

### 3.30-4.00

Carmela Perta & Valentina Ferrari

Università degli Studi G. d'Annunzio Chieti e Pescara

*"The transmission of Italian through English ports. A lexical investigation in late medieval period (15th century)"*

This paper focuses on the analysis of Anglo-Italian contact during the late medieval period. The role of Italian as language of influence has been mostly neglected prior the Early Modern Age, because of the prestige of Italian Renaissance culture; however, the considerable presence of Italian merchants in England in the late Middle Ages left some traces in texts produced in the mercantile field. Our purpose is to examine the transmission of lexical elements from Italian to English and to investigate their long-term effects on the history of English. A number of Italianisms introduced into English through this channel have been identified (Foster 1963, Rothwell 1999, Trotter 2011, Tiddeman 2016); however, the dynamics of interaction with the languages used in texts, Latin, Anglo-Norman, and Middle English, have not been unanimously defined. Our investigation proposes an in-depth analysis of the account books of the port of Southampton (Studer 1913, Quinn 1937-1938, Cobb 1961, Foster 1963, Lewis 1993), multilingual texts which testify the contact between Italian and English merchants in the late Middle Ages. We will identify Italianisms referring to elements specifically related to commercial activity, trying to interpret their lives as culturally related to Italian reality or as lexical English alternatives. By examining the main lexicographical sources devoted to Medieval and Modern Italian, and to the languages of medieval England (Latin, Anglo-Norman, and Middle English), we will attempt to delineate the chronology of the spread of such terms in English. Finally, the comparison with modern dictionaries of English will allow us to assess the persistence of Italianisms over time. Through the formal and semantic study of the lexemes as well as the investigation of the historical and cultural background of the texts we will be able to better understand the dynamics of the contact between Italian and English.

References Cobb, H.S., 1961, The local port book of Southampton for 1439-40, Southampton, The University Press.

Foster, B., 1963, The local port book of Southampton for 1435-36, Southampton, The University Press.

Lewis, E., 1993, The Southampton port and brokage books, 1448-49, Southampton, Southampton University Press. Quinn, D.B./Ruddock, A.A., 1937-1938, The port books or local customs accounts of Southampton for the reign of Edward IV, Southampton, Cox & Sharland.

Rothwell, W., 1999, 'Sugar and Spice and All Things Nice: From Oriental Bazar to English Cloister in Anglo-French', *The Modern Language Review*, 94, 647-659.

Studer, P., 1913, The Port Books of Southampton or (Anglo-French) accounts of Robert Florys, Water-Bailiff and Receiver of Petty-Customs, A.D. 1427-1430, Southampton, Southampton Record Society.

Tiddeman, M., 2016, Money Talks: Anglo-Norman, Italian and English language contact in medieval merchant documents, c1200-c1450, PhD Thesis, Aberystwyth University.

Trotter, D., 2011, Death, taxes and property: some code-switching evidence from Dover, Southampton and York, in Schendl, H./Wright, L. (eds.), *Code-Switching in Early English*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 155-189."

#### **4.00-4.30**

Anne Breitbarth

Ghent University

*You are what you is. Verbal agreement variation and change in Early Modern Dutch*

In present-day Dutch, there is agreement variation with the polite subject pronoun *u* in those verbs that do not have syncretic forms for 2nd and 3rd person agreement (*hebben* 'have', *kunnen* 'can', *willen* 'want', *zijn* 'be', *zullen* 'shall'). Given that *u* is originally the oblique case of *gij*, which up to Middle Dutch was the 2pl pronoun, but replaced the original 2sg pronoun *du* in the 15th and 16th centuries (Van der Horst 2008), the question arises how the verbal agreement developed with this pronoun once it began to be used in subject function around 1600 (Paardekooper 1996).

For the present paper, the Letters-as-Loot (LAL) corpus (<https://brievenalsbuit.ivdnt.org/>, 17th-18th c. letters) was analysed to afford a better understanding of the development.

While there has been a historical-sociolinguistic treatment of the choice between forms of address in this corpus (Rutten/Van der Wal 2014: ch. 6), the question of the development of the variation in verbal agreement in the non-syncretic verbs has not yet been addressed. In the 613 cases of subject-*u* (including subject use of *U.L.*, *U.E.*, and *u* instead of *gij*) with six nonsyncretic

verbs in the corpus (+ *mogen* 'may' in addition to the five named above), we find

