



OLD ENGLISH-ORIGIN WORDS IN A SET OF MEDIEVAL LATIN ACCOUNTS

AMANDA ROIG-MARÍN 

Universidad de Alicante

amanda.roig@ua.es

ABSTRACT. For a long time, texts in Medieval Latin were poorly regarded for their linguistic hybridity: alongside Classical/post-Classical Latin lexemes, there were many words coming from the vernaculars (in the case of late medieval England, Anglo-French and Middle English) embedded in them. This traditional and restrictive view was superseded by a more nuanced conception of multilingualism, which appreciates the value of this kind of written evidence for our understanding of the multilingual dynamics of medieval texts. The present investigation uses a case study, the *Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham* [1278-1538] (Fowler 1898-1901; henceforth, *Durham Account Rolls*), one of the largest edited and published collections of accounts in Medieval Latin, to discuss broader issues such as how to classify the vernacular lexical items present in medieval multilingual texts (are they borrowings, code-switches, or something else?) and to what extent this vocabulary can be deemed to be integrated/unintegrated into Medieval Latin. Since there are multiple underlying languages in the vernacular vocabulary of the *Durham Account Rolls*, this article will concentrate on the Old English-origin lexis in these accounts and its relation to Latin and French. An overview of 263 simplex (one-element) Old English-origin forms in the *Durham Account Rolls* proved to be a source of both basic-level terms and more specialised terminology. Finally, some examples from the most representative semantic domains (equipment, farming, animals, and materials) will be given.

Keywords: multilingualism, lexical borrowing, Medieval Latin, Old English-origin words, late medieval England.

PALABRAS DEL INGLÉS ANTIGUO EN CUENTAS ESCRITAS EN LATÍN MEDIEVAL

RESUMEN. Durante mucho tiempo, los textos en latín medieval fueron pobremente valorados por su naturaleza híbrida a nivel lingüístico: junto con lexemas provenientes del latín del periodo clásico/postclásico, se hallan muchas palabras de las lenguas vernáculas (en el caso de la Inglaterra tardomedieval, anglo-francés e inglés medio) en ellos. Esta visión tradicional y restrictiva fue reemplazada por una concepción más sutil del multilingüismo, que aprecia el valor de este tipo de testimonio escrito en nuestra comprensión de las dinámicas multilingües de textos medievales. La presente investigación se sirve de un estudio de caso, the *Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham* [1278-1538] (Fowler 1898-1901; de ahora en adelante, *Durham Account Rolls*), una de las colecciones editadas y publicadas en latín medieval de mayor envergadura, para abordar cuestiones como cómo clasificar las lexías de origen vernáculo presentes en textos multilingües medievales (¿son préstamos, cambios de código o algo distinto?) y hasta qué punto se puede considerar que este vocabulario está integrado o no en el latín medieval. Puesto que hay múltiples lenguas que subyacen al vocabulario vernáculo de los *Durham Account Rolls*, este artículo se centrará en el léxico procedente del inglés antiguo en estas cuentas y su relación con el latín y el francés. La inspección de 263 formas léxicas simples (de un elemento) en los *Durham Account Rolls* demostró ser una fuente tanto de términos primarios como de terminología más especializada. Para concluir, se darán algunos ejemplos de los dominios semánticos más representativos (equipamiento, agricultura, animales y materiales).

Palabras clave: multilingüismo, préstamo léxico, latín medieval, palabras procedentes del inglés antiguo, Inglaterra tardomedieval.

Received version 27 July 2022

Revised version accepted 19 December 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past, texts produced in Medieval Latin (henceforth, ML) but containing a significant proportion of vernacular lexical items were assumed to be the product of the scribe's linguistic incompetence in writing in Latin. Along these lines, Hone (1906: 203), a historian, claimed that "the accountant's stock of Latin [had] failed him" when discussing manorial records in the early twentieth century. These multilingual manuscripts also attracted the philologists' attention: Hulbert (1936) carried out research on the University of Chicago's collection of 13th- and 14th-century manorial records, which led him to the publication of an extensive glossary of English words recorded in that documentary evidence in ML. Hulbert's groundbreaking investigation set the stage for the research that would follow a few decades later: the value of English words in Latin documents as testimonies to medieval English life was, for the first time, foregrounded. However, these findings did not dispel the long-standing conviction that clerks' command of Latin was, overall, defective or not more than a stock of set phrases. Rothwell's "pyramid of Latinity"

(1994: 46), where clerks would be at the lower end whilst erudite scholars and high officials would be at the top, echoes this view.

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

While it is true that CL remained influential in the Middle Ages, the pressure of the standard classical forms was not equally strong in all the registers and contexts in which it was employed. In such prosaic documents as inventories or account rolls, such as the ones that will be examined in this article, writers appropriated Latin to meet their immediate needs rather than to create highly stylised pieces of writing. Vocabulary, the primary concern of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (Latham, Howlett, and Ashdowne, 1975-2013; henceforth, *DMLBS*), is one of the areas that most neatly attests to the dynamism of ML. Users would creatively use classical forms with new meanings, coin lexemes through the internal mechanisms of the language, and appropriate others through borrowing.

This article addresses the question of how to approach English-origin vocabulary embedded in texts written in another language, namely ML. It will use a case study, the *Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham* [1278-1538] (Fowler 1898-1901; henceforth, *Durham Account Rolls*), one of the largest edited and published collections of accounts in ML, to discuss broader issues such as how to classify the vernacular lexical items present in multilingual texts and to what extent they can be deemed to be integrated/unintegrated into ML. The analysis of 263 Old English (henceforth, OE)-origin lexical items in the *Durham Account Rolls* proved to be a source of not only basic-level terms but also more specialised terminology. Some examples from the most representative semantic domains (equipment, farming, animals, and materials) will be given.

