…_

I was with blood drenched

‘I was drenched with blood’

(Page, 1987, p.39)
Table 9.2: Fricativization of relevant MID forms across three OE Gospels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lindisfarne Gospels</th>
<th>Rushworth Gospels (the Mercian part)</th>
<th>West Saxon Gospels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variants</strong></td>
<td>2 mid, 491 mið</td>
<td>52 mid, 36 mið</td>
<td>425 mid, 6 myd, 0 mið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricativization Rate</strong></td>
<td>mið% = 99 %</td>
<td>mið% = 41 %</td>
<td>mið% = 0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 9.2 shows, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* has a predominant fricativization rate of 99.59%, while the Mercian part of the *Rushworth Gospels* only sees a mild rate of 41.76%, as opposed to no fricativization at all in the *West Saxon Gospels*. The fricativization rate of MID appears to be stronger further north. A similar fricativization development can also be seen in the Old Frisian cognate *mith* and the Old Norse cognate *með*. Versloot (personal communication, 21 January 2022) points out that in Old Norse, the Proto-Germanic /d/ (originally a voiced fricative) and /þ/ have merged in a non-initial position leading to a *með* form, which is also reflected in the oldest form of Old Frisian MID <mith>.

The Northumbrian *mið* was first attested in the early 8th-century Ruthwell runes, predating any definitive Viking contact, therefore likely to be a native form. It may have stemmed from a pre-Migration North Sea linguistic exchange or an early post-Migration contact, as Thomason & Kaufman (1988, p.266) points out that the Anglo-Saxons were clearly still in contact with their continental siblings from 500 to 800. The anecdotal story between King Cenwealh and Bishop Agilbert, whose languages “were adequately intelligible in the seventh century” even though one spoke West Saxons and the other spoke Frankish, also speaks some truth (Townend, 2002, pp. 163-164). Germanic contact must have remained constant even after the Anglo-Saxon departure to England.
To conclude, a variety of common phonological and lexical traits justify an early historical Germanic sprachbund in the North Sea littoral area from the 5th to the 10th centuries, whose circulation of linguistic features could travel from the Scandinavian or Frisian coast as far as to England. The unique semantics of MID and WID in Old English may also have to do with this North Sea sprachbund.

9.3 Germanic Divide of MID and WID

Cross-linguistically, MID is widely-used in various Germanic languages to govern the instrumental relation (see Versloot 2017). However, a unique development occurred in the North Germanic group to optionally allow WID to govern the instrumental relation as well, a development unseen in the traditional West Germanic group. This creates a semantic divide between the West Germanic and the North Germanic use of the cognate. Such a divide also concerns the spatial and the oppositional semantics. Old English, being a northwestern Germanic language in nature, shows partial likeness to both groups in the semantic fields of MID and WID.

9.3.1 Instrumental / Oppositional Semantics

Both Old Norse MID and WID can govern the instrumental relation, however, such a dual use is not allowed in the West Germanic WID or the classical Old English WID. The ON WID’s instrumental governing was passed onto descendants of modern Scandinavian languages, as in (5), as well as reflected in Present-day English, see (6):

(5)  

Modern Danish instrumental WID

Pollen overføres mellem planter ved vind eller insekter

pollen transferred between plants by wind or insects

‘Pollen transferred between plants by wind or insects’

(“ved”, Den Danske Ordbog)
Modern English instrumental WIÐ

He caught the fish with a net.
The crow pokes the meat with its beak.
The guerrillas fought with outdated guns.

On the other hand, the West Germanic WIÐ has a restricted semantics only limited to the oppositional sense. The German cognate wider ‘against’ is a fine specimen of such usage, see (7), although not as frequently and broadly used as the other preposition gegen ‘against’. Ancient Germanic languages, like Old Norse and Old English, also primarily used WIÐ as an oppositional preposition, following from its Proto-Germanic sense, see (8) and (9).

