

# **GRAMMATICAL GENDER IN ENGLISH**

---

950 to 1250

Charles Jones

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:  
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE



ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:  
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

---

Volume 14

**GRAMMATICAL GENDER IN  
ENGLISH**

*This page intentionally left blank*

# **GRAMMATICAL GENDER IN ENGLISH**

## **950 to 1250**

**CHARLES JONES**

First published in 1988

This edition first published in 2015

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 1988 Charles Jones

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-138-92111-5 (Set)

ISBN: 978-1-315-68654-7 (Set) (ebk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-91947-1 (Volume 14) (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-68785-8 (Volume 14) (ebk)

#### **Publisher's Note**

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

#### **Disclaimer**

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

Downloaded by [University of California, San Diego] at 18:39 07 June 2017

# Grammatical Gender in English: 950 to 1250

CHARLES JONES

CROOM HELM  
London • New York • Sydney

© 1988 Charles Jones  
Croom Helm Ltd, Provident House, Burrell Row,  
Beckenham, Kent, BR3 1AT  
Croom Helm Australia, 44-50 Waterloo Road,  
North Ryde, 2113, New South Wales

Published in the USA by  
Croom Helm  
in association with Methuen, Inc.  
29 West 35th Street  
New York, NY 10001

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Jones, Charles, 1939-  
Grammatical gender in English: 950 to  
1250.  
1. English language — Gender  
I. Title  
428.2 PE1211  
ISBN 0-7099-1476-8

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Jones, Charles, 1939-  
Grammatical gender in English, 950 to 1250.  
Bibliography: p.  
Includes index.  
1. English language — Old English, ca. 450 – 1100 —  
Gender. 2. English language — Middle English, 1100 – 1500 —  
Gender. 3. English language — Gender. I. Title.  
PE173.J66 1988 429 87-21401  
ISBN 0-7099-1476-8

Printed and bound in Great Britain  
by Billing & Sons Limited, Worcester.

## CONTENTS

### PREFACE

### CHAPTER ONE

*Introduction:*

*Grammatical Gender in West Saxon  
Old English*

1

### CHAPTER TWO

*The Tenth Century:*

*The late Old English gloss to  
the Lindisfarne Gospels*

21

### CHAPTER THREE

*The Tenth Century:*

*The late Old English gloss to  
the Durham Ritual*

102

### CHAPTER FOUR

*The Twelfth Century:*

*The Peterborough Chronicle*

129

### CHAPTER FIVE

*The Thirteenth Century:*

*Lazamon's Brut and Vices and Virtues*

171

### REFERENCES

230

### SUBJECT INDEX

238

*To*

*Michael C. Phillips*

## PREFACE

This book represents the bringing together of some of my research into the conditions under which the demise of grammatical gender marking in English occurred, a subject which has interested me on and off for the past twenty years or so. Its composition was stimulated by my feeling that such an obvious and important syntactic change had gone largely unstudied in recent times, and by the realization that any comment available in standard handbooks on the history of English led the student to the assumption that grammatical gender was catastrophically and suddenly "lost" from the language's rule system sometime "around" the eleventh century, leaving no trace of its existence either in the congruence between attributive words and nouns or in anaphoric pronominal representation. In the pages which follow I try to demonstrate that there was, from the end of the Old English period, a considerable temporal span (some three hundred years) during which there existed "echoes" of the gender classification of nouns. Most importantly, those echoes or residues were not the result of some "imperfect learning" of an earlier system whereby nouns were assigned to a particular gender class in "classical" West Saxon where grammatical gender was manifested in a well developed form. Rather they can be shown to reflect the workings of a systematic process of syntactico-morphological change. The bases of that process, we shall show, lay in speakers' propensities to assign some kind of semantic import to what had originally been the surface marks signalling whether an individual noun was lexically entered as belonging to either the *masculine*, *feminine*, or *neuter* genders. Among such markers was a rich attributive word morphology in noun phrases which was, I claim, reinterpreted along two main parameters. In the first place, certain phonetically "distinct" morphological accretions on items like definite articles and "strong" adjectives were used to express the case relationship in the proposition of the head noun with which they were in construction. Secondly, other nominal attributive shapes — notably <þæt> — were utilized to indicate the extent of shared speaker/hearer knowledge between individual nouns in their discourse context.

The model for language change which lies behind these assumptions is one which sees the re-utilization of the surface "side effects" of a nominal classification process

## Preface

like gender assignment as one dictated by well defined sets of semantic criteria. "Loss" of gender classification did not bring with it complete depletion of attributive morphological output. Rather, for at least a period of three hundred years, that morphological expression was accorded specific semantico-syntactic roles. That many of these lay in the surface expression of case relationships interior and superordinate to elements in sentential propositions has in the past posed for me considerable descriptive and theoretical difficulty. It was with the establishment of a model like *Localist Case Grammar* by John M. Anderson that many of my earlier intuitions could be given what I hope are clearer and more systematic expression. Any distortions in this book to Anderson's model are clearly of my own making.

In no sense does this short work attempt to look at all the relevant data available to the student of grammatical gender loss in English. Much work still awaits to be done using manuscript materials from both the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Nor does this study attempt other than to record the best known conclusions concerning the behaviour of anaphoric pronouns under grammatical gender "stress" in the late Old English and early Middle English periods; its scope is strictly limited to a discussion of attributive word morphology in the noun phrase.

Over the years I have had much helpful advice and comment from colleagues, and I should especially like to single out Anne Squires, Elizabeth Traugott and Toshio Nakao for the light they have shed on my darkness. I should like to acknowledge here too the financial assistance I have received from the British Academy and the University of Durham Research Fund. Since this book was produced by its author on an Apricot Xen microprocessor using a Vuman (Arts) software package, any deficiencies in its shape and presentation are in a special way uniquely his.

School of English  
University of Durham

# 1

## INTRODUCTION

### GRAMMATICAL GENDER IN WEST SAXON OLD ENGLISH

#### 1.1 GENDER CLASSIFICATION AND ITS CRITERIA

It is possibly the syntactic and morphological consequences of its having a system whereby nominal lexical items were classified by grammatical gender that more than anything else causes Old English to appear so unlike the language at any later period. The fact that the grammar of Old English demanded the dictionary grouping of its nominal word stock into gender classes was responsible for the production of some of the rich morphological patterns so characteristic of the language's nominal attributive and anaphoric pronominal systems. Although there was a considerable degree of overlap in actual phonetic output shape, the function of this morphological diversity was at least in part to reflect the case relationship characteristics of nominal and pronominal arguments in propositions in a shape appropriate to the the lexical gender assignment of their "head" or controlling noun. The terminations of attributive words like definite determiners and "strong" adjectives in the noun phrase, together with the diversity of phonetic shape in "third person" anaphoric pronouns in singular number contexts all attested, albeit never in any one-to-one fashion, to the case relationship status of the nominal argument with which they were associated *vis a vis* the sentential predicate; in addition, that case relationship indicating shape could itself reflect the gender classification of the nominal item with which it was in construction or which it "replaced". The details of this case/gender expression we shall set out below.

Those "periods" of the language traditionally referred to as *late Old English and early Middle English* (the temporal span encompassing the tenth to the thirteenth centuries) witnessed, as is well known, a considerable degree of syntactic and morphological change in this area of the grammar to an extent to which the inflectional morphology of nominal attributives eventually came to be totally depleted, while the criteria for anaphoric "replacement" of pronominal forms were "rationalized" upon a model more or less dependent upon extra-linguistic,

## 2 Introduction

biological factors (Moore (1921)). This monograph will describe the processes whereby the first of these two great changes came about. Its main aim will be to show that the gender reflecting morphology of such attributive words as definite articles, possessive pronouns, "strong" adjectives and the like was not immediately the subject of a "sudden" catastrophic neutralization; on the contrary, with the lack of a thorough-going and coherent set of criteria for the assignment of nominal gender class, the inflectional morphology which that historical assignment produced was "reanalyzed" on the basis of several sets of semantic and other norms. Rather than produce complete de-morphologizing of attributive words in noun phrases, we shall show that such a reanalysis resulted (at least for a time) in the creation of a rule system whereby specific manifestations of that attributive morphology were assigned an innovative set of expressive functions not all of which were historically inherent in it (Samuels (1972) p. 156).

The semantic and syntactic bases for the assignment of nouns to particular gender classes rarely appears to be a straightforward matter for those languages which exhibit the phenomenon of *grammatical gender*. In the Torricelli and Lower-Sepik language group of New Guinea, for instance, while some nominal item gender classification is based on factors relating to animacy, sex and human-ness, others are categorized according to the dictates of their phonological shape. Foley and van Valin (1984) point to the classification of some nouns in this language group on the basis of the syllable final consonantal and vocalic terminations of noun "stems", and even when semantic, biology based gender class specifying criteria are utilized, they are far from being simple:

"Yimes is a thoroughgoing gender system language with ten major gender classes and half a dozen or so minor classes. Four of the major classes have membership determined on semantic grounds: one denotes female humans, another, male humans, a third, higher animals, like dogs, pigs or crocodiles, and the last plants, which serve a useful function within the culture."

The principles lying behind the gender grouping of West Saxon Old English nominal lexical items has been the subject of much debate and has tended to centre around both syntactic (or at least morpho-syntactic) and semantic sets of motivation. Among the former might be a model for gender assignation based upon nominal declensional class. Fodor (1959) goes so far as to argue that gender systems themselves actually originated through the process of a simple "copy" by attributive items in the noun phrase of the inflectional morphological characteristics of the head noun itself, such that there existed in the beginning a one to one correspondence between declensional and gender specific paradigms (van Royen (1929); Kuryłowicz (1964); Lafont (1970); Flasdieck (1930)). But whatever the proto language situation, by the time we come across Old English materials any such system has been rendered irrecoverable by, among other factors, phonetic attrition to the extent that there was considerable syncretism between nominal declensional category and a much depleted three gender classificatory model. Yet there appear to be some residual effects of a gender/declensional correlation in that < -a; -að; -dom; -hal; -ing and -scipe> nominal terminations appear to be regularly associated with the *masculine*, < -nes; -ung; -ðo/ðu and -ræden> with the *feminine* and < -et, -lac> with the *neuter* (Mitchell (1986) §§ 58–61), but in most declensional types the gender class symmetry has effectively been neutralized (Meringer (1887)).

More promising as a template upon which to assign gender class to nominal lexical items might be the semantic criteria relating to the biological (especially sexual) characteristics of nominal referents. Clearly in a three gender system like that of Old English (and that only in singular contexts – gender assignment having been rendered unproductive in the plural) there will necessarily be conflation between possible real world biological subdivision under fairly "rough and ready" headings whereas in a language such as Yimas referred to above with its ten and more gender classes or in Bantu where there are at least nine (Givón (1970); Gazdar, Klein and Pullum (1983) pp. 184 ff) a greater degree of syntactic class to natural biological grouping is obviously possible, although it is not always achieved in such a simplistic way. Bruce (1979) for example points out that in the Alamblik of Papua and

#### 4 Introduction

New Guinea "masculine gender with inanimate objects denotes long thin things, while feminine denotes short, fat and round objects" (Foley and van Valin (1984) p. 325). Most commentators however assert that nominal gender class assignation in "classical" Old English was at least partially determined by semantic criteria centred upon notions such as animacy/inanimacy, human/non-human-ness and male/female (Mitchell (1986) §§ 55–56; Mōri (1979); Wyss (1982); Dekeyser (1973); Ross (1936); Moore (1921); Ausbüttel (1904); Landwedr (1911); Martin (1971); von Lindheim (1969); Lommel (1924); de la Grasserie (1904); Ervin (1962); Wienold (1967); Lohmann (1932)). An examination of nominal lexical items in Bosworth–Toller (1882) reveals that there indeed appears to have been a strong tendency to at least associate human male animates with a particular gender class traditionally (and perhaps circuitously) called the *masculine*. Likewise, although as we shall shortly see it was not as fully developed, there was a tendency to restrict human females to a single gender class grouping – the *feminine*.

In the case of the former, this classification was in most cases accompanied by inflectional morphological identification: there were at least four productive nominal inflectional shapes in "subject" marking contexts – <-a>; <-ere>; <-ende> and <-man(n)>. Of these the numerically largest group of items occurs with the <-a> type, for instance:

andsaca "adversary"; beodena "praceptor";  
berebrytta "barn keeper"; bora "ruler";  
brytta "lord"; byrnunga "warrior"; ciepa  
"merchant"; crocwyrrha "potter"; cypa  
"tradesman"; dema "judge"; ealda "old  
man"; efengelica "fellow"; fliema "outlaw";  
folctoga "chief"; fricca "herald"; geonga  
"young man"; goldgiefa "prince";  
heahgerefra "lord"; hereræswa "commander";  
swangerefra "reeve"; syla "ploughman";  
tidscripta "chronicler"; treowyhta  
"carpenter"; wesa "drunkard"; wuduwa  
"widower"

of which there are some two hundred and fifty items of this type listed in Bosworth–Toller (1882). Almost as

common are those nominal items terminated by <-end(e)> and <-ere> suffixes:

æsceberende "warrior"; bewerigende "protector"; bodigende "teacher"; frumsceppende "creator"; hatigende "enemy"; lufigende "lover"; metigende "ruler"; nowende "sailor"; ofersceawigende "bishop"; scipierende "sailor"; beatere "boxer"; cancelere "chancellor"; clænsere "priest"; demere "judge"; drihtere "steward"; efenscolere "scholar"; feohtere "fighter"; hæsere "lord"; hlytere "priest"; notere "scribe"; robere "sailor"; tannere "dyer"; witnere "torturer".

Least productive, at least in terms of the number of tokens recorded in Bosworth-Toller (1882) — only some eighty in all — are those items suffixed by <-man(n)>, for example:

æcermann "farmer"; æscmann "sailor"; bærmann "porter"; dryhtealdormann "bridesman"; ealdorman "ruler"; fostermann "bondsman"; heremann "warrior"; lahmann "lawman"; lidman "sailor"; mynstermann "monk"; plegman "athlete"; steorman "pilot"; wæpnedman "male person"

Yet we must bear in mind that all three of the above suffixes could be appended to items which presumably (although it is not always easy to be sure) could have both male and female reference:

burhman "citizen"; cearlman "peasant"; feþeman "pedestrian"; lefman "sick person"; neahman "neighbour"; æslitende "law breaker"; forewyrcente "servant"; lufiende "lover"; retende "comforter"; wegferende "traveller"; heahsangere "singer"; murnere "complainier"; slæpere "sleeper"; tumbere "dancer"; godwebwyrhta "weaver"; fulwihtbena "candidate for baptism".