1.1. LEXICAL BORROWINGS, CODE-SWITCHES OR SOMETHING ELSE?

The inclusion of a large number of vernacular lexis with Latin-inflected endings into the *DMLBS* epitomises the vigour of the language as well as the elusive nature of any contemporary, rigid taxonomic divisions based on the vernacular/non-vernacular divide. Variation is a keyword in understanding ML, particularly so when

it had to accommodate newly absorbed vernacular material with its own history, which often resulted in gender and/or spelling variants (e.g., *DMLBS*, s.v. *shafa*, *shafum*, *shefa*, *shefum* [Middle English (ME) *shaf*, *shef* < OE *scēaf*] ‘bundle’, ‘sheaf’). The question, then, arises: what is the status of the vernacular material found in Latin texts? The general lexicographical policy adopted in the *DMLBS* suggests that only vernacular vocabulary containing a Latin inflectional morpheme is lemmatised and, therefore, these words could be tentatively deemed integrated *borrowings*. The reverse strategy applies to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (Proffitt, 1990-; henceforth, *OED*),¹ which only includes words which are not inflected in Latin as *bona fide* attestations of vernacular material. Accordingly, would non-integrated vernacular lexemes in Latin texts instantiate episodes of code-switching?

Research into present-day multilingual communities has widely debated the boundaries between code-switching and borrowing. One of the most compelling approaches precisely uses morphological and phonological criteria as markers of integration: code-switching would involve the alternation between two (more rarely, three) linguistic codes without any kind of integration of the items involved, whereas a borrowing would presuppose a complete assimilation of the material from the donor language into the recipient language (see, e.g., Poplack and Meechan 1998). In historical written texts, the *oral* phonological parameter – as put forward in contemporary research – is rendered inoperative, and so the morphological criterion, as exemplified in the *DMLBS*, would, in principle, be justified. Nevertheless, this would imply examining medieval morphological units through the lens of present-day data, overlooking, amongst other things, the thin line between flourishes and abbreviation marks indicating Latin declensional morphemes, and the great variability encountered even within the same text, where the Latinate and non-Latinate variants of the same vernacular lexical item may repeatedly coexist close to each other.

ML was in a synergetic relationship with the vernaculars rather than in one of opposition, as documentary evidence shows. As Rothwell aptly put it, “the relationship of Anglo-French with Middle English was one of merger not of borrowing” (1991: 174). Durkin (2012: n.p.), in his discussion of vernacular lexis in Latin texts,² also observed that:

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

¹ This article refers to the latest available entries in the third edition of the *OED* (*OED3*). However, as there are still some unrevised entries, the year of publication (or revision, if applicable) of all entries cited is included.

² See also Durkin (2014: 290-297).

Some of the pitfalls of applying modern code-switching frameworks, such as Myers-Scotton's (see, e.g., 1993; 2011) Matrix Language Framework, to historical data were recently discussed in Roig-Marín (2019). Similarly, Gardner-Chloros (2017: 24-26) exposed the inefficacy of drawing boundaries between matrix and embedded languages not only when describing historical data but also modern material. The presence of cognates and bare forms conspicuously signals the need for a more flexible and dynamic approach. Being aware of such ambiguous material, Myers-Scotton (2002: 22) suggested the notion of a *composite* code, in her words, "an abstract frame composed of grammatical projections from more than one variety." Yet, as Gardner-Chloros (2017) also discusses, the morpho-syntactic variability encountered in multilingual (either written or spoken) texts is much greater than the variability which may occur in a standard language. Matras's (2009: 4) repertoire model highlights the availability of a large multilingual repertoire, "not organised in the form of 'languages' or 'language systems'", since the latter constitutes a meta-linguistic formulation learnt through a process of "linguistic socialization". The preference for certain elements of repertoires instead of others would be conditioned by factors such as the interlocutors and settings involved and the topics discussed.

The use of inverted commas when referring to languages resonates powerfully with authors such as Jørgensen *et al.* (2011: 23), who define languages as "sociocultural abstractions which match real-life use of language poorly". This may perhaps be too extreme a stance, disputing the very notion of a *language*, which is nowadays more distinctly conceptualised than in the Middle Ages, but the broader implications of Matras's claim, championing a large repertory drawing from several languages, would resound powerfully among multilingual speakers. In this sense, the term *translingual*, moving away from the monolingual/multilingual dichotomy, has gained currency in fields such as applied linguistics and literacy studies. *Translingualism* precisely recognises the fluid nature of languages and examines competence across languages as not being restricted to predefined sets of languages, which is why this concept could be incorporated into our formulations of medieval societies' communicative practices.

Apart from the lack of coetaneous information about "what was meant, for example, by the separatedness [sic] of languages, which we take for granted" (Trotter 2009: 155), Trotter adds another caveat, namely, the complex Latin-Romance continuum existing between ML and Anglo-Norman (see Roig-Marín (2021) for details on its applicability to the *Durham Account Rolls*).

The questions that lie at the heart of the present analysis are as follows: how can we classify the vernacular vocabulary in multilingual texts and, more specifically for the purposes of this article, in administrative documents? To what extent is it integrated/unintegrated into ML? A popular way of conceptualising lexical material from several languages has been in terms of borrowings/code-switches from an embedded language into a matrix language. More recent research (*inter alia*, Trotter 2000, 2011; Ingham 2010; Hunt 2011; Schendl and Wright 2011; Sylvester 2017) has underscored how such terms may not fully reflect the complex linguistic ecology of

late medieval England. The inclusion of the same lexical items in the *DMLBS*, the *OED* and the *Middle English Dictionary* (Lewis *et al.*, 1952-2001; henceforth, *MED*) proves the permeable linguistic boundaries in the Middle Ages and beyond.

