Quantifying Early Modern English spelling variation: Change over time and genre

Alistair Baron and Paul Rayson Lancaster University



Dawn Archer University of Central Lancashire



New Methods in Historical Corpora Conference University of Manchester, 29th - 30th April 2011

EModE spelling variation

- Marked degree of spelling variation in Early Modern English texts despite the gradual standardisation between 1500-1700 (Vallins & Scragg, 1965; Görlach, 1991; Nevalainen, 2006).
- Spelling variation has a negative effect on the accuracy of automatic corpus linguistic methods. This has been shown to be the case for:
 - Semantic analysis (Archer et al., 2003)
 - POS tagging (Rayson et al., 2007)
 - Key word analysis (Baron et al., 2009)



With no standardization

VARD 2

- A tool for normalising spelling variation in historical corpora both manually and automatically.
- Variants are detected by finding those that do not occur in a modern word list.
- A ranked list of normalisation candidates for each variant is produced using four main methods:
 - A manually created list of variant/normalisation pairs.
 - Phonetic matching using a modified Soundex algorithm.
 - A set of letter replacement rules.
 - □ The Levenshtein Edit Distance algorithm.
- Normalisations are chosen by the user or automatically by the system and replaced in the text with the original spelling retained in an xml tag.

(Baron & Rayson, 2009)

VARD 2.3



Quantifying spelling variation

- VARD allows for the study of spelling variation in EModE texts, and its effects.
- A large-scale study of the spelling variation in different EModE corpora quantified the steady decline in the ratio of spelling variants to modern spellings. (Baron et al., 2009)



- Discovery and Investigation of Character Edit Rules
- Examines variant / normalisation pairs found in the XML output from VARD.
- Determines what letter replacement rules are required to convert the variant form into the normalised form. For example:

Variant	Normalisation	Rules
anie	any	ie → y
publick	public	remove k
ioynte	joint	$i \rightarrow j$ y \rightarrow i remove e

- Frequencies are calculated for each rule indicating how often each rule occurs, which position of the variant it should be applied and with which surrounding letters.
- Meta-data is also stored to allow for the analysis of spelling rule trends over time, genre or any other meta-data present.

DICER: Discovery and Investigation of Character Edit Rules

_

19 105 Deletion



<u>6042</u> (29.54%)

20457



91.80

8.20

0.00

65.35

0.00

Display: Tokens | Types

Link to this page

Total

Edit Distanc	e:	Rul	es:							Clear So	rt Order	alize 🧭
Edits	Frequency						Total		F	Position (%)	
1	5988 (44.35%)	#	ID	Rule	Variant	Standard	(/1000) + 1	Start	Second	Middle	Penultimate	End
2	<u>4490</u> (33.25%)	1	2	Deletion	E		144.40	0.10	0.34	11.78	13.47	74.31
3	<u>2034</u> (15.06%)	2	3	Substitution	Y	I	89.90	1.36	23.22	69.98	5.44	0.00
4	<u>676</u> (5.01%)	3	<u>∠</u> 7	Insertion		F	43.46	1.01	5.06	28.57	15.52	49.83
5	<u>224</u> (1.66%)	4	4	Substitution	11		27.33	0.18	7.16	10.14	7.51	66.01
6	<u>64</u> (0.47%)	-	120	Substitution	V	E	27.55	1.20	<u>7.10</u> 8.10	22.60	66.21	1 71
7	<u>19</u> (0.14%)	5	22	Incortion	1		10.11	6.20	6.10	79.01	00.31	0.77
8	<u>6</u> (0.04%)	0	33	Insertion	-	A	19.11	0.39	0.14	78.01	8.70	0.77
9	<u>1</u> (0.01%)	/	45	Substitution	E	1	17.99	11.68	24.46	57.34	<u>6.52</u>	0.00
14	1 (0.01%)	8	<u>43</u>	Substitution	0	V	<u>15.54</u>	0.63	7.55	78.62	<u>13.21</u>	0.00
Total	13503	9	183	Substitution	IE	Y	<u>14.42</u>	0.00	0.34	2.37	2.03	95.25
		10	<u>32</u>	Deletion	U		<u>14.37</u>	0.00	<u>6.46</u>	<u>84.69</u>	<u>8.50</u>	0.34
Positions:		11	<u>16</u>	Substitution	I	E	<u>13.59</u>	29.86	13.67	21.94	<u>33.45</u>	1.08
	_	12	<u>207</u>	Substitution	Π	т	<u>12.95</u>	0.00	0.38	30.57	16.60	52.45
Position	Frequency	13	14	Deletion	Y		<u>11.78</u>	2.90	0.41	36.93	58.09	1.66
Start	<u>1043</u> (5.10%)	14	53	Insertion		U	<u>10.31</u>	0.00	4.74	81.52	<u>13.27</u>	0.47
Second	2238 (10.94%)	15	66	Substitution	E	A	10.22	6.70	32.06	45.45	14.35	1.44
Middle	8088 (39.54%)	16	19	Substitution	E	EE	10.17	0.00	27.88	45.67	20.19	6.25
Penultimate	3046 (14.89%)	17	55	Insertion		I	10.12	1.93	8.21	84.54	4.35	0.97
End	<u>6042</u> (29.54%)	18	229	Substitution	S	SS	9.87	3.96	3.96	18.32	8.42	65.35

8.95

0.00

DICER: Discovery and Investigation of Character Edit Rules

Innsbruck Letters Change... 🗘 Go!