## 6 Introduction

Inflectionally marked *female humans* assigned to the *feminine* gender are relatively few in number, only some thirty four appearing with suffixes like < -i(n)cge>; <-i/estre>; <-cwen(e)> and <-moder>, for instance:

acennincge "mother"; byrdicge "sorceress";  
modrige "maternal aunt"; hlafdige "lady";  
sealticge "female dancer"; sunucennicge  
"mother"; synnecge "female sinner"; ceneстра  
"mother"; crencrestre "female weaver";  
gliwbydenestre "female musician"; myltestre  
"prostitute"; lybbestre "sorceress"; ofestre  
"nurse"; wulltewestre "wool carder";  
dryhtcwen "noble lady"; horcwen "whore";  
þeodcwen "empress"

Indeed, classical West Saxon often used such morphological contrasts to denote male/female role fillers:

bæcere/bæcestra "baker"; beþæcend/beþæcestre  
"deceiver"; cempa/cempestre "warrior";  
lufiend/lufestre "lover"; tæppere/tæppestre  
"tavern keeper"; webba/webestre "weaver";  
witega/witegestre "prophet(ess)"; fyrenhycga/  
fyrenhycge "adulterer/ess"; horig/hora  
"fornicator"; nefā/nefene "nephew/niece";  
þeow/þeowe "slave"; abbod/aboddesse "abbot  
(ess)"; neahgeber/neahgebyrild "neighbour"

There are too a substantial number (forty in all) of nominal lexical items which refer specifically to female humans which are (without any unique morphological identifying characteristics) assigned to the *feminine* gender. Examples of these include:

bryd "bride"; burgrune "sorceress";  
cildfoster "nurse"; cifes "harlot";  
dæge "female breadmaker"; forlegis  
"prostitute"; frowe "woman"; nift "niece";  
scylcan "female servant"; sweger "mother in  
law"; þir "female servant"

Yet it is with those nouns which show explicit female reference that the sex specifying function of the gender

classification system appears to break down, since there are some eighteen items of this type which are categorized as *neuter*, for example:

wif "woman"; broþorwif "brother's wife";  
 foligerwif "prostitute"; forþwif "matron";  
 freowif "frewoman"; næmedwif "married woman"  
 unrihtwif "mistress"; sigewif "victorious  
 woman"; siþwif "noble lady"; mædencild  
 "female child"; wifcild "female child"; æwe  
 "married woman"; mægden "young girl";  
 mennenu "hand maiden"; lærningmægden "female  
 pupil"; wynmæg "winsome maid"; yrferuna  
 "female heir"

At the same time, <man(n)> suffixes are to be found with unambiguously female nouns in the *masculine* gender as, for instance, in:

fæmenhadesmon "virgin"; hiredwifmon "female  
 member of a household"; mægdenman "virgin";  
 mægþman "virgin"; wifmann "woman"

while as *masculine* we also find <wiffreond> "female friend"; <wifhand> "heiress". Still, despite the relative frequency of such *neuter* and *masculine* gender classified human female nouns, the traditionally held view that human male and female representing nouns were by and large separately listed under *masculine* and *feminine* gender groupings in the grammar of classical West Saxon has much to recommend it on the basis of the tokens we have listed above. But the situation is a very complex one and we have to contend with the fact that there are at least forty items which, while they refer to human animates, leave open the assignation of sexual group. These, sometimes — but by no means always — on the basis of their inflectional morphology, can be entered either as *feminine* as in:

byren "child"; fædernmæg "paternal kindred";  
 geoguþ "youth"; giesting "exile"; lætwestre  
 "guide"; landgesceaft "earthly creature";  
 sceafaft "being"; unlaf "posthumous child";  
 wiht "person"; woruldsceaft "earthly being"

while with *neuter* classification there are

bearn "child"; cild "child"; cradlcild  
 "child"; cynebearn "royal child"; docincel  
 "bastard"; eorþfæt "body"; fostorbearncild  
 "fosterchild"; frumbyrdling "youth";  
 geogoþcnosl "young offspring"; midgesiþ  
 "companion"; sawlhord "body"; stopbearn  
 "orphan"; umbor "infant"; wielincel "little  
 slave"; wiht "person"

Lexical items referring to *non-human mammals* also show a strong predilection to equate maleness with the *masculine* gender, femaleness with the *feminine*. Among the former we find:

anhorn "unicorn"; bucca "he goat"; bulluc  
 "male calf"; carlfugol "male bird"; cocc  
 "male bird"; colt "colt"; docga "dog";  
 eoh "war horse"; eorþcafer "cockchaffer";  
 firenbucca "ibex"; hæfer "he goat"; hana  
 "cock"; hengest "stallion"; heorut "stag";  
 ra "roe buck"; steda "stallion"; wintersteal  
 "winter stallion".

Female *feminine* non-human mammals include:

bicca "bitch"; ceahhe "daw"; cu "cow";  
 cwenfugol "hen bird"; da "female deer";  
 gat "she goat"; gilte "young sow";  
 heahfore "heiifer"; henn "hen"; hind  
 "female deer"; miere "mare"; olfendmyre  
 "she camel"; studmyre "brood mare"; sugu  
 "sow"

Non sex-specific mammals appear to be randomly entered in the three gender classes: as *masculines* we find:

apa "ape"; bridd "chicken"; brimfugol "sea-  
 bird"; broce "badger"; camel "camel";  
 ceaffinc "chaffinch"; clodhama "fieldfare";  
 cran "crane"; dopfugel "waterfowl"; earn  
 "eagle"; fugol "fowl"; geac "cuckoo";  
 goshafoc "goshawk"; henna "fowl"; hicol

"woodpecker"; hran "whale"; hroc "rook";  
 hwelpa "young animal"; igil "hedgehog";  
 lafor "leopard"; mæw "sea gull"; otor  
 "otter"; palpel "panther"; pellican  
 "pelican"; pyttel "hawk"; ylp "elephant"

while with *feminines* we find

colmæse "titmouse"; culfere "dove"; cuscote  
 "woodpigeon"; duce "duck"; gos "goose";  
 hrermus "bat"; linete "linnet"; mase "small  
 bird"; mus "mouse"; swealwe "swallow"; ule  
 "owl"; wesle "weasel"

This last group is a large one, with in excess of one hundred items and is difficult on any well motivated semantic grounds to separate off from those "common" non-mammal indicating items with *masculine* gender. Appeals to smallness of size for the items in the *feminine* gender group have some attraction, although the group does contain items like < ylp> "elephant"; < nihtgenge> "hyena" and < ilfetu> "swan". Non-human mammals are, on the other hand, quite often morphologically differentiated for male and female sex as in:

assa/asse "ass"; bera/biren "bear"; catt/  
 catte "cat"; efeta/efete "newt"; fox/fyxe  
 "fox/vixen"; hana/hen "hen"; hyrnet/hyrnetu  
 "hornet"; pawa/pawe "peacock/peahen";  
 raradumble/raredumle "bittern"; wrenna/  
 wrenne "wren"; wulf/wylfen "wolf"

Items such as < crawe> "crow", < esol> "ass"; < leo> "lion" and < yce> "toad" will often too, despite the lack of any nominal morphological distinction, trigger distinctively male/female anaphoric pronoun and attributive word shapes. However, there do not appear to be any instances of *neuter* gender assigned non-human mammals, a characteristic too of those animates referring to non-mammals such as fish and insects which generally appear randomly assigned to either the *masculine* - < æl> "eel"; < bitele> "beetle"; < gnat> "midge"; < leax> "salmon"; < moldwyrm> "earthworm"; < sceota> "trout"; < slicend> "reptile"; < snaca> "snake"; < wibba> "beetle"

— or *feminine* gender — <attorcoppe> "spider"; <brimlæst> "fish"; <butorfleoge> "butterfly"; <grindle> "herring"; <lobbe> "spider"; <loppestre> "lobster"; <lus> "louse"; <moþþe> "moth"; <renge> "spider"; <winewinkle> "periwinkle".

Yet by far and away the most characteristic feature of grammatical gender assignation in West Saxon Old English lies in the way in which (non-human) non-animates are relegated to either of the three gender groups in a fashion devoid of semantic or other motivating factors (despite the small number of morphologically triggered types mentioned above on page 3). There is no space here to itemize what is, in fact, the bulk of the language's nominal lexical inventory but it would seem incontrovertible that in the vast majority of instances native speakers would have to "learn" (without recourse to either semantic or syntactic prompting) what gender class was appropriate for items like <pund> "pound" (*neuter*); <freot> "freedom" (*masculine*); <cribbe> "stall" (*feminine*). There certainly appears to be none of the "rationalization" of the gender classification associated with inanimate object indicating nouns along the kinds of lines we saw above typical of a language like Alamblak (Mitchell (1986) §§ 56–58).

## 1.2 THE BREAKDOWN IN GRAMMATICAL GENDER MARKING

One of the most conspicuous features of the morpho-syntax of the surviving manuscripts from the late Old English to the early Middle English periods (say from a *terminus a quo* of around the mid tenth century to an *ad quem* some three hundred years or so later) lies in its failure to show on many occasions the expected gender triggered congruence between attributive words and the nouns with which they are in construction in their noun phrase. "Wrong" grammatical gender agreements abound during this period. That they appeared earliest in anaphoric pronominal expression is well known and that they were there motivated by a concern to reflect at least on some occasions the biological sex characteristics of their human, animate EQUI noun congeners has been convincingly demonstrated (Moore (1921); Mitchell (1986) §§ 69–71; Heltveit (1958); Dekeyser (1980); Gazdar, Klein and Pullum (1983) pp. 184 ff). Likewise, there have been

extensive studies of unetymological attributive word to noun congruences during the period, and there too motivation for attributive morphological innovation has been laid at the door of some kind of gender/sex equivalence: c.f. Mitchell's ((1986) § 69) examples of <seo wifman> and <seo ærest wiifa> where <wifmon> and <wif> are, as we have already noted, etymologically *masculine* and *neuter* respectively. At the same time we should also note in this context the many instances of unhistorical <bæt> definite article congruence with non-human animates cited by Ross (1936) in the late Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* — <b gefe> (OE *feminine*), <b wind> (OE *masculine*) — which he claims represent the mapping of inanimates onto the *neuter* gender class in a system where there already existed a clear gender/sex correlation between human males/females and the *masculine/ feminine* gender categories.

The concern of the chapters which follow will be to explore the kinds of motivations which may have prompted speakers to produce historically ungrammatical attributive word to noun inflectional congruence in singular number contexts. We shall demonstrate that, despite the apparently strong gender/sex equating model underlying much Old English *masculine* and *feminine* nominal gender classification, and in the face of anaphoric third person pronominal restructuring on the basis of just such a criterion, ungrammatical attributive word morphology in noun phrases is not readily or consistently explainable with reference to it at all, not least because many unhistorical congruences show historically *masculine* and *feminine* human male and female nouns in construction with "new" *feminine*, *masculine* and even *neuter* attributive word shapes. And, anyway, the sex-driven model has little explanatory adequacy for what we shall see is that very large number of cases where lexical items referring to inanimates illustrate what appears to be gender alternation between the *masculine* and *feminine*.

Lying behind the sex/gender correlation "explanation" for attributive word morphological innovation in our period is that theoretical stance which we shall persistently challenge in this monograph. Mis-congruence is viewed as *prima facie* evidence for the reclassification of nominal lexical items under different gender class groupings: *GENDER CHANGE* (*genuswechsel*) (Mitchell (1986) §§

62–63; Platt (1883); Classen (1919)). Such reclassification is held to stem from a number of factors in addition to the one examined above, some morpho-syntactic, others broadly semantic while yet others, as we shall see, are downright fanciful. Among the former are claims which centre around the "levelling" of nominal inflectional morphology through phonetic attrition or "analogical" factors. Mitchell, for instance, notes in this context the possibility of separate gender assignment to items like <sunna> *masculine* alongside <sunne> *feminine*, and <mona> *masculine* alongside <mone> *feminine* ((1986) § 65, p. 32). Certainly writers like Hoffmann ((1909), p. 56), von Glahn ((1918), pp. 11–12), Morsbach (1913) and more recently Pervaz (1958) make much use of affective criteria of this kind (*Formelle Gründe*):

"Wie ein blick auf die tabelle der  
substantive mit erhaltenem genus beweist,  
zeigen die mask. und neutra meist  
konsonantischen, die feminina fast  
ausschließlich vokalischen auslaut"  
(Philippsen (1919))

One end-state that an hypothesis like this would predict is where nominal lexical gender classification would be assigned on the basis of *masculine* for consonantly terminated items like <burh>, <cinn>, <church> and <wunder>, and *feminine* for those terminating vocalically, as in <-scipe>, <sweore>, <genge>, <witte> (Pervaz (1958), pp. 57 ff). However, we shall show in the following chapters that such criteria are at best unreliable; even in a text like the thirteenth century *Lazamon's Brut* where such a tendency is supposed to be at its most developed (Pervaz (1958), pp. 65 ff; Hoffman (1909), p. 56) it is not at all difficult to produce awkward counter-examples such that historically *neuter* items like <spere> and <husting> are found in congruence with attributive words manifesting *masculine* and *feminine* morphological shapes respectively, despite the phonological characteristics of their terminations. At the same time, it is difficult to understand why in this same text, on the basis of such *Formelle Gründe* criteria, historically *masculine* and *feminine* items such as <leode>, <tur>, <anlicnesse> and <foreward> should appear with

unambiguously *neuter* identifying attributive word shapes.

The most notable characteristic of the *genuswechsel* school is its almost desperate search for causal factors, be they syntactic, semantic or combinations of both, to be put forward as the triggers for nominal gender re-classification. This sometimes frenetic search is nowhere seen at its most extreme than on those occasions when scholars go to considerable lengths to produce lexical items of the appropriate gender class combined (sometimes extremely tenuously) with shared semantic and phonological characteristics as those of the "gender mutant" form. Hoffman (1909), Philipsen (1911) and Pervaz (1958) perhaps represent the extreme exponents of this position. Phillipsen, claiming *Begriffsassoziation* or *Bedeutungsanalogie*, typically proposes that "*bede, hie hire* 141/18, *alchere* 121/27, Außer dem aus lauten -e und der abstrakten bedeutung mag auch das fem *biene* 141/16 (ae bēn f.) eine wirkung auf den geschlechtswechsel ausgeübt haben....*mone* f. (of *ðare* 27/26), hier mag angleichung des genus an *sunne* vorlesen" ((1911), p. 77). Again Hoffman ((1909), p. 61) claims that "*feond* stets als Maskul. gebraucht – wo es die Bedeutung, Drachen, Ungeheuer hat", while Pervaz claims that the "new" *masculine* attributive shapes with the historically *feminine* <blæse> result from the influence of the etymologically *masculine* <blysa> and that the historically *neuter* <bæl> "*fire*" has been reclassified as *feminine* in Middle English due to some association it is claimed to have with the item <bær> "*litter*". Even the sympathetic must begin to have their doubts when Pervaz sees the "new" *masculine* gender of the historically *neuter* <ger> "*year*" brought into being through the association of that item with those like <sumor> and <winter> ((1958), pp. 67 ff.). Clearly the constraints upon an explanatory model of this type are few and justification for the selection of the targeted gender item itself rather than some other seems to rest solely on its having the appropriate gender class.