The main question to be posed here, therefore, should not be whether we are dealing with either borrowings or code-switches from the vernaculars into ML, but rather, what are the etymological narratives of the lexis which made its way into the *Durham Account Rolls*? It is worth remembering that the lexicographical evidence that will be adduced in this article is somewhat partial: the most complete historical dictionary that exists and will be employed, the *OED*, traces the development of each word in English, which may not correlate with the route that word followed into a ML text. That is why a probabilistic exercise based on etymology and not so much on the typological status of the material at the time will be pursued, thereby leaving aside the thorny question of whether a lexeme can be deemed a code-switch or a borrowing in the *Durham Account Rolls*.

1.2. THE DURHAM ACCOUNT ROLLS IN CONTEXT

The individual inputs of each language to the lexical make-up of the *Durham Account Rolls* may give a somewhat fragmented view of the actual synergies between ML and the vernaculars, which can be best apprehended in context. Even if attention is given to the main semantic fields susceptible to receiving influences from the vernaculars, I will here give some longer sample passages illustrating the interplay between languages in two rolls. The excerpts below are arranged, in the original manuscripts, into locative headings rather than the more usual structure which opens with *expens.* ('expenses'), *recept.* ('receipts'), *reparaciones* ('repairs'), *allocaciones* ('allocations'), or other all-encompassing descriptors which provide series of more loosely connected vocabulary often without any underlying semantic connections.³ A textual arrangement based on locatives facilitates a lexico-semantic study. Limitations are, however, imposed by the different distributions of the rolls themselves since sections vary from roll to roll. The rolls themselves are taken from several departments of the monastic estate, whose abbreviated titles are here preserved in Latin as rendered in Fowler's (1898-1901) edition.⁴

The first example below is taken from Rott. Elemos. 1465 (Fowler 1898: 243-244)⁵ and the second one from Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245-246. Because some of the

³ Some of these sections indicate the departmental locations of those receipts/expenses, hence, semantically forming a more cohesive group of lexical items (e.g., *expense sartrine*).

⁴ Rott. Celer. (*Rotuli Celerariorum*) stands for 'Cellarer's rolls', Rott. Hostill. (*Rotuli Hostillariorum*) for 'Hostiller's rolls', Rott. Camer. (*Rotuli Camerariorum*) for 'Chamberlain's Rolls', Rotuli Elemos. (*Rotuli Elemosinariorum*) for 'Almoner's rolls', Rott. Terrar. (*Rotuli Terrariorum*) for 'Terrars' rolls', and Rott. Bursar. (*Rotuli Bursariorum*) for Bursar's Rolls.

⁵ For the sake of brevity, I will henceforth give the reference to the roll as follows: abbreviated department in which the roll was produced (see Footnote 4), date, and page in Fowler's (1898-1901) edition.

lexical items are wanting on the former (paper) roll, I have selected one of the most complete sections, under the heading *coquina* ('kitchen'), and etymologically tagged their nouns and adjectives; the second example, from a different roll, presents a rarer heading in the *Durham Account Rolls*, *stabulum* (only found once in the whole edited collection, with the exception of *Stabulum Bursarii* in Rott. Bursar. 1456-1457, 636), which is why it is reproduced here as well.⁶ Not all sections contain the same amount of vernacular vocabulary in the *Durham Account Rolls* (e.g., the *Capella Infirmarie* heading contains significantly less). This is mainly because some religious-related objects are preserved in CL – see *calix argent*, *messale*, *stola*, etc. – even if the vernaculars also creep in, particularly in reference to textiles (see “ij towelles pro altari”, “j coverlyde coram altare” (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 246)). This paragraph-based approach is, therefore, productive only to a certain extent.

Excerpt from Rott. Elemos. 1465, 244:

Coquina [CL].⁷ In primis j olla [CL] erea [ML] fixa [ML] in fornace [CL]. Item iiii olle [CL] eree [ML] majores [CL]. Item iiii^{or} olle [CL] minores [CL]. Item j magna [CL] patella [CL]. Item iij zetlynges [OE + suffix]. Item j schawfour [OF] pro cibus [CL] reparandis [CL]. Item ij rakkez [prob. MDutch/MLG] de ferro [CL]. Item ij veruta [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j par [CL] de potclyps [OE + OE]. Item j brandreth [ON] cum iiii^{or} costis [CL] ferreis [CL]. Item j brandreth [ON] rotundum [CL]. Item j flehcrok [OE + OE]. Item j hausorium [ML] cupreum [ML]. Item j scomer [OF] de arecalco [ML].⁸ Item j craticula [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j mortariolum [LL] eremum [ML] cum pilo [CL]. Item ij mortariola [LL] lapidea [CL] cum j pilo [CL] ligneo [CL]. Item j dressyngknyff [OF + OE]. Item j swetstan [OE]. Item j miour [OF] de stanno [CL]. Item j tribula [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j por [MDut] pro igne [CL]. Item j candelabrum [CL] ferreum [CL] fixum [ML] in pariete [CL]. Item j mell [OF]. Item j dressyngbourde [OF + OE]. Item j barell [OF] pro veriuto [AF]. Item j archa [CL; cf. OF *arche*] in camera [CL] inferiori [CL]. Item barow cloose [OE + OF]. Item iij scale [ON] majores [CL] et minores [CL]. Item j trow [OE].

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

⁶ The translations are my own.

⁷ The abbreviations used for the different languages in this essay are well established in the discipline: AF/AN (Anglo-French/Anglo-Norman), CL (Classical Latin), LL (Late Latin), MDut (Middle Dutch), ME (Middle English), ML (Medieval Latin), MLG (Middle Low German), OE (Old English), OF (Old French), and ON (Old Norse).