Display: Tokens | Types

Link to this page

Rule #183: Substitute IE » Y

Back to rules list

Positions:

Previous Character:

Position	Frequency		Total		Rule P	osition (%)	
Start	<u>0</u> (0.00%)	Character	(%)+ ¹	Second	Middle	Penultimate	End
Second	<u>1</u> (0.34%)	т	27.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	98.78
Middle	<u>7</u> (2.37%)	L	24.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Penultimate	<u>6</u> (2.03%)	R	15.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	95.65
End	<u>281</u> (95.25%)	D	6.78	5.00	0.00	0.00	85.00
Total	295	A	5.42	0.00	0.00	37.50	62.50
		N	4.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	91.67
Character Grou	ips:	F	4.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	91.67
Group	Frequency	S	<u>2.71</u>	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Vowel Before	17 (5.76%)	н	2.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Vowel(+Y) Before	17 (5.76%)	С	2.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Vowel After	2 (0.68%)	V	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Vowel(+Y) After	2 (0.68%)	P	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
vowei(11) Alter	2 (0.00 %)	Μ	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Notes:		E	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
		G	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00

Next Character:

	Total		Rule P	osition	(%)
Character	(%)+ ¹	Start	Second	Middle	Penultimate
S	2.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
1	1.69	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
I	0.68	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
М	0.34	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00



Clear Sort Order

Variant	Standard	ED	Position	Index	Other Rules	Category	Tokens+1
verie	very	2	End	3			<u>51</u>
Majestie	Majesty	2	End	6			28
Secretarie	Secretary	2	End	8			28
maiestie	majesty	3	End	6	<u>120(</u> 2 - Middle)		16
hartie	hearty	3	End	4	<u>7(1 - Second)</u>		<u>14</u>
companie	company	2	End	6			<u>14</u>
anie	any	<u>2</u>	End	2			<u>12</u>
sorie	sorry	2	End	3	59(2 - Penultimate)		<u>11</u>
daylie	daily	<u>3</u>	End	4	<u>3(2 - Middle)</u>		<u>10</u>
trustie	trusty	2	End	5			10
happie	happy	<u>2</u>	End	4			<u>8</u>
mercie	mercy	2	End	4			8
<u>humblie</u>	humbly	<u>2</u>	End	5			<u>7</u>
copie	copy	2	End	3			6
contrarie	<u>contrary</u>	2	End	7			<u>6</u>
almightie	almighty	2	End	7			6
treatie	treaty	2	End	5			<u>6</u>
glorie	glory	2	End	4			<u>6</u>
shortlie	shortly	2	End	6			<u>6</u>
libertie	liberty	<u>2</u>	End	6			<u>6</u>
dutie	duty	<u>2</u>	End	3			5
manie	many	2	End	3			5
Nobilitie	nobility	<u>2</u>	End	7			5
Ladie	Lady	<u>2</u>	End	3			5
<u>certaintie</u>	<u>certainty</u>	<u>2</u>	End	8			<u>4</u>
holie	holy	<u>2</u>	End	3			4
honestie	honesty	<u>2</u>	End	6			<u>4</u>
partie	party	<u>2</u>	End	4			4
satisfie	<u>satisfy</u>	<u>2</u>	End	6			<u>4</u>
adversarie	adversary	<u>2</u>	End	8			4
pittie	pity	<u>3</u>	End	4	207(2 - Middle)		4
armie	army	2	End	3			4

кије туре:	Jubstitution +
Position:	Any 🛟
Character Group Before:	Any 🛟
Character Group After:	Any 🛟
Character Before:	Any 🛟
Character After:	Any 🛟
Category	Any 🛟
	Change

Search Results	Decade	Year	Century	1/2 Century	1/4 Century
----------------	--------	------	---------	-------------	-------------

1/4 Century	Matching types	Total types	%
1375-1399	<u>0</u>	345	0.000
1400-1424	10	776	1.289
1425-1449	<u>10</u>	1999	0.500
1450-1474	<u>3</u>	1693	0.177
1475-1499	<u>0</u>	2368	0.000
1500-1524	<u>33</u>	2047	1.612
1525-1549	<u>64</u>	2687	2.382
1550-1574	<u>62</u>	1354	4.579
1575-1599	<u>51</u>	1263	4.038
1600-1624	<u>65</u>	1790	3.631
1625-1649	<u>64</u>	1676	3.819
1650-1674	54	1208	4.470
1675-1699	<u>8</u>	446	1.794

Corpora – EMEMT

- Contains 2 millions words from texts dated between 1500 and 1700 from the specific domain of science and medicine (Taavitsainen & Pahta, 2010).
- Corpus released with spelling variation automatically normalised using VARD 2 (Lehto et al., 2010).
- VARD 2 was trained by Anu Lehto manually normalising a representative sample of the corpus. This comprised of:
 - 24 text extracts of 1,000 words representing all six categories at each 50-year time period.
 - 24 samples of 500 words generated by randomly selecting small portions of texts from the remaining corpus.
- The manually normalised samples (36,000 words total) contain 5,406 variant tokens and 2,820 variant types for analysis in DICER.