Hand in hand with *Begriffsassoziation* justified theories of gender reclassification go those which propose the influence of the gender of a particular lexical item showing "core" or "central" semantic characteristics present in some kind of derived status in cognate gender mutant words. Such an item is seen to act as the gender "determinant" or gender class "parent": "The most

frequent masculine marking [gender determiner] in Old English was *stan* m. "stone". The gender of the latter could have attributed to the assignment of masculine to the original feminines: OE *cealc* "chalk", *gimm* "gem", *ceosel* "gravel, shingle, sand", *teosel* "die, small square piece of stone", *ancor* (a stone was used as an anchor), *iacinctus* "jacinth, precious stone"" (Wełna (1980), pp. 403–404). But what, we might ask, are the bases upon which the "core" sample is selected, and in what sense can other items be said to be derived from it? Indeed, why do not all the "stone" semantic field items change their gender to the *masculine* in this way? One is left with the suspicion that the "gender determiner" is selected as the supposed head of the semantic field precisely for its ability to provide the appropriate gender target rather than any inherent semantic properties which it may possess (Roberts (1978)). When the search from some semantically related item with the appropriate gender classification in the native language fails, appeals are usually made to foreign language exemplars: Pervaz ((1958), p. 157) points to the "new" *masculine* genders of <bone church> and <bone hand> in Middle English as the direct influence of the French items <temple> and <bras>, while von Glahn (1918) sees the new *feminine* and *masculine* classifications of Middle English <wisdom> and <stor> as a direct result of the genders of the Latin *sapientia* and *incensum* respectively. How it could be demonstrated that individual scribes actually "knew" the non-English items (far less what their native language gender classification might have been) is never discussed by the proponents of this theoretical viewpoint nor are any convincing reasons provided as to why non-native items should have such an influencing role in the first place. Yet it is not always possible to bring forward either native or foreign word models to provide a motivation for what is seen in unhistorical attributive word congruence to be evidence for lexical gender re-classification. It is in such cases that the imagination of some scholars takes flight and we are invited to accept explanations based on *Reimassoziation* (von Glahn (1918), p. 17; Hoffman (1909), p. 59) and personification – *vide* Pervaz' ((1958) p. 161) assertion that the new *masculine* gender of <church> in *Lazamon's Brut* is to be explained by the association of the building with the person of the Pope.

### 1.3 THE MORPHOLOGY OF ATTRIBUTIVE WORDS IN WEST SAXON

It will be the central concern of the pages which follow to show that unetymological congruence between attributive words and their heads in the noun phrase need not signify any reclassification of the latter's lexical gender entry. For a variety of reasons, for which we shall give detailed explanations below, *genuswechsel* will be abandoned as a model for such congruent disparity, explanation for it being sought instead in the semantics of nominal case relationship expression in propositions and in the use of certain morphological shapes to signal discourse internal connections. But before proceeding to a detailed data examination of the texts from our chosen period, let us look at the kinds of attributive word morphology available to West Saxon speakers for the surface expression of nominal gender class association. There is no one on one relationship between inflectional attributive shape and nominal gender class in Old English. Rather, we see a considerable degree of formal overlap between attributive morphology and nominal gender group complicated still further by the again only partially expressed function whereby that same morphology signals the case status of its head noun in the proposition. Standard handbooks on Old English present this morphology in two dimensional displays where gender class is mapped onto a set of case indicating forms. Compare the following typical displays (in 1.3.a) for the surface realization of the West Saxon definite determiner "the" and the "strong" adjective <til> "good" in singular contexts (Mitchell and Robinson (1982) § 16, § 66): (where we omit forms associated with "*instrumental*" case relationships (Mitchell (1986), § 6, p. 3; Anderson (1958) and where we use a case function expressing terminology – *nominative*, etc – which we shall wish to considerably modify in later chapters). Such paradigms show the extent to which there is clear overlap between gender class, case representation and morphological expression. In the "strong" adjective instance the only phonetically unambiguous accretions are the *feminine* <-u> and <-e>, all the others conflate gender or case expression or both.

## 1.3.a

## WEST SAXON GENDER

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<b>CASE</b>			
<i>nominative</i>	se	seo/sio	þæt
<i>accusative</i>	þone	þa	þæt
<i>genitive</i>	þes	þære	þæs
<i>dative</i>	þæm/þam	þære	þæm
<i>nominative</i>	til	tilu	til
<i>accusative</i>	tilne	tile	til
<i>genitive</i>	tiles	tilre	tiles
<i>dative</i>	tilum	tilre	tilum

Likewise, in the definite determiner instance, only the <-ne>, <ða>, <se> and <seo/sio> shapes express a unique gender to case relationship correlation, although <-t> and <-re> shapes are unequivocal *gender* tokens (*neuter* and *feminine* respectively), and <-s> and <-m> unequivocally signal the case relationships covered by such traditional terms as *genitive* and *dative*. Perhaps it was this ambivalence between morphological token and semantic relationship or the inability of speakers to recover the motivation behind the assignation of individual lexical items to a particular gender category which ultimately led to the "breakdown" of historical attributive to noun congruence some time around the middle of the tenth century. Were it the case that language learners lacked formal and/or semantic criteria for entering lexical items in particular gender groups, they would still be left with the "problem" of assigning some kind of interpretation to the attributive word morphological "consequences" of such a classification. Speakers could, of course, abandon all non-nominal gender morphological expression – i.e. all nouns would belong to a "single gender" – a situation which appears to prevail in most English materials from the end of the thirteenth century. Alternatively, and this is a matter we shall pursue at length in this monograph, this inflectional "debris" could be re-interpreted either to intensify or re-inforce some of its extant expressive

capacity or as a means of reflecting linguistic relationships which were only indirectly a part of its historical function.

For instance, and we merely speculate at this point, speakers confronted with morphological complexity on attributives like the kind outlined above might "impose" upon it some other kind of rationalization based upon various types of criteria. It might be the case, for instance, that all nouns might be treated as belonging to a single paradigm, manifesting minimally only two case relationship expressions through a morphological alternation involving only  $< -t >/ < -r >$  or, perhaps,  $< 0 >/ < -r >$  inflectional suffixes. That is, a "*nominative*"/"*accusative*" versus "*genitive*"/"*dative*" paradigm based upon those attributive accretions which are historically unambiguous as to gender marking. For such a possibility, see our discussion in Chapter Four, § 5.4.

Alternatively, and we shall argue that this was the "preferred solution", the morphological residue of the outgoing gender classification for nouns could be reanalyzed on a *maximization of case relationship expression* principle. Such a paradigm might still involve some residual gender classification (*masculine/feminine*) for part of its statement, but be "gender free" in other places, thus:

### 1.3.b

"GENDER"		
	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>
CASE		
<i>nominative</i>	<i>se/0</i>	<i>seo/u</i>
<i>accusative</i>	<i>(ðo)ne</i>	<i>ða/e</i>
-----		
<i>gender empty</i>		
-----		
<i>genitive</i>	<i>-(e)s</i>	
<i>dative</i>	<i>-(u)m</i>	
-----		

It is along lines like these (although we shall wish to modify the details of the model) that our analysis will proceed: we shall in general eschew explanations for

unhistorical attributive to noun congruence that involve appeals to nominal gender re-classification. Rather, we shall show that for a period of some three hundred years or so, speakers were coming to re-interpret the products of lexical gender class assignment in nouns in terms of the case relationship expressing value of attributive morphology in noun phrases. Such a proposal will involve us in discussions concerning the relationship between morphologically realized *case forms* and the *case relationships* they denote for the nominal arguments they "qualify" (Jones (1967a); (1967b)).

An interesting parallel to the set of morphological and syntactic changes we shall be examining in this book is to be found in the "language death" situation described by Dorian ((1977); (1981)) for the Scottish Gaelic of the county of East Sutherland. The Gaelic language is under severe competition from English in this far north eastern part of the Scottish mainland and, in its "dying" stages, shows many innovative characteristics not unlike both the familiar processes of ongoing linguistic change but also those associated with pidginization. East Sutherland Gaelic has a two gender nominal classification system (*masculine* and *feminine*) often expressed through the morphology of attributive words, notably the definite article. Consider the items [gath<sup>h</sup>] "cat" and [xalag] "girl". The word initial [g] and [x] syllable one onsets are phonologically derived from a voiceless velar stop [k] which is subsequently subject to "lenition" (here an overall increase in vocalicness through voicing and fricativization (Anderson and Ewen (1980); ò Dochartaigh (1980)) in well defined phonetic environments. Consider the "standard" East Sutherland Gaelic case sensitive paradigms for these two items:

### 1.3.c

---

	the cat	the girl
<i>nominative/</i>		
<i>accusative</i>	ən gath <sup>h</sup>	ə xalag
<i>genitive</i>	ə xath <sup>h</sup>	ə xalag
<i>dative</i>	ə xath <sup>h</sup>	ə xalag

---

Syllable initial position "lenites" (continuancy shifts) underlying [k] to the voiceless velar fricative [χ], while the presence of a preceding nasal [n] segment (in the preposed definite article) historically "triggers" the voicing of the [k] to [g]. It is this "*nominative/accusative*" voicing which by and large serves to differentiate the *masculine* and *feminine* gender class nominal items in the language. Two processes are observed by Dorian in the language's "dying" state. In the first place, many young speakers seem to be conflating the two gender classes, such that the "lenition" in the *nominative/accusative* historically *masculine* items goes a step further (Anderson and Jones (1974)) to the fricative "stage": [k] → [g] → [χ]. Thus a [χat<sup>h</sup>] lexical shape appears throughout the paradigm for all case relationships in this item for all such speakers. In effect, for these younger users, the language has become mono-gender in type (the *feminine* being generalized) or even gender class-less. However, Dorian interestingly noted one female speaker whose linguistic usage did not match this tendency. Although she did on a few occasions produce [ən χat<sup>h</sup>] *nominative* shapes, she mainly realized this case expression as initiated by the underlying voiceless stop [k]. Her paradigm for the item "*cat*" therefore looked like:

### 1.3.d

---

#### CASE

---

<i>nominative/</i>	
<i>accusative</i>	[kat]
<i>dative</i>	[χat]

---

It could be argued, of course, that this speaker was "re-establishing" the gender classification system otherwise being lost to the language. But if it is indeed being lost, what could possibly be the motivation provoking speakers to re-establish it? Dorian (1981) argues that rather what is being re-established is the morphological expression of the case relationship of the nominal item in its proposition – the *agent/affected thing or person*. It was just this alternation which the failure of post nasal lenition of [k] to

[g] wiped out. Here, as Dorian suggests, grammatical gender is "dying with its boots on", its morphological consequences being used to reinforce the expression of sentence internal semantic relationships which were in the process of being neutralized through the mechanisms of phonological change.

It is processes of this kind which we shall argue are a feature of the extensive changes undergone in the attributive word to noun congruence patterns during our period. But we shall see too that the situation is an extremely complex one; not only do etymological congruences triggered by historical gender assignment processes continue to have a high statistic profile all the way through late Old English and early Middle English, but when they come to be used unhistorically they can appear with more than one innovative semantic expression.

# 2

## THE TENTH CENTURY

### THE LATE OLD ENGLISH GLOSS TO THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

#### 2.1 *SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS*

As we have seen in the last chapter, the marking of the inherent gender class of nominal lexical items by the shape of what might loosely be classified as determiners was a well established feature of the grammar of Old English of all dialects (Wyss (1982); Mitchell (1986) pp. 29ff). It is not until the tenth century that we begin to come across evidence suggesting that mutations were taking place in this area of the syntax/morphology although it is possible that the relative pervasiveness of the West Saxon *Schriftsprache* may have led to a suppression of any overt expression of ongoing changes and thus to a distortion of the chronology of such changes. For whatever set of reasons, it is not until the appearance of two very important Old English glosses from the Northumbrian area at the middle or the end of the tenth century that we are able to witness significant divergences from West Saxon usage in the output of rules governing the selection of surface shapes of gender-sensitive determiner items within the noun phrase, although, as we have noted, anaphoric expression of gender distinctions appears to have been subject to changes at an earlier date (Bauch (1912), Ropers (1918), Moore (1921)). The texts in question, and they will be the object of a detailed examination in this and the next chapter, are the late Old English glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Durham Ritual*. These two glosses (together with the materials in *Rushworth* 2) offer us what amounts to the bulk of all the surviving data from the late Old English period in the Northumbrian dialect. Their data are extensive and complex and show a great many innovations in both syntactical and morphological expression when compared with those of "classical" West Saxon models. Glossing materials have, of course, a great many disadvantages for the student of historical syntax, not least because they do not provide systematic representation of "continuous" natural language utterances and are ever liable to linguistic cross influence from the grammatical pattern

of the glossed model. Word for word glosses, which by and large both the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Durham Ritual* have been assumed to represent, can be argued to have no more usefulness for the student of morphological and especially syntactic change than vocabulary lists. The kind of information they supply concerning the linguistic intuitions of native speakers has been assumed to be extremely restricted and, as we shall see below, syntactic and morphological changes in such texts have been treated on an item-by-item basis, little reference being made to the possibility that, at least in some areas, the language of the gloss might be dealt with as though it showed features of natural discourse.