⁸ As Fowler (1901: 892) clarifies, *auricalcum* seems to be a corruption of *orichalcum*, ‘a kind of brass, gold-mestling’.

dressing-board. And 1 barrel for verjuice. And 1 casket in the lower chamber. And 1 covered barrow. And 3 larger and smaller scales. And 1 trough.

Excerpt from Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245:

Stabulum. In primis ij equi [CL]. Item ij colle [ML inf. by OF],⁹ et ij colle [ML inf. by OF] antique [CL]. Item j ladesadyll [OE + OE]. Item iij gyrthez [ON]. Item iij frena [CL]. Item ij clopis [OE] to lay [OE] under þ^c sadlys [OE]. Item ij horscolers [OE + OF]. Item j hors came [OE compound]. Item j saccus [CL]. Item ij yrenfork' [OE + OE]. Item j barowe [OE]. Item j pyke pro feno [CL] extrahendo [CL]. Item j pype [ML/OFF] pro prebenda [ML] equorum [CL].

Stable. Firstly, two horses. And 2 horse-collars, and 2 old horse-collars. And 1 load-saddle. And 3 girths. And 4 horse's bridles. And 2 cloths to lay under the saddles. And 2 horse-collars. And 1 horse comb. And 1 sack. And 2 iron forks. And 1 barrow. And 1 pike to extract hay. And 1 pipe [part of horse harness] for food for horses.

The etymologies of the lexis above evince a number of CL/LL-origin lexemes or those formed in ML (e.g., *rubeus* 'red' < CL *ruber* + *-eus*). Since French and/or English appropriated some of these lexemes (e.g., *sack* (cf. *sacc* < Latin *saccus*), *pype* 'pipe' also in French (route of entry of the English word)), their reading as either ML or vernacular is often unproductive. Only the development of a specific sense or morphology in the vernacular departing from its Latin etymon can be of assistance in attempting to delineate their immediate source language. Examples include *sago*, meaning 'say'; the CL etymon, *sagus* refers to 'coarse woolen cloak', so the sense found here seems to be derived from AF *seie*, *saie*, *soie* (also in ME) 'say' (cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *sagum*, 1 *sagus*). Another example is *fornace* 'furnace', borrowed from French *fornais* into English (*OED* (1898), s.v. *furnace*, n.) but here present in the form of the Latin etymon *fornace*, or *formule*, meaning 'benches' in ML, a sense not found in English or French. *Formule* also reveals another peculiarity of the *Durham Account Rolls* vocabulary, namely the absence of a plural marker morpheme¹⁰ across lexemes regardless of their vernacular/Latin origin (see, e.g., *olle* 'pots' (CL), *formule* (CL), and *scale* 'scales' (ON)). The pattern in "iij scale majores et minores" is paralleled in "iij olle eree majores", which might indicate a scribal convention of omitting the *-s/-z*, particularly but not exclusively, in NPs where Ns are preceded by numerals.¹¹

⁹ *DMLBS*, s.v. 2 *collare* [CL; cf. OF *coler*, *coliere*], *collium*, *collius*, *collia*.

¹⁰ In this article, this phenomenon is referred to as zero-plural marking, although *sensu stricto* the absence of the plural morpheme does not involve a zero or null morpheme and should be understood in the context of ML, characterised by scribal innovation in the usage of declensions.

¹¹ The lack of the plural marker is also recorded in words occurring on their own. Its presence in two identical constructions might be simply due to the scribe's re-use of the same structure. Whole sentences are indeed copied verbatim under two different sections within the same roll: "Item j por pro igne" and "Item j candelabrum ferreum fixum in pariete".

The scribes' insightful and flexible command of the vernaculars and Latin is exemplified by the use of synonyms across languages, as in ON-origin *brandreth* (e.g., "j brandreth rotundum") and CL-origin *craticula* (e.g., "j craticula ferrea"), both meaning (according to our present understanding of these words) 'gridiron'. Above are phrases entirely made up of Latin-origin vocabulary (e.g., "Item j candelabrum [CL] ferreum [CL] fixum [ML] in pariete [CL]") as well as composed of vernacular lexical items in tandem with Latin (e.g., "Item vj qwyshyns [AF] de opere [CL] Flandrensi [ML]"). What is meant by *Latin* is earlier periods of Latin (i.e., CL/LL) or ML lexemes not found in the vernaculars. The vernacular/Latin distinction is greatly eroded by the vast amount of vernacular vocabulary that was incorporated into ML (see, e.g., "Item j barell [ML] *barellus*, *barellum*, *barella* < OF *baril* 'barrell' pro veriuto" [ML *verjutum* < AN *verjous*, OF *vergus*, ME *verjous* 'verjuice']). Not only is the French-origin vocabulary remarkable in these paragraphs but also that of OE origin: the vocabulary related to the "stable" includes *ladesadyll* 'a saddle for carrying loads' (OE + OE), *hors came* 'a horse-comb (a comb for combing horses)' (a compound already in OE), *barowe* 'a barrow' (OE), *horscolers* 'horse collars' (OE + OF). Whole syntactic units in French or in English also occur in "cum scriptura de le Roy" (Rott. Elemos. 1464-1465, 244) and "ij cloþis to lay under þe sadlys" (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245). These constructions in English would be symptomatic of a stage of "moribund switching" according to Wright's (1998) study of multilingual writing. However, rather than part of a process of Anglicisation, this seems to be an isolated case in the edited *Durham Account Rolls*; there are no other similar instances in the material examined (see, e.g., the last roll of the Rott. Magistr. Inf. dated to 1526-1527 (283-284), which has few non-adapted vernacular lexical items or Rott. Bursar. 1536-1537 (667-707) given *in extenso*).