German oppositional WIÐ (+DAT)

wider die Vorschrift handeln
against the rule act
‘Act against the rule’

Old Norse oppositional WIÐ (+DAT)

Hann hafði líðsafla við konunginum
He had sufficient-forces against the-king
‘He had sufficient forces against the king.’

(Buckhurst, 1925, p.62)

Old English oppositional WIÐ (+ACC/DAT/GEN)

Grendel wan hwile wið Hroðgar
Grendel strived while against Hrothgar
‘Grendel fought against Hrothgar for a while.’

(Beowulf:152, OED)

The later Scandinavian development of WID towards the instrumental use must have greatly repressed its original oppositional semantics, since both senses are in diametrical semantic conflict. In all modern Scandinavian languages, oppositional WID was replaced by more clear-cut oppositional choices like mod/mot ‘against’ (in continental Scandinavian) or gegen ‘against’ (in Icelandic). Interestingly, the same also occurred in Modern English where AGAINST came to be used as the primary oppositional preposition. This common development aligns Modern English with the Scandinavian group rather than the West Germanic group.

In conclusion, while the West Germanic group largely retains WID’s historical oppositional semantics, the Scandinavian group has transformed it into a much more versatile use, including the instrumental governing. It is highly likely that the ON instrumental WID may have been carried over into the Danelaw Middle English during the contact, creating a schism between the classical OE WID and the ME WID. Therefore, typologically Modern English WID is more similar to the Scandinavian cognates.

9.3.2 Spatial Semantics

In Old Norse, both MID and WID have a productive spatial sense, as in (10) and (11), which was continued into the modern Scandinavian descendants, see (14) and (15). Such a spatial semantics is again unseen in the West Germanic group, not even in Old Frisian (perhaps due to the limited historical materials, based on personal communication with Versloot, 22 January 2022). The West Saxon Old English, although traditionally regarded as a type of West Germanic, also has an active use of spatial MID and WID (with similar case governing) like the Scandinavian counterparts, see (12) and (13).
(10) **Old Norse spatial MID (+DAT)**

`með sjónum`
along the-sea
‘along the sea’

(“með”, Cleasby & Vigfusson, 1874)

(11) **Old Norse spatial WID (+ACC)**

`hér við ánna`
here by the-river
‘here by the river’

(“við”, Cleasby & Vigfusson, 1874)

(12) **West Saxon OE spatial MID (+DAT)**

`Onlong bróces mid streáme`
along brook in-the-direction-of stream
‘along the brook in the direction in which the stream runs’

(“mid”, *Bosworth-Toller's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*)

(13) **West Saxon OE spatial WID (+ACC/DAT)**

`wið ðone weall`
by the wall
‘near the wall’

(“wiþ”, *Bosworth-Toller's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*)
Modern Danish spatial MID

Små spredte snefnug kom nu dansende med vinden
small scattered snowflakes came now dancing in-the-direction-of wind
‘Small scattered snowflakes came dancing now along the wind’

(“med”, Den Danske Ordbog)

Modern Danish spatial WID

faderen sad ved klaveret og spillede og sang.
the-father sat by the-piano and played and sang
‘The father sat at the piano and played and sang.’

(“ved”, Den Danske Ordbog)

Another Scandinavian language that got rid of MID, Faroese, also keeps the vibrant spatial sense in the remaining við:

Við (Faroese) prep.

“with, beside”; in addition to these basic meanings, it is used in many idioms where the meaning may correspond to English “at, by, near, to”, etc...hon sat við eldin ‘she sat by the fire’.

This preposition is often found in combination with the adverb fram when it equals English “along, beside”, e.g. ein hópur av nýggium hásum er komin fram við vegnum ‘a lot of new houses have been built (lit. have come) along the road’.