From the outset we shall have to take due account of the limitations — and they are probably considerable — which glossing materials impose upon the conclusions we may wish to reach concerning the status of rule changes and processes in natural language. Indeed, it may appear to the reader that on some occasions we place too much stress upon the extent to which the glossator's usage can represent ongoing features of the synchronic rules of his syntax/morphology. Departing from traditional methods of approach to both glosses, we shall nevertheless wish to suggest that in many instances the interlinear Old English does indeed reflect characteristics of contemporary continuous discourse and is not merely a slavish token by token rendering of the Latin exemplar. We shall see too that there are sometimes positive advantages to be gained from the study of glossing materials of this kind: on many occasions, for instance, the scribe of the two Northumbrian glosses provides not merely a straightforward word for word rendering of the Latin but will submit two or more alternative Old English variants for a Latin word or phrase and in so doing provides us with some insights into syntactico-morphological alternation at particular places in his grammar. At the same time, the kinds of deviation from the West Saxon "norm" which are so prominent a feature of the grammar of both glosses are by no means random or attributable solely to "Latin influence". Well defined patterns (reflected in the syntax of later, non-glossed materials) can readily be discerned to an extent which compels us to treat the data of these glosses as at least a partial reflection of the rule processes of the glossator's (or glossators') grammar.

## 2.2 THE LATE NORTHUMBRIAN GLOSS TO THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

Our intention in this chapter will be to examine the nature of and extent to which the gender congruences between determiners and their associated nouns in this late Northumbrian gloss differ from those found in "classical" West Saxon data. Having done this we shall then attempt to provide an explanation, or rather a set of explanations, for the divergences from the West Saxon model to be met with in our text. To this end, we shall divide our discussion into two broad parts: (a) those instances where there is a Latin determiner form (adjective, demonstrative, etc.) for which the scribe can provide a gloss and (b) where there is no Latin determiner but where the syntax of Old English would normally demand the presence of one. From our point of view the latter will prove to be the more important for any conclusions we may reach concerning the nature of syntactic and morphological innovation ongoing in the language. One advantage of treating our data in this way will be that we shall be able to isolate out at an early stage in our discussion the precise effect of Latin influence on the congruent gender system in the manuscript thus leaving the way clear for us to identify and describe "genuine" ungrammatical gender agreements in NP constructions indicative of contemporary linguistic changes.

We shall, in turn, consider the following possible causes for the appearance of determiners with unhistorical gender agreement shapes in NPs in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

- (1) the intrusion of the grammatical gender class of the Latin word being glossed
- (2) an attempt by speakers to more closely correlate the three gender categories of *masculine*, *feminine* and *neuter* with some human/non-human, male/female sex set of biological criteria in the real world
- (3) the use of determiner morphology to express relationships holding between nominal lexical elements in the narrative discourse; to express the status of speaker/hearer knowledge assumptions and, in general, to track relationships between elements in continuous discourse contexts

(4) the use of determiner morphology to show case relationships holding between sentential items in propositions.

There are, as we have already noted in the previous chapter, other potent "influencing factors" which can bring about a reclassification of the gender class of particular nominal lexical items but we shall show that the above four will take care of the vast majority of innovative determiner + noun congruence constructions and do so largely without reference to notions such as lexical gender "reclassification": i.e. to *gender change*. While some of the new morphological expressions we shall encounter may be put down to idiosyncracies in the glossator's own idiolect, we shall nevertheless see that a great many others are forerunners of more developed systems in non-glossing texts of a later date.

The scholarly literature documents well the fact that the late Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* illustrates many of the linguistic characteristics more typical of the English language at a later date in its history (Baxter (1985); Blakeley (1947); Britton and Ross (1960); Callaway (1918); Cook (1894); Kolbe (1912); Lindelöf (1901); Ross (1937; 1940)). Noun and verb morphology both attest modification, especially in the "simplification" of declensional, conjugational and case/person expression. That the text also shows considerable deviation from West Saxon models in its gender congruence system in NP constructions has been known for a long time (Ross (1935)) and can be seen from even the most casual glance at the manuscript. Consider, as an instance, the following short passage from (John xvi/21) (all references are to Evangelist and verse in Skeat (1871–1887)):

## 2.2.a

miððy uutedlice hæfið acenned þ	cnæht uutudlice þ	I
CUM AUTEM PEPERERIT PUEBUM	IAM	
ne gemynes þ ðæs hefignise þ ðæs ofersuiðunge þ	I	
NON MEMININIT PRESSURAE		
fore þ glædunge þ for gefea	I	
PROPTER GAUDIUM		

The noun <cnæht> is assigned the *masculine* gender in West Saxon, while <hefignes>, <oferswiðung> and <glædnes> are normally assigned to the *feminine*, yet in the above passage they appear with unambiguously *neuter* <þ> markers or with <ðæs> forms which are certainly not *feminine* gender indicators in the "classical" dialect. Throughout the gloss the scribe will use <þ> to indicate the singular "subject"/"object" <þæt>/<ðæt> form of West Saxon although much more rarely he will use <þt>, <ðæt>, <ðaet> and <ðætt>. (For a complete display of definite determiner occurrences in the gloss, see Ross and Stanley (1956) Book Two, pp. 140–147.) It is worth noting in passing too the use of the <ł> (<uel>) abbreviation as a means of introducing glossing "equivalents" or "variants" for individual Latin words or syntactic constructions. The importance of these alternate renderings will become obvious as we proceed.

Yet it would be wrong to assume too readily that the glossator's language had completely abandoned the set of "classical" West Saxon rules assigning particular genders to particular lexical items. To demonstrate this, let us begin by considering the distribution of the definite article forms in the gloss in an attempt to assess the "encroachment" into the grammar of constructions showing "unhistorical" or "unetymological" gender congruences. We can distinguish four main categories of gender marking in the definite article as it occurs in the *Lindisfarne* gloss:

- (1) unambiguous *masculine* gender markers:
  - (a) "subject" types:  
<se>, <þe>, <te>
  - (b) "object" types:  
<ðone>, <þone>, <ðene>, <done>, <ðon'>, <ðonne>
- (2) unambiguous *feminine* gender markers:
  - (a) "subject" types:  
<ðiu>, <ðyu>, <ðy>
  - (b) "object" types:  
<ða>
- (3) unambiguously *neuter* gender markers:  
"subject" and "object" types:  
<þ>, <þt>, <ðæt>, <ðaet>, <ðætt>

- (4) forms which are ambiguous as to neuter or masculine genders:
- (a) "possessive" types:  
 <ðæs>, <dæs>, <ðaes>
  - (b) "locative" or "dative" types:  
 <ðæm>, <dæm>, <ðaem>, <þæm>

The following table (based upon Jones (1964) pp. 19 ff) illustrates the crude numerical distribution of all individual tokens of the above forms mapped against the etymological gender assignment in West Saxon of the individual nouns with which they appear in construction in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss:

## 2.2.b

WEST SAXON GENDER			
	<i>masc</i>	<i>fem</i>	<i>neut</i>
<i>LG</i> <þe>, <þone>	883	16	19
<i>LG</i> <ðiu>, <ða>	21	223	25
<i>LG</i> <þ>	96	68	260
<i>LG</i> <ðæs>, <ðæm>	293	43	118

Perhaps the most interesting features of these figures is the extent to which they show that the "classical" West Saxon gender system has remained intact in this late Northern manuscript. The definite article forms show no wholesale shift away from an historical/etymological gender classification indeed, only one in seven of the forms noted in Jones (1964) showed any deviation away from a usage we should expect to find in an Alfredian text. We might even dismiss such a level of abnormality as that displayed above in 2.2.b as statistically of little significance and ascribable to the rather odd linguistic status of interlinear glossing. However, we shall hope to show that what we in fact discover in the above usage is an embryonic stage of a set of morphological changes which are to be found in a

more developed state in the language (especially in Anglian dialects) over the period of the next three or four hundred years. Indeed, one of the most frequent innovations employed by the *Lindisfarne Gospels'* scribe turns out to be the beginnings of one of the commonest constructions involving determiner usage in the modern language.

### 2.3 *LATIN INFLUENCE*

In addition to showing the relatively conservative habits of the glossator, the figures in 2.2.b also show that he is most likely to assign a "wrong" gender determiner form where the unambiguously ("subject"/"object") *neuter* <þ> form (and its orthographic variants) is to be found in construction with lexical items classically assigned to either the *masculine* or *feminine* genders. This feature of the gloss (and very often, in discussion of the text's gender idiosyncracies, this feature alone) was noted by the earliest scholars of the manuscript (Waring (1886); Ross (1936)). Some 63% of "subject" and "object" <þ> forms are "wrongly" assigned to non-neuter lexical items in the gloss. In a linguistic situation like the one we are dealing with, perhaps the most immediate reason which might come to mind for such a state of affairs would be to ascribe the discrepancy to the scribe's tendency to slavishly copy the gender of the Latin nouns he is "literally" glossing. The following table at 2.3.a shows the distribution of unetymological <þ> tokens in the gloss against the gender of the Latin nouns being glossed alongside that of the nouns with which they are in construction. These figures represent the occurrences of unetymological <þ> tokens with particular lexical items, not with all occurrences of these items. It is fairly obvious that even in this maximally deviant area of gender-marking determiner forms the influence of the gender of the Latin item glossed is not great. Even the twenty cases where the "new" *neuter* glossing form and the gender of the Latin word co-incide are less promising than they might at first sight appear.

## 2.3.a

LATIN GENDER			
	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
OE <i>masculine</i>	12	18	10
OE <i>feminine</i>	11	26	10
<i>total</i>	23	44	20

In the first place, of the twenty as many as *eight* appear only once in the entire gloss with a definite article form, namely <að> "oath" (L i/73); <brord> "herb" (L viii/6); <flod> "flood" (L xxvii/27); <gefea> "joy" (L CONT lxi; <giefu> "gift" (Mt xxiii/19); <glædnes> "joy" (J xvi/21); <grund> "ground" (L xiv/49); <sidu> "side" (J xx/20). Had there been several instances of the above with a neuter determiner shape regularly glossing a Latin neuter noun, then we might be more persuaded as to the efficacy of Latin gender influence. But even in those cases where we can find a variety of determiner occurrences with particular nouns, the effect of the Latin item's gender on the Old English gloss is never persistently in evidence. Consider the following:

## 2.3.b

OE <samnung> (*feminine*)

LATIN WORD GLOSSED		
<i>concilium</i> (N)	<i>congregatio</i> (F)	<i>synagoga</i> (F)
<i>LG deter.</i>		
ðiu (Mt xxvi/59)	þ (Mk Arg 11)	ða (Mk iii/1)
þ (Mk xiv/55)		ðær (J xii/42)
		(J ix/22)

OE <duru> (*feminine*)

<i>ianua</i> (F)	<i>ostium</i> (N)	<i>gazophilacium</i> (N)
ðe (Mt xxv/10)	ðe (L xi/7)	ðæs (Mk xii/41)
ðon (Mk xi/4)	þ (L xiii/25)	
	ða (J x/2)	
	ðær (J xviii/16)	

OE <lichoma> (*masc* line)

<i>corpus</i> (F)	<i>caro</i> (F)
ðe (Mt xxvii/59)	ðio (Mk xiv/39)
þ (L xxiv/3)	anre (Mt xix/5)
(Mk xv/45)	anum (Mk x/8)
(L xii/4)	
(Mt xiv/12)	

Nowhere do we find a clear split between "new" *neuter* OE <þ> tokens and a Latin *neuter* gender noun. The most promising case looks to be that involving the gloss of *corpus* (where there are four cases of innovative <þ> determiners) and *caro* with its <ðio> article and <anre> adjective. Yet even here there are difficulties: the <anre> instance, as we shall see below, is probably a special case, since Latin influence does indeed appear to be a powerful factor *just when there is a Latin adjective/ possessive or demonstrative pronoun in the text for the scribe to literally gloss*. Yet, even given the strength of that tendency, we still witness a "wrong" non-feminine case suffix glossing IN CARNE UNA at (Mk x/8) – <in lichoma ana l um>: nevertheless, the scribe does seem predisposed to gender influence from the noun of the glossed language when he has a Latin determiner or other adjectival form present which he can render literally, regardless of the dictates of the syntax/morphology of his own language. Consider a case like:

2.3.c

The West Saxon *masculine* gender of <forcwide> is ignored and the scribe is content to offer a literal rendering of *illud*. A phenomenon like this is extremely common — although we shall see that it is by no means universal or straightforward — with glosses of Latin pronominal forms, consider:

2.3.d

- (1)      wif            ða ilca  
**MULIER.....EAM**  
                        (Mt v/32); (J viii/3)

(2)      wif            ðiu ilca  
**MULIER.....ILLA**  
                        (Mt xiv/25); (L xiii/11)

(3)      hus            ða ilca  
**DOMUS.....ILLAM**  
                        (Mt xxi/13); (Mk iii/25)

(4)      foerde        ða ilca    woegē  
**DESCENDERET EADEM VIA**  
                        (L x/31)

where the *neuter* genders of <wif> and <hus> and the *masculine* of <weg> are "over-ridden" by the scribe's practice of literal, word for word glossing. Nevertheless, this technique is not followed on a number of occasions and the grammatical gender of the Old English noun surfaces even in the face of a different gender Latin form:

2.3.e

- (1) ðe ilca dæge  
IPSA DIE (L xxiv/13)

(2) in ðæm ilca ðonne hus  
IN EADEM AUTEM DOMO (L x/7)

(3) þ ilca word cuoeðende  
EUNDEM SERMONEM DICENS (Mt xxvi/44)

while, on occasion, both the Latin and the Old English genders are reproduced:

2.3.f

(1) leafo in ðæm l in ðær  
FOLIA.....IN EA (Mk xi/13)

(2) feer-lic l dæge ðio l ðe  
REPENTINA DIES ILLA (L xxi/34)

However, it is also possible to produce instances in which the scribe will use an *ungrammatical* Old English determiner gloss even where there is a specific Latin, in this case, pronominal form to target towards:

2.3.g

ðios widua wæs þ ilca miððy gesuge se drihten  
HAEC UIDUA ERAT...QUAM CUM UDISSET DOMINUS  
(L vii/12-13)

In cases such as this we might expect the influence of the scribe's literal glossing habit to be at its most strong, yet we must conclude that there are native language rule system pressures in such contexts to make him both ignore the gender of the Latin pronominal form and that of the *feminine* control noun antecedent <widua>, and these we shall investigate below. However, it does appear to be the general rule that the scribe will literally render Latin determiner and pronominal forms, a state of affairs especially obvious when we come to examine his glossing habits relating to the Old English "demonstrative" <ðis> and the possessive pronouns <ðin>, <min>. We find many instances where the Old English and Latin genders coincide, as with the following possessive and locative case forms:

## 2.3.h

- (1) monnes ðisses  
HOMINI ISTIUS (J xviii/17)
- (2) middangeordes ðisses  
MUNDI HUIUS (J xiv/30)
- (3) folces ðisses  
POPULI HUIUS (Mt xxvii/24)
- (4) cnæhte ðissum  
PUERUM ISTUM (L ix/48)
- (5) in more ðissum  
IN MONTE HOC (J iv/20, 21)

There are in excess of thirty occurrences of this type in the gloss (Jones (1964) pp. 41–42). Coincidental Old English and Latin *feminine* gender contexts are evident from examples such as:

## 2.3.i

- (1) on næht ðisser  
IN NOCTE HAC (J xiv/30; Lxi/20;  
Mt xxvi/31)
- (2) in ðisser ceatra (*sic*)  
IN CIUITATE ISTA (Mt x/23)
- (3) of ðisser tid (*sic*)  
EX HORA HAC (J xii/27)

while the unhistorical *feminine* and *masculine/neuter* morphology found with the etymologically *masculine* <ficbeam> and <liege> and etymologically *feminine* <plett> respectively are evidently the result of literal rendering of the Latin demonstrative in :

## 2.3.j

- (1) on ficbeame ðisser  
IN FICULNEA HAC (L xiii/7)

- (2)      **in ðisser légo**  
           IN HAC FLAMMA (L xvi/24)

- (3)      **frō ðissū plette**  
           EX HOC OVILI (J x/16)

Yet cases still appear where Old English etymological gender morphology is retained despite a contrast in the Latin exemplar, as in:

### 2.3.k

- (1)      **in ðissum dæg**  
           IN HAG DIE (L xix/42)

- (2)      **in ðisser bóec (sic)**  
           IN LIBRO HOC (J xx/30)

and where unhistorical *masculine/neuter* morphological forms appear with historically *feminine* nouns even when the Latin noun glossed is itself *feminine*:

### 2.3.1

- (1)      **frō cneoreesso ðasū**  
           A GENERATIONE HAC (L xvii/25)

- (2)      **cneoreso ðis(s)ū**  
           GENERATIONE ISTI (L xi/30; Mk viii/12)

This last example perhaps suggests too that the glossator, when faced with a non-gender specific Latin determiner shape, chooses to gloss it as though it were *non-feminine*, c.f.