2. DATA COLLECTION

The data has been manually culled from the *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham from the Original MSS* [1278-1538], edited by Fowler in three volumes (1898-1901). I gathered the following information for each vernacular lexical entry: lemmas, definitions (the closest sense to the occurrences of the word(s) in the rolls), attestations in the *OED*, *MED*, and *DMLBS*, and the etymological information provided in those dictionaries (paying particular attention to the one provided in the *OED* and *MED*). The data was arranged by language of origin. I here concentrate on the vernacular input from OE, a total of 263 lexical items. In the data compilation process, I necessarily had to discard words which neither the present state of lexicographical scholarship nor my own enquiry had been able to trace: some of them are difficult to pin down because of the lack of contextual cues (e.g. *foraiwes* (Rott. Hostill. 1371, 130) and *chiltens* (Rott. Bursar. 1406-1407, 606)), while others are specific material objects (e.g., a *scowler* (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1422-1423, 271), a name given to 'a window in the Infirmary hall', *warde* (Rott. Celer. 1459-1460, 89) 'a kind of large pot' [*magna olla*], *eden* (Rott. Celer. 1459-1460, 89) 'a kind of vessel' or *nole* (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1384-1385 (verso), 264, 'a particular cup')).

After classifying all the vocabulary, I performed a semantic analysis: I made use of the *Historical Thesaurus of the OED* categories (with a few adjustments), when available, and considered the larger semantic networks offered in the *OED*, which usually encompass semantically related words from the OE period (if existent and if the word in question is included in the dictionary) onwards.

3. OLD ENGLISH IN THE *DURHAM ACCOUNT ROLLS*

Compared to the other major source languages in the *Durham Account Rolls* (AF, ON, and MDut), OE was a source of vocabulary historically native to the country for much longer. Through the filter of ML these languages are on more equal grounds, contributing with vernacular material to the lexis of the *Durham Account Rolls*. Despite the role of French as the default language of communication in the management of estates among the higher officers during this period,¹² English played an important part in conceptualising both basic, hyperonymic, vocabulary (e.g., *nallez* ‘nails’ and *pan* ‘a pan’) and, more often, technical lexis in the form of “basic-level terms” (Croft and Cruse 2004; Sylvester 2018) or hyponyms. Basic-level terms are further down the semantic hierarchy and, therefore, are semantically more specific than superordinates. However, a term may belong to a basic-level category for speakers with a good command of the subject matter but at the same time it may not be “a satisfactory basic-level term for one who has limited experience of it” (Sylvester 2018: 255; see also Croft and Cruse 2004: 96-97). Both basic-level terms and hyponyms tend to be multi-word lexical items in the *Durham Account Rolls* which can be fully made of OE-origin vocabulary, exclusively of borrowings or, more generally, be a combination of native material and borrowings from ON, AF, or MDut already integrated into Middle English. They would have functioned as collocations or conceptual lexical units in the scribes’ ordinary speech, thus being often embedded in the accounts with varying degrees of integration into ML through the use of case endings, suspension marks, or zero morphemes, and they could also be partly rendered in Latin, giving rise to hybrid creations. The exploration of 263 OE-origin simplex forms may also unveil another source of not only basic-level terms but also more specialised terminology. Some examples from the most representative semantic domains will be given and their relation to CL, LL, and ML adumbrated: how many of them are early borrowings from Latin? Do they coexist with the Latin stems that were the source of the OE words? Are the OE-origin words widely found in ML?

One of the most comprehensive and important earliest lists of Latin-origin borrowings in OE was Serjeantson’s (1935), with more than 520 borrowings. As Durkin (2014: 100) rightly points out, some are rather dubious, and there are some omissions in Serjeantson’s Appendix, as well as of material mentioned in the body

¹² See Ingham (2012) and well-known works such as Bibbesworth’s *Le Tretiz*, a tool for teaching young aristocrats French terminology which would have been useful in an agricultural context.

of her text. Once the *Dictionary of Old English* comes to fruition, a more complete understanding of the OE word-stock will be acquired, including the c. 600 relatively secure borrowings from pre-conquest Latin (Durkin 2014: 100; see also Wollmann 1993 and Scheler 1997 for earlier estimations).¹³ A recurring methodological pitfall from a monolingual lexicographical perspective is precisely how to approach Latin borrowings which preserve their inflection in OE and, therefore, are not always integrated (see, e.g., the OE forms under *OED* (2001), s.v. *mat*, n.¹).

3.1. LATIN-ORIGIN BORROWINGS INTO OLD ENGLISH

It is worth noting that out of the early Latin-origin borrowings into English in the *Durham Account Rolls*, *capon*, *psalter*, and *butter* preserve their ML declensional paradigm along with their abbreviated forms (ML rather than CL as their endings do not fully match up with the expected case endings of the original CL declensions): *boutiri*, *butir*, *butir*, *Butir.*, *butiro*, *butir*, *butiri* (CL *būtyrum*) ‘butter/s’; *capon*, *capone*, *caponibus*, *capon.*, *caponum*, *capones* (CL *capō*) ‘capon/s’; and *psalterium*, *psalterio*, *psalterii* (sing.), *psalteria* (CL *psaltērium*) ‘psalter/s’. The majority are unintegrated or exhibit a wide range of suffixes and/or suspension marks, signifying that their classification either as ML lexemes or as reflexes of the same Latin words borrowed into OE is often problematic: *wrethyn candell* ‘writen candle’ (OE *candel*, *cōndel* < Latin *candēla*), *culter* ‘the colter of a plow’ (OE *culter* < L *culter*), *mattes*, *matte*, *mattis* ‘mats’ (OE *matta*, *meatte*, *meatta* < L *matta*),¹⁴ *schewtells*, *scutellis*, *scotil*, *scuttyl*, *scoteles*, *scutell.*, *scutell* (pl.), *scotlys*, *scuteles*, *scotellez* ‘scuttles (baskets for winnowing corn)’ (cf. *scutella*, *scutello*; OE *scutel* < Latin *scutella*; *DMLBS*, s.v. *scutella*, *scutellus*, *scutellum*). If the vernacular appropriation of the Latin root evinces considerable morphological transformations unparalleled in the history of the Latin etymons, a more direct connection can be established between the words as adapted in OE and those in the *Durham Account Rolls*, as in *mylne*¹⁵ ‘mill’ (OE *mylen*, *myln* < L *molina*, *molinus*) or *lopisters*, *lopster*, *lopsters* ‘lopsters’ (OE *lopustre*, *lopystre*, *loppestre* < Latin *locusta*). *Milne* is found in Anglo-Latin as *milnus* (see *DMLBS*, s.v. *milnus*), clearly betraying the influence of the English vernacular. However, instead of a Latinised vernacular lexical item of this kind, sometimes the *DMLBS* only includes etymons such as *cammarus*, *locusta*, *polyypus*, and *saltulus*, which are the expected developments of words for ‘lobster’ descending from earlier stages of Latin.