(Lockwood, 1955, p.96)
The OED ("with") also shows a remnant spatial use of WÍD, meaning ‘near, close to, alongside’, in contemporary nautical English between the 16th and 19th centuries, see (16).

```
(16)

Year    Works

1591  Rep. Fight Iles of Açores sig. Cv
A fourth ranne her selfe **with** the shore to saue her men.

1625  Pilgrimes II. 1133
An houre after Sunne rising, we were **with** a very long and faire point.

1708  London Gazette. No. 4422/7
It proving close and dirty Weather,...we could not venture in **with** Land.

1748  A Voyage round World by Anson ii. vii. 212
One of our prizes was ordered to stand close in **with** it [sc. the land].

1790  Journal of a voyage to new South Wales 108
As we run in **with** the land,...we were surprised to see..some small patches of snow.

1849  Naval Biogr. Dict. 661/2
At the cutting out, close in **with** the enemy's batteries of La Guépe privateer.

1860  Uncommercial Traveller Jan. 322/1
A man..saw..some dark troubled object close in **with** the land.
```

(“with”, OED)

Such usage mostly occurs in set phrases like **run/close in with the land/shore**, probably as a jargon used by sailors. The last example in 1860 was quoted from Charles Dickens’ writing,
*Uncommercial Traveller.* This may partly reflect its contemporary popularity even in mainstream literature. This meaning, however, is no longer available in Modern English. Its absence in various Middle English corpora may be due to its colloquial nature and highly specialized use. It therefore shows the potential limit in the use of historical corpus data.

To conclude, spatial *WID* and *MID* represent another Germanic divide between the North and West Germanic groups. West Saxon Old English natively has a strong spatial sense in both prepositions, a feature highly similar to the Nordic group, possibly coming from the historical contact in the sprachbund.

9.3.3 Summary

In conclusion, the Germanic variation of *MID’s* and *WID’s* semantics can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germanic</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>MID and WID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td>MID/WID</td>
<td>MID/WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English (West Saxon)</td>
<td>MID/WID</td>
<td>MID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Saxon</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Frisian</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MID (WID?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>MID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>MID/WID</td>
<td>MID/WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faroese</td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>WID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern English</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>WID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 9.3, we can see the full distribution of MID’s and WID’s semantics in a list of (diachronic) Germanic languages. In general, West Germanic languages like German or Old Saxon have a clear semantic delimitation between MID and WID, while the Scandinavian cognates, like in Old Norse and Danish, are apt for mixed use. In terms of Old English (West Saxon), its prepositional pair has a vibrant spatial sense like the North Germanic cognates, but its MID at the same time behaves more like the West Germanic counterpart in its monopoly over the instrumental semantics. As a northwestern Germanic language, Old English must have historically received some common features from the North Sea sprachbund, but retained its West Germanic characteristic as well. Such a dual identity gave a wide range of semantic flexibility to the Old English pair.

Modern English WID, however, did not continue directly from the Old English ancestor. It has no markedly oppositional semantics like the OE or West Germanic WID, nor does it behave consistently like the Scandinavian cognates in keeping an active spatial sense (cf. Faroese). It looks like a simplified version of both sides after an intense restructuring. This restructuring may have been triggered by the medieval Anglo-Viking contact.
9.4 Mechanism of Koineization

As previously mentioned in Chapter 5, koineization must have occurred in the central area of the Danelaw where the concentration of Viking descendants was the densest. The process of koineization has been well studied by sociolinguists. Its detailed stages of changes are outlined below:

In a dialect mixture situation, large number of variants will abound, and, through the process of accommodation in face-to-face interaction, interdialect will begin to occur. As time passes and focusing begins to take place, particularly as the new town, colony, or whatever begins to acquire an independent identity, the variants present in the mixture begin to be subject to reduction...The reduction of variants that accompanies focusing, in the course of new-dialect formation, takes place via the process of koineization. This comprises the process of levelling, which involves the loss of marked and/or minority variants; and the process of simplification, by means of which even minority forms may be the ones to survive if they are linguistically simpler.