### 2.3.m

- (1)      **woroldes ðisses**  
           SAECULI HUIUS (L xx/34; xvi/8)

- (2)      **cneoreses ðises**  
           GENERATIONES HUIUS (L vii/31)

(3)           cneoreso ðisses  
 GENERATIONIS HUIUS       (L xi/31)

where both Old English nouns are etymologically *feminine*. However, we shall suggest below that his readiness to do just this may, in fact, reflect an aspect of the internalized rule system of his own grammar and not merely represent some idiosyncratic glossing method.

We might conclude from the above discussion that the direct influence of the gender of the Latin word being glossed is not a particularly important factor as an explanation for the unhistorical gender congruences found in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss. Were it to have been so, we might surely have expected to see many more "ungrammatical" gender agreements than we actually find. The only contexts where we can point with any confidence to a Latin influence explanation are those where literal glossing of a Latin determiner (or other similar) form is involved although even there we have shown that there are exceptions.

#### 2.4 GENDER CHANGE AS A REFLECTION OF *EXTRA-LINGUISTIC HUMAN SEX AND ANIMACY DISTINCTIONS*

Almost all students of the history of the grammatical category of gender in the late Old English and early Middle English periods have been seduced by the idea that innovative determiner congruences reflected the desire of speakers to bring into line the three gender "classes" with some perceived real world categorization of sex/animacy (Fodor (1957); Ibrahim (1973); Wyss (1982); Ross (1936); von Glahn (1909); Clark (1957)). We have already examined the extent to which the West Saxon gender system reflected such extra linguistic classifications (especially when they were refined and elaborated upon) and we saw (see pp 4–10 above) that, indeed, *masculine* and *feminine* genders did reflect fairly consistently male and female human distinctions (especially where *ergativity* was involved) although there were some important exceptions. Likewise although the *neuter* gender was indeed the domain of inanimacy in a great number of instances nouns having reference to inanimate objects were assigned *masculine* or *feminine* genders as well. Ross, who among

all scholars of the grammatical gender change phenomenon in English, is perhaps the most attracted to the sex/gender correlation asserts that in "classical" West Saxon:

"the majority of male nouns were masculine and the majority of female nouns feminine, on the other hand the majority of asexual nouns was not neuter, although the majority of neuter nouns was asexual"

((1935), p. 21) where "asexual" seems to infer not only inanimates but also animate non-humans such as plants and animals, although Ross' sex/animacy classification is not well worked out.

Certainly, a casual inspection of the unetymological gender forms appearing in the gloss would seem to bear out the hypothesis that syntactic/morphological change was tending to move in a direction where essentially those nouns which referred to lexical items denoting inanimate objects and commonly assigned *masculine* or *feminine* gender status in Old English were being systematically "transferred" in the gloss to a "new" *neuter* gender. This point is apparently immediately confirmed when we map a simple list of all occurrences of unhistorical *neuter* determiner <þ> tokens against the sex/animacy characteristics of the lexical items with which they are found in construction in the gloss:

#### 2.4.a

	HUMAN MALE	HUMAN FEMALE	NON-HUMAN ANIMATE	NON-HUMAN INANIMATE	
unhistorical <þ> forms in the gloss	9	3	7	120	

It seems only too obvious that in an overwhelming number of instances, unhistorical <þ> forms are being used with nouns which refer to inanimate objects (although the cases where the "new" <þ> forms are to be found with human males and females might even at this point cause us to

hesitate). Since we shall be examining many of the unhistorical <þ> forms in some detail below, it is unnecessary to provide a complete list of them at this point, but illustrative of such inanimate (*mASCULine/fEMINine* gender) noun "transfers" to the *neuter* are:

<þ stow> (J xxi/25); <þ rod> (L xxiii/26); <þ duru> (L xiii/24); <þ miltheortnis> (L x/37) and <þ somnung> (J xv/2) all with historical *fEMININE* genders, while with etymological *mASCULines* we find <þ dom> (L xi/42); <þ wingeard> (Mt xxi/39); <þ calic> (Mk x/38); <þ stan> (J xi/38); <þ scilling> (L xv/8) and <þ hlaf> (L xxiv/30).

As Ross ((1935) p. 326) asserts:

"the English Language was losing its gender categories and the male and the female sex categories were in the process of being distinguished; it is obvious that if in any language the two sexual categories are distinguished grammatically, the asexual will tend to be distinguished also. It was therefore natural that the only remaining gender category, the neuter, should supply the deficiency and should thus pass over into the asexual sex category."

This process Ross calls *NEUTRALIZATION* and although we shall be compelled in what follows to considerably modify the positiveness with which Ross asserted it, the hypothesis does have a superficial, common sense attraction, especially when we see the scribe clearly indicating (despite the *mASCULine* gender of <wifman>) his anaphoric powers of sex expression:

#### 2.4.b

from frumma uutedlice scæfto woepen man ɬ hee  
 AB INITIO AUTEM CREATURAE MASCULUM

7 hiuu ɬ wifmon worhte hia god  
 ET FEMINAM FECIT EOS DEUS  
 (Mk x/6)

arguing that if the scribe is conscious of an anaphoric/NP determiner sex/gender clash, he might modify the rules of his grammar to bring the two more into line in other appropriate contexts.

Indeed, when we turn to look at the way in which the glossator treats those human animate nouns assigned to the *neuter* gender in West Saxon, we appear to have further vindication in support of Ross' position. Consider the following passages featuring the etymologically *neuter* noun <mægden> "young girl":

2.4.c

he gecueð cerras þ eft gewoendas ne is forðon  
DICEBAT RECEDITE NON EST ENIM

dead ðy meiden þ þ maiden ah slepes....7  
MORTUA PUELLA SED DORMIT

geheald þ genom hond hire 7 arras þ maiden  
TENUIT MANUM EIUS ET SURREXIT PUELLA  
(Mt ix/24-25)

Again:

2.4.d

7 gebroht þ gefered wæs heafud his in disc  
ET ALLATUM EST CAPUT EIUS IN DISCO

7 gesáld wæs ðær mædne 7 brohte moder hire  
ET DATUM EST PUELLAE ET TULIT MATRI SUAE  
(Mt xiv/6-11)

It would seem clear that the unambiguously *feminine* <ðy> and <ðær> forms (together with the *feminine* anaphoric items) point to some kind of reclassification of the the *neuter* <mægden> to the *feminine gender/female* sex correlation expressed through the morphology of the definite article. Yet we might still wonder why in the (Mt ix/24–25) case, forms like <þ mægden> should appear in such overtly female marking contexts at all, and why *eius* should be glossed as <his> in the following passage from (Mk vi/28) paralleling that for the (Mt xiv/6–11) quotation

immediately above:

#### 2.4.e

7 to-brohte heafud his in disc 7 salde  
 ET ATTULIT CAPUD EIUS IN DISCO ET DEDIT

þ ðær mædne 7 þ mægden cuoeð moder his  
 ILLUD PUELLAE ET PUELLA DICIT MATRI SUAE

where not only do the <ðær> and <þ> determiners occur side by side, but the pronominal reference (despite glossing the *feminine* SUAE) is apparently determined by the *neuter* grammatical gender of <mægden>. Is the scribe merely being inconsistent in cases like these? While we shall have just cause to complain about his failings in that area, we might nevertheless suggest that we should beware of too readily accepting the sex/gender matching hypothesis on the basis of such ambiguous evidence since, as we shall point out at length below, it is possible to offer explanations for the co-occurrence of *neuter* and *feminine* determiner forms in such close discourse proximity by reference to other sets of criteria.

In fact, the closer one examines the *neutralization* case, the less attractive it becomes. For instance, in a system where — as Ross claims — there was evolving a matching up between extra-linguistic categories like human male/female and the grammatical gender classes of *masculine* and *feminine*, we might expect that a prime "exception" in such a context — the *neuter* gender of <wif> "woman" — would be a certain candidate for "gender change". The item occurs frequently (49 times in all) with definite article forms in our gloss but on only three of these occasions do we find the item in construction with an unambiguously *feminine* determiner shape; on all others we either find the unambiguously *neuter* <þ> (35 times) or the *non-feminine* <ðæs> (twice) and <ðæm> (11 times). Even the "new" *feminine* determiner occurrences can be explained away as being literal glosses of Latin demonstrative forms, thus <ðius wif>/HAEC MULIER (J viii/4); <ðio wif>/QUAE MULIER (L xv/8) and <ðios wif> (*sic*)/HANC MULIEREM (L vii/44).

Interesting too is the fact that although, as we suggested above, a great many of the innovative <þ> determiner forms could be accounted for in terms of Ross' *neutralization* model by virtue of their being in NP constructions whose head signifies an inanimate object, when it comes to *anaphoric* representation of Old English *masculine* and *feminine* gender inanimates, the scribe is generally content to use a gender agreeing pronominal form (regardless of sex/animacy considerations) or, more likely, to literally render the Latin pronoun. There seems to be but a single instance in the entire gloss where the scribe uses an unetymological <hit> pronoun which might be construed as an attempt to represent the inanimacy characteristic of the replaced NP:

## 2.4.f

ne drinco ic of ðassum cynne win-treo oð  
NON BIBAM .... DE HOC GENIMINE UITIS USQUE

ðone dæge miððy ðene þ hit ic drinco  
IN DIEM CUM ILLAM BIBAM  
(Mt xxvi/29)

We might also ponder on the fact that if innovative <þ> forms are to be treated as evidence for marking the inanimacy of their nouns, why do we on occasion find them in construction with *masculine* items which in the same NP show adjectival forms morphologically marked for that *masculine* gender? We find, for instance, glosses such as <þ ðyrnenne beg> /SPINEAM CORONAM (J xix/5) and <þ forcuedne middangeard> /ARGUENDUM MUNDUM (J Cont xxxviii). Why should the adjectival form not also be "shifted" to the *neuter* gender especially, as we shall see below, "endingless" adjectival forms are a common feature of the gloss?

But we must turn now to a much more serious set of objections to Ross' *neutralization* hypothesis. The first of these centres around the fact that there are several instances in the gloss where nouns denoting human males and females which are historically MASCULINE and FEMININE in gender in their West Saxon classification appear with unetymological <þ> determiner forms. The items in question are <þ cnæht> "boy" (L xviii/17), (J

xvi/21), (Mk ix/36); <þ moder> "mother" (L Cont xxviii); <þ hehstald> VIRGO (J Arg 12); <þ lichoma> "body" (Mt xxvii/59 etc); <þ gast> SPIRITUS (J xix/30), (L Cont xciii), while with non-human animates we find unhistorical <þ> in construction with <fola> "foal" (masculine) (Mk xi/21: xi/7), (L xix/33) and <ficbeam> "fig tree" (L xxi/29), (Mk xi/13,20). While the <þ cnæht> and <þ moder> cases look particularly damaging for Ross' model, the unhistorical <þ lichoma> instances might in fact be construed as supporting it, since on at least two occasions the innovative <þ> form is to be found used when reference is being made to the *dead* body of Christ, e.g.

## 2.4.g

7 mið ongæt from ðæm aldormen salde  
 ET CUM COGNOISSET A CENTURIONE DONAUT

þ lichoma iosep  
 CORPUS IOSEPH  
 (Mk xv/45)

Yet historical <ðe> forms are to be found in such contexts as well (Mt xxvii/59; L xvii/37) while, even where there is a *neuter* Latin form to be glossed and in a context where again a dead body is being referred to, we still find the scribe denoting human maleness anaphorically!:

## 2.4.h

7 geneolecton ðegnas his genómon þ lichoma  
 ET ACCIDENTES DISCIPULI EIUS TULERUNT CORPUS

7 bebyrgdon ðæt ½ hine  
 ET SEPELIERUNT ILLUD  
 (Mt xiv/12)

Again, an inanimacy interpretation of a case like the following would seem rather unlikely:

2.4.i

gie ne se afyrhtad from ðæm ða ðe ofslæð  
 NE TERREAMINI AB HIS QUI OCCIDERUNT

þ lichoma  
 CORPUS

(L xii/4)

"Do not fear those who destroy the body"

Ross himself attempts to explain away the <þ cnæht> cases on two counts. Firstly, he argues, the item <cnæht> in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss may derive from a different Germanic origin from the West Saxon <cnihht> and as such may well have been assigned a different (*neuter*) grammatical gender classification. However, there is simply no independent evidence for the existence of such a form. Secondly,

"In some languages where there is a classification of nouns by sex there seems to be a tendency to regard immature persons as asexual. Thus, in Modern English the following remark might be addressed to a child: 'It's not a very good little boy (girl) today: did it want its mummy?'" (Ross (1935) p. 362)

Nevertheless, although the second proposition is a little more acceptable than the first, we have to point out that the glossator of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* nowhere uses <hit> anaphorically for a <cnæht> antecedent and, even in cases where <cnæht> is found with an unhistorical *neuter* determiner, <hine> is used in anaphoric reference:

2.4.j

7 on-feng þ cnæht gesette hine in middum  
 ET ACCIPIENS PUERUM STATUIT EUM IN MEDIO  
 (Mt ix/36)

Besides, the Modern English use of "it" with reference to items like "baby", "child", etc. probably as much reflects the speaker's attitude to the topic — (dis)interest, uncertainty, etc — as it does any consideration for age,

size or maturity. We shall return to a more detailed consideration of these <cnæht> examples below.