Many Latin-origin borrowings from the OE period would later come into contact with the French vernacular equivalents, resulting in a number of scenarios: the

¹³ Scheler (1977: 38) identifies 50 post-Conquest (i.e., 1066-1150) Latin borrowings into OE although his parameters are not clearly delineated and remain dubious.

¹⁴ *-is* can be analysed as a variant of Northern ME *-ys* or as the Latin plural ablative.

¹⁵ Also in *milne irennys* ‘mill irons’, *milneles* ‘mill eels [poss. eels from a millpond]’, *milnestanes*, ‘mill stones’, *milnpikkes* ‘tool used to trim the surfaces of millstones’, and *milnposte* ‘mill post’.

English lexeme was partly influenced or reinforced by the French lexeme deriving from the same root, such as *capon*' (Old Northern French/AF *capun*, *capon*), *moskyllles* 'mussels' (< post-classical Latin *muscula* (< CL *mūsculus*), reinforced by AF *moskle*, *muscle*, *muskele* (OF *moulle*)), *plastr*' 'plaster' (OE < Latin *plastrum*; French *plaistre*, *plastre*), *pynes* 'pine seeds' (OE *pin* < L *pīnus* (reinf. by French *pin*),¹⁶ or *pyone* 'peony seed' (OE < Latin *paēōnia* (reinforced by French *peoine*, *pioine*)); the French lexeme may also have superseded the early OE lexeme (e.g. *Ostree* (pl.), *oysters*, *Oystres* 'oysters' (OE *oster* < CL *ostrea*; OF *uistre*, *oistre*)¹⁷ or the English word might have been reborrowed from French (e.g., *morter* (in compounds); OE *mortere* < CL *mortārium* (also in the *Durham Account Rolls*), later cf. OF *mortier*, *morter*); the OE and French descendants of these Latin-origin words could also coexist in ME: *lak* 'lake' (OE *lacu* < L *lacus*; OF *lac*), *tabule* 'tables (flat stones/tablets)' (pl.) (OE < CL *tabula*; OF *tabul*, *tabull*), *troutes*, *truttis*, *trout*, *Salmon Troutys*, *trutis*, *trut*' 'trouts' (cf. OE *trugt* < LL (also ML) *tractus*, *tracta*, *truta*; OF *truite*, *troite*, *troute*), and *sekkes* 'sacks' (West Saxon *sacc*, Mercian *sec* < Latin *saccus*) which in French had a different vowel (*sac*, *sach*) and shares the <e>-stem with ON (cf. Old Icelandic *sekkr*). Crucial to the multilingual matrix of the *Durham Account Rolls* is precisely a potential linguistic ambiguity (e.g., is *culter* Latin or English? Are *trut*' or *mortar*' ML, AF, or ME?).

In total, 98 out of the 263 OE simplexes – that is, 37.26%, excluding derivatives on OE roots in ME –¹⁸ are in the *DMLBS*. Apart from the Latin-origin borrowings into English, which this lexicographical resource derives directly from their Latin etymons (e.g., *DMLBS*, s.v. *candela* [CL]) unless they reflect vernacular-specific morphological and/or semantic changes in ML (*DMLBS*, s.v. 4 *polus*, 3 *pola* [ME *pol* < AS *pal* < *palus*]), the nominative cases of other vernacular-origin lexical items are sometimes reconstructed in this ML dictionary as they are often only found in the oblique case in the extant texts (e.g., *ladelus* [ME *ladel* < OE *blædel*] and *mattocus* [ME *mattok*], although also note the suspension sign in some lexical items like 1 *grot*' [ME pl. *grotes*]). The spelling variability found in medieval texts is also simplified in the lemmas and the number of attestations illustrating the lexeme's actual usage varies (compare *DMLBS*, s.v. *lempeta* [ME *lempet* < OE *lempedu*], with only one attestation '1313 in crevese, in ~is, wylkes Ac. Durh. 10', and s.v. 3 *hopa* [ME *hop*], which is more amply recorded in the *DMLBS*). Four Germanic, OE-origin, lexemes appear to

¹⁶ Nevertheless, the sense of *pynes* found in the *Durham Account Rolls*, 'edible seeds from the cones of various pines', seems to be first attested not earlier than the ME period, in 1327 (*OED* (2006), s.v. *pine*, n.²), and should be compared with CL *pīnea* and French *pyne*, OF *pin*). French cognates with these early Latin-origin borrowings into English may have undergone completely independent developments so that the existing ME reflex and the OF lexeme do not resemble to each other (for instance, *culter*, cf. OE *culter* < L *culter*; OF *coutre*).

¹⁷ The root *ostr-* is also present in ML (cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. *ostrea*, *ostreum*, *ostria*, 1 *ostrium*).