(Trudgill, 1986, p.126)

As introduced, after several closely related dialects come into contact with each other, they would go through phases of mixing, levelling and simplification, promoted by various social factors such as peer networking or intermarriage. In the current case, instrumental WID must have entered the Anglo-Scandinavian interdialect during the linguistic accommodation between the Anglo and the Scandinavian speakers. This feature was then put to compete with other variants in the reduction and focusing processes. In the end, the most marked variants were eliminated. In the period of Middle English, several potential factors may have contributed to the markedness of MID and its subsequent ousting by the Norse-influenced WID. These bias factors are explained in the following section.
9.5 Potential Bias Factors

Linguistic variation and change are universal, even for small units like MID and WID. For example, Faroese also lost MID in the historical development, while a Norwegian dialect of Romsdal was found to have lost WID instead (Sandøy, 2005, pp. 237-238). In the Scandinavian languages, the MID-WID pair seems to be rather unstable due to their overlapping semantics, as Sandøy (2005) comments that “ON med and við had very overlapping semantic domains, and already at the ON stage there was some interchange between the two prepositions, which could naturally lead to a merger” (p.235). However, the merger in Danelaw English ends with the loss of MID for some prominent reasons.

Since Danelaw English was the product of koineization, it underwent reduction of highly-marked linguistic features as a result of levelling and simplification. MID may have been removed from the ME linguistic system due to three potential factors: stem confusion, morphemic productivity and case preference.

9.5.1 Stem Confusion

Both ON med and OE mid come from the Proto-Germanic stem *midi, while ON við and OE wiþ come from the Proto-Germanic stem *wipí, shortened from *wiprå (Orel, 2003, p.464). One examiner points out that the WID stem has an unclear Indo-European origin beyond the Germanic while the MID stem has a very clear etymology, traceable back to Proto-Indo-European (cf. Greek μετά, with fully regular application of Grimm’s and Verner’s laws). This might explain WID’s more fluid nature in the Germanic semantic shift.

As Proto-Germanic developed into different descendent languages, the phonological quality of these stems could also change. For example, ON med has a rather different vowel from the Old English cognate mid. On the other hand, the ON við does not differ much from the OE counterpart wiþ, with just a minimal variation on the starting consonant.

Therefore, MID would create a greater communication problem to Anglo-Scandinavian listeners in their communication, than the use of WID. We can imagine that when an ON speaker communicated with an Anglo-Saxon speaker in oral speech, their chance of getting the WID stem right would possibly be at 100% due to the almost identical pronunciations.
Yet their chance of getting the MID stem correct might at least have been halved, due to the
distraction of another homophonous stem *midjaz.

The Proto-Germanic stem *midjaz ‘middle’ has descendants like the Old Norse miðr and Old
English midd (Ringe & Taylor, 2014, p.51). Originally an adjective, the ON miðr could be
easily differentiated from the OE cognate midd if the declension was intact, as in (17).

(17)

Her hiene bestæl se here *midne winter ofer twelftan niht to cippahanmme
Here him stole-away the army in mid winter over twelfth night to Chippenham
‘This year about mid-winter, after the twelfth-night, the army stole out to Chippenham.’

(The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 878AD)

um miðjan dag
in middle day
‘in the middle of the day’

(“mið”, Concise Icelandic-English Dictionary)

In (17), we can clearly differentiate both midne and miðjan from the preposition MID due to
the declensional endings. However, with the rapid loss of inflection in the early ME period,
*midjaz could have become an uncomfortable homophony with MID, especially in the form
of the preposition AMID (ultimately derived from the OE phrase on middan ‘in the middle
of’). I can quote a modern case of such potential misunderstanding from a biblical hymn God
Has Spoken by the Prophet:

(18)

‘Mid the world’s despair and turmoil,
One firm anchor holding fast:

…

(Briggs, 1981)
In (18), the word *mid* is in fact a shortened form of *amid*, the first syllable omitted for rhythmical reason. Semantically it is compatible with both readings of ‘among’ or ‘with, along’. Misunderstanding of this kind could abound in the ME period without a morphological marking between the stems of *midi* and *midjaz*. On the contrary, we can still observe such morphological demarcation in Modern German, see (19).