The remainder of this section will be concerned with a close examination of unhistorical <þ> forms and we shall try to show that an explanation for their occurrence in the gloss lies in areas other than marking the inanimacy feature of lexical items. However, the proposals we shall make will require us to treat the glossing data in a rather untraditional way; we shall wish to suggest that it in fact shows the characteristics, on many occasions, of a continuous piece of discourse rather than those of a literal word for word rendering of a foreign language exemplar with little value for the student interested in the internalized grammatical rules of speakers of late Northumbrian Old English.

But before we commence that study we must mention yet another argument against Ross' proposals, one which he himself noted:

"the use of etymologically unjustified forms  
is not confined to neutralization; masculine  
and feminine forms are used with asexuals  
irrespective of etymological gender"  
(1935) p. 326)

We find instances where *masculine* determiner forms like <ðone> are used in construction with nouns representing human females with West Saxon *feminine* gender classification, thus:

#### 2.4.k

ðone	l ða ðorfend	widwa
PAUPEREM		UIDUAM
(Mk Cont xli)		

Likewise, with *feminine* gender inanimates (here <tid>) where we might expect to find an innovative <þ> determiner, we have:

2.4.1

wæccas forðon forðon nuuto gi ðone dæge ne  
 UICILATE ITAQUE QUIA NESCITIS DIEM NEQUE

ðone tid

HORAM

(Mt xxv/13)

Examples such as these will be the subject of our concern in sections 2.12 and 2.14 and we shall argue there that, contrary to Ross' assertion, they do indeed represent features of the synchronic grammar of the late Old English period and can be interpreted, among other things, as the surface expression of *case relationships* holding between various items in the sentence or proposition. Most importantly, we shall see that both sets of anti-*neutralization* solutions we propose can be shown to be active characteristics of the nominal syntax and morphology of Middle English materials until as late as the thirteenth century.

2.5 AN ALTERNATIVE SET OF EXPLANATIONS FOR  
 THE UNHISTORICAL <þ> FORMS IN THE GLOSS  
 TO THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

Disenchantment with appeals for an inanimacy marking function for unetymological <þ> forms in the gloss, plus their failure to match in any consistent fashion the gender of the Latin words being rendered, leaves us facing the rather daunting task of providing some kind of explanation for what is by far the most idiosyncratic feature of definite article morphology in this important late Old English text. We do not claim that the explanations which we shall suggest for such forms are open to interpretation within a completely satisfying unitary set of linguistic criteria nor that all cases can be equally happily dealt with. Still, we shall hope to convince the reader that at least a significant number of the unetymological <þ> forms can be accounted for in terms of what is a *bona fide* set of syntactico-semantic innovations in the internalized rule system of late Old English and that they are not just the result of indiscriminate errors on the part of a scribe becoming insensitive to the need to reflect in the

morphology of nominal attributive words the inherent gender class of the lexical item with which they were in construction.

The typology of the innovations which we are about to propose will involve our treating the glossing materials in a controversial way. Glosses are traditionally treated as akin to word-lists: they are seen essentially as item for item renderings, any inter-item relationships which are expressed being viewed as a reflection, if anything, of the syntactical and morphological patterns of the rendered language. Glosses have generally been held to offer little in the way of information which relates to the sentential and supra sentential constructions found in natural language data. In what follows, we shall however depart radically from such a position to show that there appear to be certain circumstances where our glossator provides information of a functional kind, especially as regards *the relationship holding between elements in the Old English discourse* even though (or perhaps because of the fact that) the glossing language cannot be often read as representing "natural syntax". The kinds of functional relationships which we claim he makes reference to by the use of innovative determiner morphology include (1) the extent of shared speaker/hearer knowledge concerning the inter-action between lexical items in the discourse (2) the signalling of what are generic or limited semantic scope lexical items and (3) the introduction of new lexical material into the discourse.

Naturally, much of what we shall claim will of necessity be rather speculative, but we shall see that at least some of the discourse tracking/assumed information marking functions of the unhistorical <þ> forms can be paralleled in the usage of texts of a much later date. Some, however, may be idiosyncratic to the grammar of the glossator's generation or to that of the glossator himself. However, perhaps ultimately the main justification for our detailed examination of the unetymological <þ> determiner in this manuscript will not only be its undoubtedly intrinsic interest but because it represents the beginnings of a determiner construction which was to become so well established in the grammar of the later language.

### 2.5.1 <p> AS AN INDICATOR OF IDENTICAL NP CO-REFERENCE

The single most common context where unhistorical gender <p> forms are to be found in the gloss is one where the nouns with which they are in construction have already been introduced (with the same phonological shape) in the immediately preceding "discourse" and usually with a zero determiner shape: environments of the type where  $NP_i > NP_j$  and where  $NP_i \equiv NP_j$ , as in a string like "*Eldred made the gloss and then Eldred died*", where there are Equi-NPs <*Eldred*> and where the modern language would regularly substitute a pronominal form for the second or, in certain instances, mark it with a <that> -type determiner (Quirk et al. (1984) pp. 136–138). Utterances of this type are rather common in our text as can be seen from the following extended examples:

#### 2.5.1.a

7 gesald uæs him boc ðæs witges esaie 7	
ET TRADITUS EST ILLI LIBER PROPHETAES ESAIAE ET	
þte þ miððy untynde þ boc gemitte to stoue	
UT REUOLUIT LIBRUM INUENIT LOCO	
ðer awritten uæs 7 miððy gefeald þ boc	
UBI SCRIBTUM ERAT ET CUM PLICUISSET LIBRUM	
agæf ðæm embeht-menn 7 saett	
REDDIDIT MINISTRO ET SEDIT	
(L iv/17-20)	

"He was handed the scroll of Esiah. He opened the scroll and found the passage which says....He rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down."

#### 2.5.1.b

wæs ðonne ðer ede þ sunor bergana monigo	
ERAT AUTEM IBI GREX PORCORUM MULTORUM	
foedendra þ lesuuandra ða diowblas infoerdon	
PASCENTIUM ..... DAEOMONIA... INTRAUERUNT	

In bergum 7 mið fer-ræs eode þ sunor  
 IN PORCOS ET IMPETU ABIIT GREX

oefistlice on luh  
 PER PRAECEPS IN STAGNUM  
 (L viii/32-34)

## 2.5.1.c

giuede lichoma hælendes 7 mið ongæt from  
 PETIT CORPUS IESU ET CUM COGNOUISSET A

ðæm aldormenn salde þ lichoma iosep  
 CENTURIONE DONAUT CORPUS IOSEPH  
 (Mk xv/43-45)

## 2.5.1.d

7 ofduna astag hræs ɏ windes on luh soðlice  
 ET DESCENDIT PROCELLA UENTI IN STAGNUM AT

he aras geðreade þ wind  
 ILLE SURGENS INCREPAUIT UENTEM  
 (L viii/23-24)

## 2.5.1.e

la blindo huæt forðon mara is gefe ɏ wig-bed  
 CAECI QUID ENIM MAIUS EST DONUM AN ALTARE

þ gehælgas þ gefe  
 QUOD SANCTIFICAT DONUM  
 (Mt xxiii/19)

## 2.5.1.f

in lehtun ymbfæstung ɏ byrgenn niuæ in ðæm  
 IN HORTO MONUMENTUM NOUUM IN QUO

ne ðagett ɏ næfra ár ða ænigmonn gesetted wæs  
 NONDUM QUISQUAM POSITUS ERAT

... neh uæs þ byrgenn gesetton ðone hælend  
 IUXTA ERAT MONUMENTUM POSUERUNT IESUM  
 (J xix/41-42)

where in West Saxon the nouns <sunor>, <boc>, <gefe> and <byrgenn> are of the *feminine* gender, while <wind> is *masculine*. Much in the same vein, we might cite instances where there occur two identical reference NPs in the gloss, the first showing a determiner with historical gender congruence:

#### 2.5.2.a

7 ጀidder ic geonga gie uutton 7 ጀone ueg  
ET QUO EGO UADO SCITIS ET UIAM

gie uuton cuoeð him ጀomas drihten nuutuve þ  
SCITIS DICIT EI THOMAS DOMINE NESCIMUS

huidder 7 huu mago ué þ uég gewuta  
QUO UADIS ET QUOMODO POSSUMUS UIAM SCIRE  
(J xiv/4-5)

#### 2.5.2.b

se hælend uutedlice cuoeð him hu magoge drinca  
IESUS AUTEM AIT EIS.. POTESTIS BIBERE

ጀone calic ጀone ic drinco se hælend uutedlice  
CALICEM QUEM EGO BIBO ... IESUS AUTEM

cuoeð him þ calic ec ጀon ጀone ic drinco  
AIT EIS CALICEM QUIDEM QUEM EGO BIBO

gie drinca  
BIBETIS

(Mk x/38-39)

#### 2.5.2.c

to-brocen uæs se stream ጀæm huse on ጀon  
INLISUM EST FLUMEN DOMUI ... IN QUA

toslitten wæs þ stream  
INLISUS EST FLUUIUS  
(L vi/48-49)

It seems not unlikely that in all the above instances in 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 when the discourse shows two nouns with

identical referents, then that identity is signalled on the second noun by the deployment in construction with it of a <þ> definite determiner, regardless of the etymological gender class of the noun itself. In such contexts the grammar of Modern English could, of course, substitute a pronominal form at the point where the innovative <þ> occurs in our examples. We can only but speculate that this possibility was open to the scribe as well, but that the constraints of an item by item gloss compelled him into a nominal rendering with, we might suggest, the <þ> determiner signally a possible pronominalizing environment in his normal output (Jones (1971)).

Indeed, so common is the above phenomenon in the gloss that we might even interpret the historical use of the determiner <þ> with a *neuter* noun like <treo>, not simply as a manifestation of the noun's gender but of the fact that it is the repeat of an identical noun in the immediately preceding discourse:

### 2.5.3

þ doæð tré góð 7 wæstm his góð þ  
AUT FACITE ARBOREM BONAM ET FRUCTUM EIUS BONUM AUT

doæð ðæt tré yfel 7 wæstm his yfel  
FACITE ARBOREM MALAM ET FRUCTUM EIUS MALUM  
(Mt xii/33)

For other similar <þ> usages, see the occurrences with the *masculine* nouns <ficbeam> (Mk xi/20); <wingeard> (Mt xxi/39–41), (Mk xii/1–10), (L xx/9–16); <ðreat> (Mk v/31), (J vii/31–32); <wind> (Mk iv/39), (Mk vi/51), (Mk xiv/24–32); <fola> (Mk xi/2–7), (L xix/30–34); <worð> (Mk xiv/66–68) and with *feminine* nouns <cyðnisse> (J v/31–32); <byrgenn> (Mt xxvii/64–66), (Mt xxvii/60–61), (L xxiii/52–55); <stow> (L xiv/8–10); <scyld> (Mt xviii/25–30); <uælle> (J iv/6), (J v/2–7); <hehstald> (J Arg 12).

2.6 <þ> AS A MARKER OF NOUNS WHICH CONSTITUTE  
A SINGLE MEMBER CLASS OR HAVE UNIQUE  
REFERENCE CHARACTERISTICS

A second major context triggering the appearance of "wrong" <þ> determiners appears to correlate with the referential domain of their head nouns. Lexical items referring to specific and known geographical localities as well as objects belonging to a single member class, about whose identifying characteristics WH— questions would be inappropriate and which are normally non-count — e.g. *Heaven*, *Hell*, *The Cross*, *The Last Judgement*, *The Sabbath*, *Books of the Old Testament*, *Manna* — characteristically appear with <þ> determiners regardless of their historical gender class. Not unlike the previous set of cases such items incur a special status of speaker/hearer knowledge which is *completely shared* — one and one only referential condition fits the lexical item in all cases. Total exclusivity of class or set membership is assumed. Indeed, it is interesting to note in this context that the scribe glosses the Latin SOLUM "only" by <þ ane> (Mt xxi/22). Consider the following cases:

2.6.1.a

oððe on dæg of ðæm inn-eade in ærce  
USQUE IN DIEM QUA INTRAVIT NOE IN ARCAM

7 cuom þ flód 7 losade k spilde alle  
ET UENIT DILUUIUM ET PERDIDIT OMNES  
(L xvii/27)

"Until the day that Noah went into the Ark and the flood came and destroyed them all"

2.6.1.b

þ boc ðæra sighðana eac awrat  
APOCALIPSEN SCRIBSERAT  
(J Arg 12)

## 2.6.1.c

eaðor is uutedlice þ heofon 7 þ eorðo  
 FACILIUS EST AUTEM CAELUM ET TERRAM

þte foregeleore  
 PRAETERIRE

(L xvi/17)

## 2.6.1.d

7 cuæð him to soðlice soð ic cueðo iuh  
 ET DICIT EI AMEN AMEN DICO UOBIS

gie geseað þ heofon untyned 7 angla godes  
 UIDEBITIS CAELUM APERTUM ET ANGELOS DEI

up-stigende  
 ASCENDENTES

(J i/51)

where the abode of the Deity is clearly referred to while, when <heofon> refers to "*the sky*", we find:

## 2.6.1.e

ða betyned uæs se heofon gerum ðrim  
 QUANDO CLUSUM EST CAELUM ANNIS TRIBUS  
 (L iv/25)

An even better contextual comparison can be seen in the use of the item <ende> (WS *masculine*) where on the one hand it refers to the unique event of *The End of the World* and is in construction with <þ>, contrasting with a context where an individually specified event is under discussion:

## 2.6.1.f

Ah huoeðre ne sona þ ende  
 SED NON STATIM FINIS  
 (L xxi/9)

"but the end of the world does not follow immediately"

as against:

2.6.1.g

Inn gesætt mið ðæm ðeignum þte  
 PETRUS.....INTRO SEDEBAT CUM MINISTRIS UT  
 he gesuge ðone ende  
 UIDERET FINEM

(Mt xxvi/58)

"Peter followed at a distance...and going in he sat down among the attendants, meaning to see the end of it all".