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

be declined following the ML paradigm (*fanna* ‘fan’, *creba* ‘crib’, only attested once, *clout*, *clitta*, *clouttis*, *clout*. (pl.) ‘clouts’, and *cove*, *cofe*, *coue*, *cova*, *cofe*, *cova* ‘cove (chamber/pantry)’ but most of them contain *-e*, *-es*, *-is*, and, to a lesser extent, *-ez* (e.g., *barowe*, *barow*, *barows*, *barowes* (*le*), *barrowez* ‘barrows’ and *coclis*, *kocles*, *kokells*, *cokles*, *cokylles*, *cokelys*, and *kokyllez* ‘cockles’); *-(e)z* should be, in principle, unexpected in lexical items other than French-origin loanwords, although it is found in 43 OE-origin lexemes, that is, 28.10% of the total of pluralised OE-origin nouns (153),¹⁹ in lexemes which could have potentially been employed in AF as well. This non-negligible percentage stresses the permeability of language boundaries in the *Durham Account Rolls* and the multilingual vocabulary of English more generally.

3.2. SOME NOTES ON SEMANTIC DOMAINS

By semantic field, the most numerous items are those denoting equipment (41), including fastenings (e.g., *hespes* ‘hasps’, *henges* ‘hinges’, *hopez* ‘hoops’, *rapys* ‘ropes’, and *stapels* ‘staples’), containers (e.g., *fatt* ‘vat’, *boll* ‘bowl’, *troue* ‘trough’, and *ladels* ‘ladles’), and tools (e.g., *betours* ‘beaters (instruments for beating)’, *schaves* ‘shaves (instruments for cutting/scraping)’, *swetstan* ‘a whetstone’, and *stayff* ‘a pole or bar used for several purpose’). Within the domain of farming (17), there are also 6 terms for tools and implements (*byll* ‘a cutting/hacking implement’, *culter* ‘a coulter’, *bake* ‘a hack’, *harows* ‘harrows for cultivating land’, *mattok* ‘a mattock’, and *pykoys* ‘pickaxes’), enclosed fields (e.g., *croftis* ‘crofts’ and *hope* ‘hope (an enclosed land)’), and animal husbandry (e.g., *busys* ‘booses (stalls for livestock)’, *byre* ‘a byre (a cowshed)’, *stirropes* ‘stirrups’, *yokys* ‘yokes’, and *yare* ‘an enclosure for catching fish’).

Other OE-origin terms include those for animals in general (20)²⁰ and animals for food ((5) *herrings* ‘herrings’, *troutes* ‘trouts’, *moskylles* ‘morses’, *ostree* (pl.) ‘oysters’, and *wilkes* ‘whelks’), materials (18), raw (e.g., *balk* ‘baulk/balk’, *bemes* ‘beams’, *spone* (pl.) ‘spoons’, and *wattylles* ‘wattles’) or manufactured (e.g., *bras* ‘brass’, *lynnynges* ‘lining’, *schaffes* ‘sheaves (bundles of iron or steel)’, and *seme* ‘seam (fat, grease)’), food (15) (e.g., *berme* ‘barm’, *grotis* ‘groats’, and *pynes* ‘pine seeds’), plants (11) (*fruth* ‘a frith’, *hather* ‘a heather’, *thornes* ‘thorns’, and *wedys* ‘weeds’), measurements (11) (e.g., *wegh* ‘a weigh (unit of quantity for commodities)’, *fothyre* (pl.) ‘a fother (a cart-load)’, *bollez* ‘bolls (dry measure)’, and *ken* ‘a kenning (a measure for grain and other dry goods)’), and textiles and clothing (11) (e.g., *bakkes* ‘backs (usually, cloaks)’, *halyng* ‘halling (a piece of tapestry)’, and *bayres* ‘furs’).

¹⁹ These are the following: *bollez*, *bolstourz*, *bordez*, *cannez*, *crabbez*, *crokez*, *croppiez*, *kokyllez*, *deynez*, *fattez*, *flettez*, *futbrez*, *grotez*, *hakkeez*, *heltrez*, *hopez*, *ladz*, *leippeez*, *mossez*, *nallez*, *pykkez*, *poundez*, *rakkeez*, *ricez*, *rongez*, *ropeez*, *rowmeez*, *scotellez*, *sevez/syffeze*, *shellez*, *sholez*, *spyndillez*, *stapillez*, *steropez*, *stokkeez*, *stottez*, *stralez*, *sylez*, *tyldez*, *trouez*, *wattillez*, *webbez*, and *weez*.

²⁰ This division corresponds to the *Historical Thesaurus of the OED* taxonomy: “the world » food and drink » food » animals for food’ and ‘the world » animals’.

-Ing forms (26) extend across the aforementioned semantic domains:²¹ among others are *beytting* ‘repairing’, *byndyng* ‘binding’, *byrtenyng* ‘chopping (of wood)’, *demmyng* ‘deming’, *drawyng* ‘drawing’, *dygbyng* ‘digthing’, *fellyng* ‘felling (of timber)’, *floryng* ‘flooring’, *beggeyng* ‘hedging’, *layng* ‘re-steeling’, *nalyng* ‘nailing’, *qubykkyng* ‘quicking (now obsolete) fencing or protecting with a quickset’, *stoppyng* ‘stopping (filling with herbs, spices, etc.)’, and *thirlyng* ‘thirling (drilling or boring a hole)’, and there are also two gerunds ending in Latin-origin *-ando* (*sinkando* ‘sinking’ and *wyndanda* ‘winding’). Manual workers responsible for these everyday tasks in the different departments of Durham Cathedral would have communicated in English, which explains the high incidence of vocabulary already present in OE for names of tools, animals, plants, or measurements. The choice of the phrasing already present is deliberate: apart from Germanic roots, the influx of Latin and French, particularly noticeable from the ME period, is at the centre of the vocabulary of the *Durham Account Rolls*. Beyond the stems *per se*, the suffixes also betray these nuanced and complex inputs.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This article has overviewed the vocabulary deriving from OE, the only ‘native’ source of vernacular vocabulary in the *Durham Account Rolls*. Special attention has been given to how early Latin borrowings into OE are rendered in these rolls, concluding that their classification in binary terms, that is, as either ML or vernacular, is rather problematic unless the lexeme in question exhibits morphological/phonological changes unparalleled in the Latin etymons which are not mediated by English. This is a recurrent pitfall in the analysis of typologically proximate languages in both the Germanic and Romance branches.