a socially, geospatially, and also linguistically structured change over the time covered by the corpus. 3rd p. agr. clearly is the incoming variant, gradually replacing the initially dominant 2nd p. (taking the approximate birth year of the letter writers as a proxy for diachrony). Female letter-writers appear to lead the change by 1–2 generations (Fig. 1a), and the centre of innovation seems to be Amsterdam (Ams), from where it spreads to the surrounding province of Noord-Holland (NH), and then further south to Zuid-Holland (ZH) and ultimately Zeeland (ZL), which, unlike the other provinces, which are more similar to each other, significantly lags behind (Fig. 1b). Furthermore, there is a clear distinction between three syntactic positions

of the finite verb: as Fig. 1c shows, 3rd p. agr. first dominates in inversion contexts, followed with considerable delay by uninverted/straight V2-contexts, and only diffuses much later to verb-final contexts. This is strikingly reminiscent of the position-dependent agreement found in Dutch with the 2sg pronoun *jij* < *gij*, which had been established when *gij* replaced *du* (e.g. Postma 2011).

The data are argued to provide further evidence for diagglossia in Dutch during the 17th and 18th centuries, in addition to that presented by Rutten (2016): the letters reflect formulaic use and codification as well as reflexes of natural language use, at a time (just) before a standard language ideology developed in the Netherlands. In this case, the epistolary forms of address with concomitant 3rd p. agr. were established as a written convention “from above”. The observed agreement variation in use, and the initial preference for 2nd p. agr. can be attributed to writers who had not yet (fully) internalized the convention initially grafting the epistolary forms of address onto their underlying agreement system pertaining to *gij* (“from below”). This accounts for the initially very clear position dependent agreement, which is gradually eroded as 3rd p. agr. with *u* spreads. The fact that women lead the transition to uniform 3rd p. agr. indicates that this was perceived as a prestige form (cf. Labov 1990, 2001).

Ultimately, however, this change is not completed. This can be understood as a result of the high token frequency of the verbs involved, a factor that is known to preserve irregularity (e.g. Bybee 1995): Among the 2526 different verb lemmas in the LAL-corpus, the six nonsyncretic verbs are among the most frequent ones, ranking 1st (*zijn*), 2nd (*hebben*), 3rd (*zullen*), 5th (*kunnen*), 10th (*mogen*), and 15th (*willen*).

Fig. 1: Probability of 3rd person agreement with subject-*u* in the Letters-as-Loot corpus, by gender, province, verb position, and lexeme.

References:

Bybee, J. 1995. Regular morphology and the lexicon. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 10/5: 425–455. Horst, J.M. van der. 2008.

Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis. Part 2. Leuven. Labov, W. 1991. The intersection of sex and social class in the course of

linguistic change. *Language Variation and Change* 2: 205–254. Labov, W. 2001. *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 2: Social Factors*.

Malden, MA. Paardekooper, P.C. 1996. U (ond.) ook voor 1600. *Taal en Tongval* 48: 70–71. Postma, G. J. 2011. Het verval van

het pronomen du – dialectgeografie en historische syntaxis. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16: 56–87.

Rutten, G. 2016. *Diaglossia, individual*

*variation and the limits of standardization: Evidence from Dutch*. In C. Russi (ed.), *Current Trends in Historical Sociolinguistics*, 194–218.

Warsaw. Rutten, G./M.J. van der Wal. 2014. *Letters as Loot: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Dutch*.

Amsterdam."

#### **4.30-5.00**

Sungmin Park

McMaster Divinity College

*Language Policy of the Roman Empire for the Eastern Provinces between the Third Century BCE and First Century CE*

Joshua Fishman and Einar Haugen have contributed to the development of the language policy model at the institutional community level.<sup>1</sup> Highlighting the significance of the individuals' potential effect on the language policy at the individual level, Spolsky suggests an inquiry into the management agencies and management advocates.<sup>2</sup> By employing Bernard Spolsky's concept of language management and management agency, this study examines one context in which sociopolitical factors influenced linguistic ideology: the eastern provinces of the Roman empire in the first century CE, where such factors shaped linguistic ideology about code choices for official imperial social practices.

This study consists of two parts. The first part involves the inquiry of historical records about the Roman elite group, which provide information on the linguistic ideologies of the Roman authorities, such as the Roman Emperors, politicians, and scholars, who served as the language management and management agency. The second part explores the use of official language in the official documents stored in the archives and inscriptions found in the public, government, and educational institutions. The study of these pieces of evidence aims at elucidating how the linguistic ideologies of the Roman Empire's authorities influenced the language practices concerning the use of official languages in the eastern provinces.