2.6.1.h

*The Holy Cross*

7 miððy gelæddon hine ge-grippedon ɬ sumne  
 ET CUM DUCERUNT EUM APPRAEHENDERUNT SIMONEM  
 simon (sic) cyrinisce cymnde of londe 7  
 QUENDAM CYRINENSEM UENIENTEM DE UILLA ET

geseton him þ rod to bearanne  
 IMPOSUERUNT ILLI CRUCEM PORTARE  
 (L xxiii/26)

(but also <ða roda>/CRUCEM (J xix/17))

2.6.1.i

*Manna*

aldro iuero gebrecon ɬ on uæstern þ fostrað  
 PATRES UESTRI MANDUCAUERUNT IN DESERTO MANNA  
 7 deado ueron ɬ  
 ET MORTUI SUNT

(J vi/49)

## 2.6.1.j

*The stone sealing Christ's tomb*

7 gesæh ḥ þ stan genumen ḥ auæled  
 ET UIDET LAPIDEM SUBLATUM

of ðæm byrgenne  
 A MONUMENTO

(J xx/1; Lxxiv/2)

There is no previous mention of <stan> (OE *masculine*) in the context and we can only assume that the <þ> is to be interpreted as "*the stone*", knowledge of which is shared by reader and writer and which is a single member class. It is interesting to note too that in a passage where there are several references to the burial stone it is the *first* mention which shows a <þ> determiner, those subsequent realizing the historical masculine <ðone> marker:

## 2.6.1.k

7 towælte ðæt stan to duru ðæs byrgennes hua  
 ET. ADUOLUIT LAPIDEM AD OSTIUM MONUMENTI.. QUIS

eft ḥ awæltes us ðone stan fro duro  
 REUOLUIT NOBIS LAPIDEM AB OSTIO

ðæs byrgennes..7 eft-locadon gesegon  
 MONUMENTI ET RESPICIENTES UIDENT

efet-awaelted ðone stan wæs  
 REUOLUTUM LAPIDEM ERAT  
 (Mk xv/46 - xvi/4)

but whether the two <ðone> instances merely represent historical grammatical gender or have some other, discourse tracking function, we shall discuss below (see the example at 2.11.c below). Other examples of unhistorical <þ> with nouns whose reference is to a single member or unique class might also include the following: <þ sunnedæg> /SABBATUM (Mk xvi/1) (but note <þ sunnedae> /SABBATUM (J v/18)); <þ ɔrifald

costung> /TRINA TEMTATIONE (L Cont xi).

Perhaps related to the above cases are those where unhistorical <þ> occurs in construction with NON COUNT and/or ABSTRACT nouns such as "tribute", "mercy", "justice", "dust" – cases where a "some" quantifier would be inappropriate and where the lexical items in question are not being introduced into the discourse for the sake of further referential elaboration or qualification. Consider the following:

#### 2.6.2.a *Circumcision*

forða þ forðon moises salde iuh þ ymb-huungun þ  
PROPTER-EA MOSES DEDIT UOBIS CIRCUMCISIONEM

gif þ ymbcearfniſe onfoeð se monn  
SI CIRCUMCISIONEM ACCIPIT HOMO  
(J vii/22-23)

#### 2.6.2.b *Mercy*

soð he cuoeð seðe dyde þ miltheartnis on him  
AT ILLE DIXIT QUI FECIT MISERICORDIAM IN ILLUM  
(L x/37)

#### 2.6.2.c *Justice*

7 bi-wærlas þ dom 7 lufo þ broðerscip godes  
ET PRAETERITIS IUDICIUM ET CARITATEM DEI  
(L xi/42)

"You Pharisees...have no care for justice or  
the love of God"

#### 2.6.2.d *Tribute*

is reht þ us to seallanne þ geafel ðæm caseri  
LICET NOBIS DARE TRIBUTUM CAESARI  
þ nó  
AN NON  
(L xx/22)

2.6.2.e *Bread*

7 aworden wæs miððy eft-geræste þ mið him  
 ET FACTUM EST CUM RECUMBERET CUM ILLIS

onfeng þ laf 7 gebloedsade  
 ACCIPIT PANEM ET BENEDIXIT

(L xxiv/30)

"and when he sat down with them he took bread and said this blessing"

ah þte gefylled uere þ sie þ uritt seðe brucað  
 SED UT IMPLEATUR SCRIBTURA QUI MANDUCAT

mec mið (sic) þ hlaf he ahefeð þ ongægn mec  
 MECUM PANEM LEUABIT CONTRA ME

hel þ his  
 CALCANEUM (sic) SUUM

(J xiii/18)

"But there is a text in Scripture to be fulfilled:  
 'He who eats bread with me has turned against me'"

It might be argued, especially in the last example, that no particular piece of bread is under discussion or being topicalized but that reference is being made to the abstract notion of food in general. <ymbhungor>, <ymbcearfnes> and <milheartness> are etymologically *feminine*, while *masculine* are <stan>, <geafol> and <hlaf>.

2.6.2.f *Singing*

wæs ða sunu his ældra on lond 7 miððy  
 ERAT AUTEM FILIUS EIUS SENIOR IN AGRO ET CUM

gecuome 7 geneolecde to huse geherde  
 UENERIT ET APPROPINQUARET DOMUI AUDIUIT

huislung 7 þ song þ  
 SIMPHONIAM CHORUM

(L xv/25)

where <hwistlung> and <song> are historically *feminine* and *masculine* respectively. We might wonder, of course, why the scribe omits to place a <þ> determiner with <huislung> as well.

### 2.6.2.g Dust

æc soð þ asca seðe æt-hran us from ceastræ  
ETIAM PULUEREM QUI ADHAESIT NOBIS DE CIUITATE

Iuera of we drygdon  
UESTRA EXTERGIMUS

(L x/11; L ix/5; Mk vi/11)

We might claim that examples like these involve nouns knowledge of whose referential area is shared by speaker/hearers, which are not normally associated with restrictive relative clauses nor with quantifiers such as "each", "one" or "a", but rather with "all" and "every". It is interesting to observe too that *locational* nouns like <stow> (*feminine*) and <stede> (*masculine*) consistently appear in construction with an unetymological <þ> determiner in defining or restrictive relative contexts: that is, where the function of the relative clause is to provide precise spatial information, as in:

### 2.6.3.a

neh ðær ceastræ þ wæs þ stowe ðer ahoen  
PROPE CIUITATEM ERAT LOCUS UBI CRUCIFIXUS

uæs se hælend  
ERAT IESUS

(J xix/20)

### 2.6.3.b

sende him on alle ceastræ 7 þ stydd ðæm  
MISIT ILLOS...IN OMNEM CIUITATEM ET LOCUM QUO

wæs he tocymend  
ERAT IPSE UENTURUS

(L x/1)

"He sent them on ahead...to every town and place he was going to visit himself"

## 2.6.3.c

cymmas geseað þ styd l ðiu stou ðer assetted  
 UENITE UIDETE LOCUM UBI POSITUS

wæs drihten  
 ERAT DOMINUS

(Mt xxviii/6)

## 2.6.3.d

7 sætt fore ðæm heh-sedle in þ styd l seðe  
 ET SEDIT PRO TRIBUNALI IN LOCUM QUI

is gecuoeden i. est lapide stratutus on ebrisc  
 DICITUR LITHOSTROTUS (*sic*) HEBRAICE  
 (J xix/13)

## 2.6.3.e

uæs ðonne in þ styd ðer ahoen uæs lehtun  
 ERAT AUTEM IN LOCO UBI CRUCIFIXUS EST HORTUS  
 (J xix/41)

The gloss shows, in fact, no unambiguously *masculine* determiner forms (<se>, <ðone>) with the noun <styd> at all and its regular use with the <þ> determiner might be used as an argument for its having undergone a "change of gender" to the *neuter*. But we wish to discount such a view (for reasons we have already set out in the first Chapter) suggesting instead that the unetymological forms are used because the noun only appears in *specific location contexts* signalled by defining relative clause modifiers. We come across no examples such as "*show me a (any/ some) nice place*". However there does appear to be one counter-example where <þ styd> occurs in an environment free of any restrictive relative construction:

2.6.3.f

efern uutedlice aworden gewærð geneoleddon  
UESPERE AUTEM FACTO ACCESSERUNT

to him ðegnas his cuoedon woestihg wæs  
AD EUM DISCIPULI EIUS DICENTES DESERTUS EST

stou l þ styd  
*LOCUS*

(Mt xiv/15)

But in its context the <þ styd> refers to a particular locale whose identity is known by the participants in the action: "When it grew late the disciples came up to him and said 'This is a lonely place'". Indeed, Rushworth shows <Deos stowe is weste>. Once more, with a particular geographical feature we find an unhistorical <þ> in a defining context:

2.6.3.g

se hælend færende uæs l mið ðegnum his  
IESUS EGRESSUS EST CUM DISCIPULIS EIUS

ofer þ burna l i. uinterburna cedron is genemned  
TRANS TORRENTM CAEDRON

(J xviii/1)

Although it is a singleton, there is an interesting instance where we find just such an unetymological <þ> determiner where we might by now expect to find it: with a locationally "empty" <stouue>/<styd> identified spatially by a restricted relative adjunct, but *where the case relationship of the control NP antecedent is LOCATIVE* – a directional goal is referred to and, indeed, "grammatically" indicated as an alternative in the gloss:

2.6.3.h

7 eade l foerde eftersona ofer iordanes  
ET ABIIT ITERUM TRANS IORDANEN

on ðæt þ ðær stouue þ styd ðer uæs iohannes  
 IN EUM LOCUM UBI ERAT IOHANNES

fulguande þ clænsande ærist  
 BAPTIZANS PRIMUM  
 (J x/40)

Although we shall have reason to comment further on this kind of phenomenon below, it would appear from this last instance that in the glossator's grammar the determiner <þ> was not only no longer gender sensitive, it was also used to signal the status of introduced lexical information *irrespective of the morphological demands of surface case relationship marking*.

We can, lastly, mention at this point other uses of <þ stow> in locational contexts. These are not totally unlike those very first examples we discussed whereby unetymological <þ> fulfilled the function of highlighting the second mentioned of two identical NPs in a discourse. In the examples we are about to introduce we witness a usage whereby, although there is no shared phonological output in the surface syntax, we might postulate that the lexical configuration for the control, first mentioned, locational items under consideration is something like [*some place which is x*] where the variable in our data refers to the nouns <lehtun> (*masculine*) "garden" and <weg> (*masculine*) "road", thus

#### 2.6.3.i

uæs lehtun in ðone in-foerde he 7 ðegnas  
 ERAT HORTUS IN QUEM INTROUIT IPSE ET DISCIPULI

his wiste uutudlice 7 iudas þ stoue  
 EIUS SCIEBAT AUTEM ET IUDAS.... LOCUM  
 (J xviii/1-2)

#### 2.6.3.j

sacerd sum foerde ðailca wooge miððy  
 SACERDOS QUIDAM DESCENDERET EADEM UIA.....CUM

wæs neh þ stou  
 ESSET SECUS LOCUM

(L x/30-32)

We might include alongside these the single instance of the use of a "wrong" <þ> form in construction with the historically *feminine* <burg>. On the basis of our arguments so far we might suggest that in glossing the proper name CAPHARNAUM the determiner signals a single member class item: <infoerde in þ burug> /INTRAUT CAPHARNAUM (L vii/1) However, our enthusiasm for this explanation and perhaps many others of those offered so far should be tempered in the light of the occurrence of no fewer than four other cases where we find constructions like:

2.6.3.k

miððy	uutedlice	inn-eade	ł	inn-foerde	ða	burug
CUM	AUTEM			INTROISSET		CAPHARNAUM
7	infoerdon	capharnaum	ða	burug		
ET	INGREDIUNT			CAPHARNAUM		
				(Mk i/21)		

## 2.7 MORE "PRO" CONTEXTS FOR UNHISTORICAL &lt;P&gt;

Perhaps one of the features most characteristic of the late Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* lies in its use of the determiner <p>, regardless of etymological gender considerations, with nouns which refer to *parts of the body, the body itself, physical attributes and characteristics, dress and occupation*. This at first sight rather amorphous set of nominal reference appears to be associated with a single syntactic constraint concerning *pronominalization* in an NP<sub>i</sub> >/≡ NP<sub>i</sub> discourse situation. Perhaps we can best begin to illustrate this by an example involving the historically *feminine* noun <ansien> :

## 2.7.1.a

englas hiora in heofnum symle geseas  
 ANGELI EORUM IN CAELIS SEMPER UIDENT

ðone ansione faderes mines seðe in heofnum is  
 FACIEM PATRIS MEI QUI IN CAELIS EST  
 (Mt xviii/10)

## 2.7.1.b

miððy ondreardon ða ɏ uutedlice 7 ahældon  
 CUM TIMERUNT AUTEM ET DECLINAUERUNT

p onsion on eorðo  
 UULTUM IN TERRA  
 (L xxiv/5)

In both examples we have what looks like a "possessive" type construction: (a) "*my father's face*" and (b) "*They were afraid and cast down their sight upon the earth*". However, there is clearly at least one important difference between the two "possessives". Whereas the latter shows a discourse EQUI NP situation such that [*the men<sub>i</sub> were afraid and cast down the men's<sub>i</sub> sight upon the earth*], the former clearly does not, there being no previously mentioned or implied <onsion> in the context. In addition, the (b) type is often associated with what is referred to as *inalienable possession*, that is where the nature of the possession is not PARTITIVE (Anderson

(1975)). In an utterance such as "*I have a red chair*" the speaker is suggesting that from the possible set of all chairs he/she possesses one which happens to be *red*. On the other hand, an utterance such as "*John washed his face*" does not in the same way infer that from the possible set of faces in existence John washed the one which was *his*. At the same time, examples like the last involve the obligatory selection of a personal pronoun with the second of the two NPs: \*"*John washed the face*" where "*face*" in this context constitutes a (normally) inseparable characteristic of the subject noun's anatomical nature.