Many of the early Latin borrowings into OE were also later on influenced/reinforced by French lexemes deriving from the same Latin root, which complicates their categorisation from a modern viewpoint. Even OE-origin lexemes which were not incorporated into continental French varieties could have been employed in AF, so the presence of *-ez* is not far-fetched in the context of late medieval multilingual England.

Finally, the semantic component of the OE-origin vocabulary present in these ML texts proves to be particularly relevant to our understanding of the main realms in which the vernacular was employed *in lieu* of or at the same time as their Latin counterparts, such as in words relating to equipment of different kinds, materials or names for animals. The data here presented is just a sample of the potential of research into the vernacular vocabulary in ML texts as preserved in rolls which, for a long time, had largely remained under-investigated from a philological viewpoint.

²¹ Note that many of them are not in the *Historical Thesaurus of the OED*.

REFERENCES

- Croft, W. and D. A. Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkin, P. 2012. "Middle English—an overview". <https://public.oed.com/aspects-of-english/english-in-time/middle-english-an-overview/> (accessed 23 July 2022).
- Durkin, P. 2014. *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, J. T. 1898-1901. *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, from the Original MSS.*, 3 vols. Durham: Surtees Society.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 2017. "Historical and modern studies of codeswitching: A tale of mutual enrichment". *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond*. Eds. P. Pahta, J. Skaffari, and L. Wright. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 19-36.
- Healey, A. d. et al. 1986. *Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto: University of Toronto. <https://www.doe.utoronto.ca/> (accessed 23 July 2022).
- Hone, N. J. 1906. *The Manor and Manorial Records*. London: Methuen.
- Hulbert, J. R. 1936. "English in manorial documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries". *Modern Philology* 34 (1): 37-61.
- Hunt, T. 2011. "The languages of medieval England". *Mebrsprachigkeit im Mittelalter*. Eds. M. Baldzuhn and C. Putzo. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 50-68.
- Ingham, R. 2010. *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*. York: York Medieval Press.
- Ingham, R. 2012. *The Transmission of Anglo-Norman: Language History and Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M. and J.S Møller. 2011. "Polylinguaging in superdiversity". *Diversities* 13 (2): 23-37.
- Kay, C., Roberts, J., Samuels, M. and I. Wotherspoon. 2009. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/thesaurus/> (accessed 23 July 2022).
- Latham, R. E., Howlett, D. R. and R. K. Ashdowne. 1975-2013. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources [DMLBS]*. Oxford: British Academy. <<http://www.dmlbs.ox.ac.uk/>> (accessed 23 July 2022).
- Lewis, R. E., et al. 1952-2001. *Middle English Dictionary [MED]*. Online edition [2000-2018] in *Middle English Compendium*. Ed. F. McSparran et al. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <www.quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/> (accessed 23 July 2022).

- Matras, Y. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2011. "The matrix language frame model: Developments and responses". *Codeswitching Worldwide. Bd. II*. Ed. R. Jacobson. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 23-58.
- Poplack, S. and M. Meechan. 1998. "How languages fit together in codemixing". *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2 (2): 127-138.
- Roig-Marín, A. 2019. "Towards a Multilingual Approach to the History of English". *Atlantis* 41 (1): 185-194.
- Roig-Marín, A. 2021. "On the Latin-Romance continuum in the *Durham Account Rolls*". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 137 (2): 319-343.
- Rothwell, W. 1991. "The missing link in English etymology: Anglo-French". *Medium Aevum* 60: 173-196.
- Rothwell, W. 1994. "The trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer". *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 16: 45-67.
- Scheler, M. 1977. *Der englische Wortschatz* (Grundlagen der Anglistik und Amerikanistik 9). Berlin: Erich Schmidt.
- Schendl, H. and L. Wright, eds. 2011. *Code-Switching in Early English*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Serjeantson, M. S. 1935. *A History of Foreign Words in English*. London: K. Paul.
- Simpson, J. A. and M. Proffitt. 1990-in progress. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/> (accessed 23 July 2022).
- Sylvester, L. 2017. "A semantic field and text-type approach to late-medieval multilingualism". *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond*. Eds. P. Pahta, J. Skaffari, and L. Wright. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 77-96.
- Sylvester, L. 2018. "Contact effects on the technical lexis of Middle English: a semantic hierarchic approach". *English Language & Linguistics* 22 (2): 249-264.
- Trotter, D., ed. 2000. *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Trotter, D. 2009. "Stuffed Latin: vernacular evidence in Latin documents". *Language and culture in medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500*. Ed. J. Wogan-Browne. York: York Medieval Press. 153-163.

- Trotter, D. 2011. "Death, taxes and property: Some code-switching evidence from Dover, Southampton, and York". *Code-Switching in Early English*. Ed. H. Schendl, and L. Wright. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 155-189.
- Wollmann, A. 1993. "Early Latin loan-words in Old English". *Anglo-Saxon England* 22: 1-26.
- Wright, L. 1998. "Mixed-language business writing. Five hundred years of code-switching". *Language change: Advances in historical sociolinguistics*. Ed. E. Håkon Jahr. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 99-118.