(19)

Mit Mitte 20 ist er eine Stilikone

with mid 20 is he one style-icon

‘In his mid-20s, he's a style icon’

For Modern German speakers, *mit* and *mitte* can be easily differentiated both by writing and by ear due to the extra ending of -*te*. However, for early Middle English speakers they would have become highly homophonous. Thomason & Kaufman (1988) notices that “a motivation for borrowing (the Norse lexis, such as *they*) may have been avoidance of uncomfortable near-homophony, since the OE equivalents (the OE h-form pronouns) are potentially homophonous” (p. 299). The same can be said of the ME preposition MID and the highly homophonous *midjaz* form, potentially creating a high chance of misunderstanding in the communication, as shown in Figure 9.2:

![Diagram of Anglo-Scandinavian (mis)understanding](image)

As Figure 9.2 shows, the use of VID would not pose any communication barrier, while the use of MID may cause significant misunderstanding in the Anglo-Scandinavian communication. The accumulative effect of this bias generation after generation may
eventually lead to a complete abandonment of the use of MID in the Anglo-Scandinavian community, as in the case of *Ormulum.*

We can confirm this from the Modern English reflexes of these historical stems, see Table 9.4. Whenever there is a similar phonological quality between the OE and ON stems, the word would survive into Modern English (such as *wiþ*-*við* and *midd*-*miðr*). Otherwise, if there is a phonological mismatch, a stem would be discarded instead, as in *midi*.

Table 9.4: Comparison of historical stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Language</th>
<th><em>midi</em></th>
<th><em>wiþraŋ</em></th>
<th><em>midjaz</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>wiþ</td>
<td>midd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td>með</td>
<td>við</td>
<td>miðr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern English</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>mid-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One examiner expresses doubt from the functionalist perspective, questioning why MID disappeared despite having a fairly uniform denotation while the less transparent form-meaning mapping of WIÐ was the one which prevailed. First, as the previous semantic discussion shows, WIÐ already became almost synonymic to MID after the Norse contact, therefore both prepositions were in fact functionally highly similar in the late ME period, which means that the denotation of both prepositions would not be markedly different by the 13th or 14th century. Second, many other OE prepositions also died away in history albeit with a fairly uniform denotation, such as æðr ‘before’ or wiþforan ‘before’. Hence, there seems not to be any definite correlation between the survival of a preposition and its functional uniformness in denotation in the history of English.
9.5.2 Morphemic Productivity

Another potential factor in play is the morphemic productivity. Although MID by itself was a much more frequently-used preposition than WID in OE, WID in fact has a much wider presence as an entire morpheme, especially as a prefix.

According to the Bosworth-Toller’s Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (“wip-”, 2019-), the prefix WID- was highly productive and semantically consistent with the preposition WID. This prefix gave rise to a range of OE verbs related to its oppositional sense, such as wip-ceosan ‘to reject’, wip-bregdan ‘to withhold’ and wip-cwepan ‘to contradict’ etc. There is another longer prefix WIDER- in OE, also generating a broad variety of oppositional verbs, nouns and adjectives, such as wiper-habban ‘to resist’, wiper-hlinian ‘to lean against’, wiper-crist ‘antichrist’, wiper-cwide ‘resistance’, wiper-hygdig ‘adverse’ and wiper-med ‘contrary-minded’. Hence, the productivity of WID not only comes from its prepositional use, but also from its morphemic use as a prefix.

WID’s prefix productivity continued into the ME period. According to the MED (“with-pref.”, 2000), with- as a prefix occurred in over 100 ME words. They can be categorized into four groups by semantics: (A) ‘in opposition, against’, such as withfighten ‘to fight against’ and withseien ‘to speak against’; (B) ‘away, back’, such as withdrauen ‘to withdraw’ and withberen ‘to carry away’; (C) ‘together, in company’, withlaughen ‘to laugh along’ and withjoinen ‘to keep together’; (D) loan-translations of Latin words with the prefix con-, such as withchaungen ‘to alter (one’s expression or frame of mind)’, a morphemic translation of the Latin verb commutare (‘switch’) under the rendering of com > with and mutare > chaungen (cf. the cum > mid correspondence in the OE time). As we can see, the WID- prefix extended from the oppositional semantics into the comitative semantics in the ME period, parallel to its contemporaneous prepositional development. Most verbs of type (A) and (B) have OE predecessors, but those of type (C) and (D) were calqued quite late in the ME period. This testifies to the synchronized development of the prefix and the prepositional WID, under a common lexical link and shared lexical productivity.