Corpora – Innsbruck Letters

- Part of the Innsbruck Computer-Archive of Machine-Readable English Texts (ICAMET) (Markus, 1999).
- 469 complete letters dated between 1386 and 1688, containing a total of 182,000 words.
- Contains parallel line pairs, one of the original text and one with a normalised version of the first line:

\$I schepyng at thys day, but be the grace of God I am avysyd \$N shipping at this day, but by the grace of God I am advised

Converted into XML format so individual spelling variant-normalisation pairs can be analysed:

> <replaced orig="schepyng">shipping</replaced> at <replaced orig="thys">this </replaced> day, but <replaced orig="be">by</replaced> the grace of God I am <replaced orig="avysyd">advised</replaced>

43,740 variant tokens and 13,503 variant types to be analysed with DICER.

Corpora – Lampeter

- Tracts and pamphlets published between 1640 and 1740 (Schmied, 1994).
- Six domains represented (Religion, Politics, Economy & Trade, Science, Law and Miscellaneous) with two texts for each domain per decade.
- □ Total of 120 complete texts by 120 different authors. 1.1 million words.
- Spelling variants automatically normalised with VARD 2.3 at a 50% threshold after being trained by manually normalising a 3,000 word sample (as used in Rayson *et al.*, 2007).
- □ 34,304 variant tokens and 7,339 variant types to analyse in DICER.

Extra final e removed



$-d \rightarrow -ed$



$ck \rightarrow c$

Examples: Physick (Physic) publick (publick) Zodiack (Zodiac) Vast majority –ick % Tokens endings. Lower frequency: 21st in EMEMT. 138th in Innsbruck. 5th in Lampeter.







$\lor \rightarrow \cup$



Single edits

- Single edit variants, e.g. one insertion, deletion or substitution from the standard form.
- Generally easier to normalise automatically.
- More variants requiring more than one edit in later texts makes spelling normalisation harder further back in time.



Lampeter Domain

% of variant tokens with extra final e



Future work

- Further analyse DICER results to search for (new) trends over time, genre and text types.
- Look at other (larger) datasets, such as Early English Books Online.
- Incorporate DICER into VARD 2 to allow for learning normalisation rules "on the fly".



Thanks for listening

Acknowledgements:

- Thanks to Irma Taavitsainen and the Helsinki team for providing the EMEMT corpus, particularly Anu Lehto for the manual normalised samples.
- Thanks to Manfred Markus for providing the Innsbruck Letters corpus with manually checked normalised text.
- Research funded by EPSRC PhD Plus at Lancaster University.

More information:

- VARD: <u>http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/~barona/vard</u>
- DICER: <u>http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/dicer</u>

References

Archer, D., McEnery, T., Rayson, P. & Hardie, A. (2003). Developing an automated semantic analysis system for Early Modern English. In D. Archer, P. Rayson, A. Wilson & T. Mcenery, eds., Proceedings of Corpus Linguistics 2003, 22–31, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

Baron, A. & Rayson, P. (2009). Automatic standardisation of texts containing spelling variation: How much training data do you need? In M. Mahlberg, V. González-Díaz & C. Smith, eds., Proceedings of Corpus Linguistics 2009, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

Baron, A.,Rayson, P. and Archer, D. (2009). Word frequency and key word statistics in historical corpus linguistics. Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies, 20 (1), pp. 41–67.

Görlach, M. (1991). Introduction to Early Modern English. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

References

Lehto, A., Baron, A., Ratia, M. & Rayson, P. (2010). Improving the precision of corpus methods: The standardized version of Early Modern English Medical Texts. In I. Taavitsainen & P. Pahta, eds., Early Modern English Medical Texts: Corpus description and studies, 279–290, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Markus, M. (1999). Innsbruck Computer-Archive of Machine-Readable English Texts. In Innsbrucker Beitraege zur Kulturwissenschaft, Anglistische Reihe, vol. 7, Leopold-Franzens-Universitaet Innsbruck, Institut fuer Anglistik, Innsbruck.

Nevalainen, T. (2006). An Introduction to Early Modern English. Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Rayson, P., Archer, D., Baron, A., Culpeper, J. & Smith, N. (2007). Tagging the bard: Evaluating the accuracy of a modern POS tagger on Early Modern English corpora. In M. Davies, P. Rayson, S. Hunston & P. Danielsson, eds., Proceedings of Corpus Linguistics 2007, UCREL, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

References

Schmied, J. (1994). The Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts. In M. Kytö, M. Rissanen & S. Wright, eds., Corpora across the Centuries: Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on English Diachronic Corpora, Rodopi, Amsterdam, St. Catherine's College, Cambridge.

Taavitsainen, I. & Pahta, P., eds. (2010). Early Modern English Medical Texts: Corpus description and studies. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Vallins, G.H. & Scragg, D.G. (1965). Spelling. André Deutsch, London.