This study demonstrates that pro-Greek ideology was more influential than pro-Latin ideology among the Roman elites. Historical documents imply that, due to the lack of a unified and systematic language policy across the empire, individual Roman authorities had the autonomy to implement language policies within their respective jurisdictions before the first century CE.<sup>3</sup> While Latin was predominantly used for official documents and inscriptions in the central government of the Roman Empire, records intended for communication with the elites and inhabitants of the eastern provinces, such as official proclamations, contracts, and laws, were often bilingual in Latin and Greek or exclusively in Greek.<sup>4</sup>

1 Joshua A. Fishman, “Language Planning and Language Planning Research: The State of the Art,” in *Advances in*

*Language Planning*, ed. Joshua A. Fishman (Mouton: The Hague, 1974), 15–36; Einar Haugen, “The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice,” in *Progress in Language Planning: International*

*Perspectives*, eds. Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman, *Contributions to the Sociology of Language* 31 (Berlin:

de Gruyter, 1983), 269–89.

2 Bernard Spolsky, *Rethinking Language Policy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2021), 127–28.

3 See Appendix.

4 Regarding previous scholars’ studies, see References. In this study, I will investigate these resources in light of

their social domains.

Appendix. Historical Documents of Linguistic Ideologies among the Roman Elites

1. Pro-Latin Ideology

Social Status Historical Figure Historical Record

Emperors Tiberius Julius Caesar

Augustus (?)

Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, Tiberius 71

Tiberius Claudius Caesar

Augustus Germanicus (?)

Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, Claudius 16.2;

Dio Cassius, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἱστορία* 60.17.4

Politicians Roman ambassadors to

Tarentum

Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et Dictorum*

*Memorabilium libri IX* 2.2.5; cf. Appian,

*Historia Romana* 3.7.2.

Marcus Porcius Cato Plutarch, *Καίων ὁ Πρεσβύτερος*, *Βίοι*

*Παράλληλοι* 12.5

Lucius Aemilius Paullus Titus Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita* 45.29.3

Scholars Valerius Maximus *Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum*

*Memorabilium libri IX* 2.2.2

Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis Juvenal, *Satires I*, *Graecam urbem* 3.61

2. Pro-Greek Ideology

Social Status Historical Figure Historical Record

Emperors Tiberius Julius Caesar

Augustus (?)

Dio Cassius, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἱστορία* 57.15.3–4

Tiberius Claudius Caesar

Augustus Germanicus (?)

Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, Claudius 42

Gaius Octavius Thurinus Dio Cassius, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἱστορία* 51.16.4

Nero Claudius Caesar

Augustus Germanicus

Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, Nero 7.2

Politicians The Advocates of Molon Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et Dictorum*

*Memorabilium libri IX* 2.2.3

Marcus Tullius Cicero Cicero, *In Verrem* 2.4.147

Quintus Ennius Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 17.17.1

Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus Plutarch, Πομπήιος, Βίοι Παράλληλοι 79.2

Scholars Malon Valerius Maximus, Factorum et Dictorum

Memorabilium libri IX 2.2.2

Greek education center in

Rome

Plutarch, Λεύκιος Λούκουλλος, Βίοι Παράλληλοι

42.1–2

#### References

Adams, James Noel. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Ando, Clifford. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. *Classics and Contemporary Thought* 6. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Clackson, James. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift in the Mediterranean World during the Roman Empire." Pages 36–57 in Alex Mullen and Patrick James (eds), *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Clackson, James, and Geoffrey C. Horrocks. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Dubuisson, Michel. "Y a-t-il Une Politique Linguistique Romaine?" *Ktèma* 7 (1982): 187–210.

Farrell, Joseph. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Haugen, Einar. "The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice." Pages 269–289 in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), *Progress in Language Planning. International Perspectives. Contributions to the Sociology of Language* 31. New York: Mouton, 1983.

MacMullen, Ramsay. "Provincial Languages in the Roman Empire." *American Journal of Philology* 87(1) (1966): 1–17.

Moatti, Claudia. "Translation, Migration, and Communication in the Roman Empire. Three Aspects of Movement in History." *Classical Antiquity* 25(1) (2006): 109–140.

Mullen, Alex. "Latin and Other Languages. Societal and Individual Bilingualism." Pages 527–548 in James Clackson (ed), *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Petersmann, Hubert. *Zur Sprach- und Kulturpolitik in der Klassischen Antike*. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998): 87–101.

Preston, Rebecca. "Roman Questions, Greek Answers. Plutarch and the Construction of Identity." Pages 86–122 in Simon Goldhill (ed), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Price, Simon R. F. "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 104 (1984): 79–95.

Rochette, Bruno. "Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire." Pages 549–563 in James Clackson (ed), *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Sherk, Robert K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969.

Spolsky, Bernard. *Language Policy. Key Topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Spolsky, Bernard. *The Languages of the Jews. A Sociolinguistic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Spolsky, Bernard. *Rethinking Language Policy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Swain, Simon. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, Ad 50–250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2021."