On the other hand, MID was never quite productive as an affix except in a few words like midwife (more like a bound morpheme than a prefix here) and theremid ‘with that, at the same time’. Interestingly, MID has a strange late calque mid-outen (‘without’) recorded in the
MED, apparently modeled on the preposition *without* ‘without’ in the absence of any historical origin. A token of *mid-outen* was also found in LAEME #1700 (dated to C13b in Norfolk). *Mid-outen*, as a non-native form, is likely to be a Middle English hyper-correction similar to the *h*-insertion in the history of English. In a way, this attests to the rapid loss of true knowledge of MID in the late ME period.

9.5.3 Case Preference

The last potential factor of concern is the case preference in the linguistic system. The change of prepositional case governance is common in the history of Germanic. Sandøy (2005, p.235) notices a shift in case governance after Faroese and the Romsdal dialect lost one of their prepositions.

Table 9.5: Shift of case governance in Faroese WID and Romsdal MID

(Sandøy, 2005, pp. 237-238)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thematic role</th>
<th>Old Norse</th>
<th>Faroese við</th>
<th>Romsdal med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>við</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medø</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>við</td>
<td>A/D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medø</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thematic role</th>
<th>Old Norse</th>
<th>Faroese við</th>
<th>Romsdal med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>við</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medø</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directional</td>
<td>við</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medø</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>við (point of time)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medø (iterative)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A: Accusative, D: Dative)

As Table 9.5 shows, the ON *medø* mostly governs dative and *við* mostly governs accusative. Upon the loss of *medø* in Faroese, the classic semantic fields of *medø* (such as the instrumental and the comitative use) turn to be governed by a dative *við*, while the rest (the locative, directional and time use) continue to be governed by an accusative *við*. On the other hand, in
the Romsdal dialect, the merger led to the use of dative almost across the board\(^{18}\), the traditional case governed by ON \textit{med}. This leads Sandøy (2005, p.239) to suspect that “if there was a tendency in F(aroese) to prefer the accusative, the preposition \textit{við} was preferred to \textit{med} as a consequence”. And the opposite (dative preference) may also be true of the Romsdal dialect, leading to its loss of \textit{WIÐ}.

Some other linguistic evidence seems to support this claim. Petersen (2017, pp. 136-138) finds that when a verb is borrowed from Danish into Faroese, it typically takes the accusative while the same verb borrowed into Icelandic would normally take the dative, therefore the accusative case seems to be the default case in Faroese. Another example again concerns the spatial preposition \textit{til}. This preposition was genitive-governing in ON, but turns to govern accusative in Modern Faroese and dative in the Romsdal dialect (Sandøy, 2005, p.230). This indicates an accusative preference in Faroese and a dative preference in the Romsdal dialect. The Faroese retention of \textit{WIÐ} (mostly accusative-governing) and the Romsdal retention of \textit{MID} (mostly dative-governing) indeed seem to be more than coincidence.

Now return to the case in English. According to Freeman (2018, p.45), OE \textit{MID} turned to mostly govern dative in the late OE period while the OE \textit{WIÐ} turned to mostly govern accusative around the same time, see Table 9.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case of object</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early (OE) Prose</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>47.14%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late (OE) Prose</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WID</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>83.75%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) Except in the temporal use, which has no historical origin in ON (see Sandøy, 2005, p.238).
As Table 9.6 shows, in the early OE prose, dative MID constitutes 74% of tokens and this percentage rises to a striking 95% in the late OE period, at the expense of the instrumental MID tokens. As for WID, it has 47% of early tokens governing accusative as opposed to 83% of late tokens governing accusative, at the expense of the dative WID tokens. A gradual specialization in case governing seems to have occurred for both MID and WID in the OE period\(^{19}\), with MID gradually orienting towards dative governing and WID towards accusative governing.

As the case system gradually collapsed in the ME period, both dative and accusative cases were later reduced into an oblique case. Yet some evidence suggests that the dative was in fact lost earlier than the accusative. According to Thomason & Kaufman (1988), one of the primary grammatical changes from OE to ME include “the loss of the genitive plural and dative (both singular and plural) cases” (p.274). The dative case in the Peterborough Chronicle, according to Clark (1970), “is almost abandoned as a case, a usage...foreshadowed in the Lindisfarne Gospels and in Rushworth St. Matthew” (p. liii). The loss of dative in the PC causes several indirect objects to be inflected in the accusative or uninflected forms, such as *se cyng heafde gifen þet abbotrice an frencisce abbot* [uninflected] 1070 (‘the king had given the abbacy to a French abbot’), although MID could sometimes reinstate a vestige of dative in set phrases like *mid ealle deofle* [DAT] 675 (‘with all devil’), both quoted from Clark (1970, pp. liii-liv).

The early loss of dative case (perhaps as well as the historical instrumental case) may then be a potential factor that accelerates MID’s loss.

Another interesting observation is mentioned by the OED (“mid”, 2000-), “in Old English, the preposition (*mid*) is usually construed with the dative; examples with the accusative are rare and chiefly Anglian”. Mitchell (1985, p.505) also confirms that MID with accusative occurs frequently in Bede and early poetry. I conduct a search in the YCOE corpus (Taylor et al., 2003-), and indeed find as many as 119 accusative MID tokens in Bede, an OE writing

\(^{19}\) However, the change is not obvious in the verse text, which is more archaic.
overlaid with Anglian features. It is likely that Anglian Old English showed an early preference for accusative over dative along the same path as Faroese, although given the lack of more concrete evidence, this is at best a hypothesis. Still, case preference may have potentially played a role in the loss of MID in English.

In conclusion, the above-mentioned three potential factors render MID more marked in the linguistic system, therefore leading to its later elimination in the koineization process.

9.6 Conclusion

This chapter introduces the North Sea Germanic sprachbund by various phonological and lexical evidence. The semantic characteristics of OE MID and WIÐ, especially the spatial use, may be inherited from the early sprachbund contact. The later Anglo-Viking contact may have introduced a process of dialect mixing, in which new variants such as the Norse-influenced WIÐ was introduced before the system went into a process of marked feature reduction. Three potential factors may contribute to MID’s markedness and its final loss: its high potential for stem confusion, its relative lack of morphemic productivity and the potential dative aversion in English.
Chapter 10. Conclusion

The current thesis investigates the highly speculated loss of MID in English via a quantitative approach. Historical corpora yield data from the 10th to the 14th century along with various metadata. Multiple statistical analyses were performed on the dataset. Semantic analysis shows a gradual semantic merger of MID and WID from the OE to the ME period, highlighted by WID’s bleaching oppositional sense and its sudden gain of instrumental semantics. Regression analysis quantifies the impact of each variable on the historical shift. East Midlands is shown to be leading the change while Kent is the strongest resistor. With the passing of each year, the chance of getting WID increases, but at a different rate for different semantics. The rate of change is faster in the instrumental relation compared to the rest, possibly due to the highly intense Anglo-Scandinavian exchange there.

The OE part of data was discussed via the comparison of three OE gospels. The result shows a marked dialectal difference in the use of WID, both inter-regionally and intra-regionally. The ME part of data was divided into four regions. East Midlands was the locus of change marked by its heavy Scandinavianism in Ormulum. The loss of MID was firstly observed in Ormulum, albeit less so in the contemporary Peterborough Chronicle due to register and style concern. This later spread of the new feature was facilitated by the multi-ethnic social networks and the southward migration of East Midlands speakers into the capital in the 13th and 14th centuries. West Midlands texts were in general more conservative, although Cheshire, being an important Viking hub, also saw an early loss of MID in the local texts. The Norsification package circulated across both Midlands leaving an imprint on the AB language as well. Alliterative prose was particularly popular in the West Midlands, yet diction seems not to influence the choice of prepositions as much as style. Southern region, especially Kent, kept the use of MID until very late in time. It may have to do with the prominent presence of free peasants there in Kent. Free peasants had greater socio-economic freedom, with access to freer migration, which could be translated into a unique linguistic advantage in the medieval society. Northern England offers little historical ME data due to the damage wrought by William’s harrying. Some 14th-century northern text retained MID as an archaic rhyming option, although more northern texts no longer used it at all. The loss of
MID is also observed in early Scots and Norn. The language death of Norn and its later replacement by Scots may shed some light on the similar historical scenario in Danelaw.

Comparing the pan-Germanic MID-WID pair, a semantic divide can be observed between the North Germanic and the West Germanic groups. The Old English MID and WID share a common spatial use with the Scandinavian cognates, probably due to historical sprachbund contact. The later Anglo-Viking contact may lead to a koineization process where marked linguistic features were eliminated. Three potential factors (stem confusion, morphemic productivity and case preference) may contribute to the markedness of MID and cause its final loss.

After the detailed analyses, we can now return to the research questions raised in Chapter 1:

- Why did the loss of MID occur? What were the possible reasons?

The loss of MID occurred due to the historical Anglo-Scandinavian contact which brought about a koineization process to reduce marked features. MID was removed due to its linguistic markedness caused by three potential factors: stem homophony, its relative lack of morphemic productivity and the potential dative aversion in English. Sociolinguistic factors such as the laissez-faire language policy and the immigrant society may also have precipitated the loss and its replacement by WID.

- How was MID gradually replaced by WID (originally meaning ‘against’ in OE, ancestor to Modern English with) in the course of the ME period?

MID was the dominant preposition in the OE time, but came into fierce synonymic competition with WID in the ME period, especially after WID’s semantic extension after the Norse contact. WID, with a newly-gained broad range of semantics, grew very popular in the Danelaw region and this new feature was spread to the London area via population migration.
of the sokemen in the 13th and 14th centuries. London English later became the basis for the national standard language and sealed the victory for WID.

• When did the replacement first take place? Did the replacement proceed incrementally or suddenly?

The replacement first took place, according to the available written record, in the 12th-century *Ormulum*, but it must have occurred much earlier before it was officially written down. The overall replacement proceeded incrementally with each passing year, but it progressed at a faster pace in the instrumental semantics than in other semantics. The gain of the instrumental use in WID was rather sudden, likely due to transfer from the Norse cognate.

• Where did the replacement first take place? Did the change take place in all the different dialect areas at the same time?

MID was replaced the earliest in the East Midlands where the Anglo-Viking contact was strongest. The change did not take place all at the same time nationwide, but slowly spread from East Midlands to West Midlands then to the South. The region of Kent withheld the change until very late, before the arrival of the national Standard English.

To conclude, the loss of MID is shown to be driven by the Anglo-Scandinavian contact with multiple sociolinguistic factors involved.
Appendices

Due to the vast number of tokens, please access the raw data, collocational/semantic/regression data sheets, Latin-Old English Gospels correspondence and relevant R codes freely from my Github repository: https://github.com/rongkunLIU/OldEnglishMID
Abbreviations

AR  Ancrene Riwle
AW  Ancrene Wisse
BTASD  Bosworth-Toller’s Anglo-Saxon Dictionary
CM  Cursor Mundi
CRE  Constant Rate Effect
DR  Durham Ritual
eLALME  A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English
LAEME  A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English
LB  Laȝamon Brut
LG  Lindisfarne Gospels
ME  Middle English
MED  Middle English Dictionary
MLE  Multicultural London English
OE  Old English
OED  Oxford English Dictionary
ON  Old Norse
PC  Peterborough Chronicle
PCMEP  Parsed Corpus of Middle English Poetry
PPCME2  Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English
RG  Rushworth Gospels
WSG  West Saxon Gospels
YCOE  The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose
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