Instances like the above where parts of the body are concerned we might metaphorically suggest demonstrate a "close relationship" type of possession where separation of the possessor and possessed is not, under normal circumstances, achievable: they represent contexts where negation is not appropriate to the proposition \*"*John doesn't have his face*" whereas well formed is "*John doesn't have his car*". In our gloss there are quite a large number of unhistorical <þ> occurrences which appear in the slot where the modern language would compulsorily insert a pronominal possessive with an inalienably possessed noun (Postal (1966)):

#### 2.7.1.c

7 ðis miððy gecueð ædeaude him  
ET HOC CUM DIXISSET OSTENDIT EIS

ða hón d 7 ða sidu þ sidu  
MANUS LATUS  
(J xx/20)

where <sidu> is historically *feminine*. This is an interesting example where the scribe gives us an alternative syntactic output: the historical <ða> "object", singular, *feminine* marker alongside the "unhistorical" <þ> denoting that the "possessor" of the "side" is identical to the "subject" of OSTENDIT.

## 2.7.1.d

7 slog aldormonnes esne 7 ofcearf his  
 ET PERCUSSIT PONTIFICUS SERUUM ET ABSCIDIT EIUS

earlipprica þ suiðra  
 AURICULAM DEXTRAM

(J xviii/10)

where <þ suiðra> is, we claim, an equivalent signal for the <his> glossing *eius*. What is especially interesting in this case is that the scribe has consciously altered an original <ðio> determiner (reflecting the historical *feminine* gender of <eare-lipprič>) in favour of the <þ> indicator of inalienable possession.

Included here appear to be those cases of the unhistorical <þ> determiner with the item <gast>. If we isolate all the occurrences of <gast> in the gloss as a whole we see that whenever it glosses SPIRITUM to mean either "*the Holy Ghost*" or some "*unclean spirit*" then <ðone> determiner forms are used:

## 2.7.1.e

ðone gast adune stigende suælc culfræ  
 SPIRITUM DESCENDENTEM QUASI COLUMBAM  
 (J i/32, 33)

geðreade se hælend ðone gast unclænne  
 INCREPAUIT IESUS SPIRITUM INMUNDUM  
 (L ix/42)

as well as examples at (J iii/34) and (Mk iii/30). On the other hand, when we come across a <þ gast> gloss there is certainly little reason to explain it away in terms of Ross' *neutralization*, but it appears to represent an instance rather like those above relating to inalienable possession:

## 2.7.1.f

7 mið gebegdum heafde þ gesalde þ gást  
 ET INCLINATO CAPITE TRADIDIT SPIRITUM  
 (J xix/30)

*"He bowed his head and gave up his spirit"*

### 2.7.2 PHYSICAL CONDITION

Here we might include those cases where the noun in construction with unhistorical <þ> refers to a *disease* or *state of mental/ physical being*:

#### 2.7.2.a

7 cuedon him þte gioster doeġ ðios seofunda  
 ET DIXERUNT EI QUIA HERI HORA SEPTIMA  
 forleort hine þ feber-adol  
 RELIQUIT EUM FEBRIS  
 (J iv/52)

#### 2.7.2.b

7 sona Astod þ flowing blodes hire  
 ET CONFESTIM STETIT FLUXUS SANGUINIS EIUS  
 (L viii/44)

#### 2.7.2.c

miððy uutedlice hæfið acenned þ cnæht..  
 CUM AUTEM PEPPERIT PUERUM  
 ne gemynes þ ðæs hefignis þ ðæs ofersuiðunge þ  
 NON MEMINIT PRESSURAE  
 fore þ glædnise þ for gefea  
 PROPTER GAUDIUM  
 (J xvi/21)

Perhaps the <þ glædnise> case, while possibly denoting possession, might also be accounted for as a non-count (abstract) noun as were those instances under 2.6.2 above. Note too that the <þ cnæht> form in 2.7.2.c might just also be interpreted as "*her child*" but we shall postpone a full discussion of this difficult noun until later in the chapter. Perhaps under this general category we might also mention the use of unhistorical <þ> with the following: <cyrtil> (L vi/29); <metbælig> (L xxii/36) and <spræc> (L Cont xlvii).

## 2.8 &lt;þ&gt; AS A MARKER OF "INDEFINITENESS"

There still remains a fairly large number of unhistorical *neuter* <þ> forms which do not seem to fit readily under any of the proposals listed above. In addition, many of these instances are found in contexts providing the most glaring counter exemplification to Ross' *neutralization* hypothesis, i.e. in construction with lexical items like <moder> "mother" and <cnæht> "boy" which by no stretch of the imagination could be considered to be "asexual" or inanimate. Let us begin our examination of these remaining cases by considering the distribution of definite article forms in the gloss with the historically *masculine* noun <cniht>. There are more than a dozen places where the noun appears with unambiguous *masculine* gender <ðe>, <ðone> forms in the gloss and in all these cases reference is being made to either the young Christ or the young John the Baptist, consider:

## 2.8.a

(1) se cnæht hælend  
 PUER IESUS (L ii/40, 43)

(2) se cnæht ðonne gewax  
 PUER AUTEM CRESCEBAT (L i/80)

and see also (L i/59), (L i/66), (L ii/27), (Mt ii/10–15). However there is one case where the boy being identified is one who has been cured of possession by an evil spirit and we cite it because it bears an interesting comparison with others which follow

## 2.8.b

geðreade se hælend ðone gast unclænne 7  
 INCREPAUIT IESUS SPIRITUM INMUNDUM ET

gehælde ðone cnæht 7 Agæf hine fæder his  
 SANAUTI PUERUM ET REDDIDIT ILLUM PATRI EIUS  
 (L ix/42)

but compare this with the passage:

2.8.c

7 on-feng þ cnæht gesette hine in middum hiora  
 ET ACCIPIENS PUERUM STATUIT EUM IN MEDIO EORUM  
 (Mk ix/36)

"and he took a little child and set it down in their midst"

No previous mention has been made of this child and there is certainly no shared writer-reader knowledge of it. The <þ> form would appear to be indicating that new information is being introduced into the discourse. Even though it is quite the opposite kind of usage from that we have highlighted for unhistorical <þ> in what has gone before, we might argue that the <þ> determiner here signifies a quantifier like "a" or "any". That this is indeed the case becomes even more possible when we consider the instance from (L xviii/17):

2.8.d

soðlice ic cuoeðo iuh seðe suahuælc ne  
 AMEN DICO UOBIS QUI-CUMQUE NON

on-foeð ric god suæ þ cnæht ne in-cymeð  
 ACCEPERIS REGNUM DEI SICUT PUER NON INTRABIT

in ðæt ilce  
 IN ILLUD

Once more no previously contextually introduced child is represented and the <þ> would seem to signify quantification like "any" or, indeed, relate to those *GENERIC* instances we discussed above under 2.6.2. We might even explain the single occurrence of <þ moder> in these terms as well. The relevant passage is from (L Cont xxviii):

## 2.8.e

7 ða þ moder 7 broðro ceigendo cuoeð ðaðe  
 ET EOS MATREM FRATRESQUE UOCANDOS AIT QUI

fadores doende willo  
 PATRIS FECERINT UOLUNTATEM

and refers, presumably, to the Gospel passage (L viii/19–21): *mater mea et fratres mei hi sunt qui uerbum dei audiunt et faciunt*. Clearly no reference is being made to any "mother" previously discussed or to be discussed in the discourse. Rather we might tentatively suggest that the passage implies a sentiment like "*those people are like my mother and brothers who..*" where "mother" and "brothers" are to be seen as having some kind of indefinite "any" type quantifier. On the other hand, 2.8.e might just be included under a kind of "inalienable possession" heading.

It is interesting in this context too to take a close look at the occurrences of the historically *neuter* lexical item <cild>. Ross' hypothesis would suggest that this human animate should only occur with *masculine* gender markers and, indeed, it does so in those cases where a *human, ergative, animate* context is evident, for instance in:

## 2.8.f

gefeade se cild In inna hire  
 EXULTAUT INFANS IN UTERO EIUS  
 (L i/41,44)

However, the "historical" *neuter* form of the definite article is confined to cases where – although the conditions of animateness and human-ness (but not ergativity) still persist – the discourse clearly points to a *first mention, new information* situation and an "indefinite" quantifier like "a":

## 2.8.g

7 ðis iuh tacon l becon gie gemoetes iñ  
 ET HOC UOBIS SIGNUM INUENIETIS

þ cild mið cild-claðum iñbewunden 7 gesetted  
**INFANTEM PANNIS INUOLUNTUM ET POSITUM**

in binne  
**IN PRAESEPIO (L ii/12)**

"*And this is your sign; you will find  
a baby wrapped...."*

### 2.9 INTRODUCTION OF NEW DATA INTO THE DISCOURSE

Our discussion above describes what is probably the majority distribution of unhistorical <þ> determiners in our gloss but still leaves unaccounted for what are quite an interesting set of usages. While these do not fall so neatly together as some of those we have been considering above, we nevertheless feel that we might put forward some proposals — all be they rather tentative — for the motivation which underlies their introduction, all the while conscious that we may be falling into the trap of imposing a too-subtle interpretation upon what is after all a very limited data set. It seems to be the case that, as well as "refering back" to previously introduced, identical reference lexical materials in a discourse, our innovative <þ> form might be used as a means whereby *new* information, information which is to be further commented upon, is put before us. Consider the following instance:

#### 2.9.a

ðæm geonduærde se hælend hé is ðæm ic  
**CUI RESPONDIT IESUS ILLE EST CUI EGO**

þ tobrocene þ laf rahte þ ic ræco uællo 7 mið-ðy  
**INTUNCTUM PORREXERO ET CUM**

gebræc þ þ láf salde iude simonis  
**INTINXISSET PANEM DEDIT IUDAS SIMONIS**  
**(J xiii/26-27)**

where <(h)laf> is historically *masculine*. The passage might be rendered as "*it is the man to whom I give this piece of bread when I have dipped it in the dish. Then after dipping it in the dish, he took it out and gave it to*

*Judas*". The second <þ láf> clearly falls under our category 2.1 above where we have reference back to some identical NP and the possibility of pronominalization at the <þ láf> slot in the sentence. The first <þ> with <laf>, we wish to claim, introduces its noun as new information, further to be commented upon and as such performs the same function as "*this*" in the modern language.

Perhaps even clearer instances of this usage can be seen with the nouns <geddung> (*feminine*) and <bisene> (*feminine*) glossing PARABOLA:

## 2.9.b

(1) ðas ðæm geherendum to-geécdē cuoeð  
HAEC ILLIS AUDIENTIBUS ADICIENS DIXIT

þ geddung  
PARABOLAM

(L xix/11)

(2) cuoeð ða æc ðæt biseno to him  
DICEBAT AUTEM ET PARABOLAM AD ILLOS  
(L xviii/1)

where the discourse proceeds to elaborate upon the details of the parable in each case, a situation perhaps most transparently to be seen in the example involving the non-human animate historically *masculine* <folia>:

## 2.9.c

7 cuoeð ðæm gaað in burig in gie onfindes  
ET AIT ILLIS ITE IN CASTELLUM INUENIETIS

þ folia gebunden ofer þ on ðene ne ænig get  
PUULUM LIGATUM SUPER QUEM NEMO ADHUC

monna gesæt  
HOMINUM SEDIT  
(Mk xi/2)

It would seem perhaps possible to think of these kinds of cases as being related to those we discussed under 2.6.3

where the information appropriate to <þ>-marked *locational* nouns is supplied by a following restrictive relative modifying clause: <þ styd ðer ahoen uæs>/LOCO UBI CRUCIFIXUS EST (J xix/41). However, there are many examples which suggest that the unhistorical <þ> form is coming to be used as a marker of simple "indefiniteness", identified with quantifiers like "some" even in situations where the discourse provides no new information relating to the item in question:

## 2.9.d

- (1) 7 cuomon in hus 7 gesæh þ wanung (F)  
 ET UENIUNT IN DOMUM..ET UIDET TUMULTUM  
 (Mk v/38)
- (2) efne-sprecendum ðegnum astod on middum  
 CONLOQUENTIBUS DISCIPULIS ADSTANS IN MEDIO  
 coue (*sic*) sibh iuh 7 ða get forhtende  
 DICT PAX UOBIS ET ADHUC PAUENTES  
 7 þ gast woendum æd-eaudnise  
 SPIRITUMQUE PUTANTES OSTENSIONE  
 (L Cont xciiii)
- (3) 7 ða ðegnas gewundum ɬ uunden of ðornum  
 ET MILITES PLECTENTES  
 ða corona þ sigbeg of ðornum gesetton hæfde  
 CORONAM DE SPINIS IMPOSUERUNT CAPITI  
 his  
 EIUS  
 (J xix/2-3)
- (4) 7 miððy ðis dydon efne-gebegdon fiscana  
 ET CUM HOC FECISSENT CONCLUSERUNT PISCUM  
 þ menigo  
 MULTITUDINEM  
 (L v/6)  
 "and when they did this they captured a large  
 number of fish"

Consider too the following contrasting examples where the historically *masculine* noun <here> "crowd" appears with etymological and unetymological determiner forms. In the first instance the biblical context is one where the presence of a crowd or multitude has been immediately previously mentioned, while in the second the presence of the crowd represents a new element in the discourse:

## 2.9.e

- (1) 7 mið ðy geheht ɏ gehatend wæs ȿone menig ɏ  
 ET CUM IUSISSET

ȿone here                        ofer heg ɏ gers  
 TURBAM            DISCUMBERE    SUPER FAENUM  
 (L xiv/19)

- (2) forȿon ȿaget hine spreccende heono  
 ATHUC EO LOQUENTE ECCE

þ here ɏ ȿa menigo  
 TURBA  
 (L xxii/47)

"and while he was speaking a crowd appeared"

2.10 *UNHISTORICAL MASCULINE AND FEMININE  
 GENDER DETERMINER FORMS*

While there can be no doubt that the statistically most frequent "incorrect" ungrammatical gender definite article determiner forms are <þ> types, we nevertheless come across substantial numbers of cases in the gloss to these Gospels where with etymological *neuter* nouns there are attached determiner forms appropriate to *masculines* and *feminines*. Likewise historically *feminine* nouns appear in construction with *masculine* definite determiners and vice versa. Our discussion of this kind of ungrammaticality will lead us into difficult areas and our conclusions should be viewed as tentative ones only. Two principal motivations for such forms will be offered. The first, applying mainly to unetymological <ȿone> and <ȿæm> forms, will suggest that article morphology is being innovatorily used to show *CASE RELATIONSHIPS* holding between various items

within propositions and to this we shall turn our attention in section 2.11. More immediately, we shall take up once more the idea that unhistorical determiner forms are used in a "discourse tracking" function or as a means of indicating the level of speaker/hearer shared information concerning lexical items in the discourse. While it is very likely that the finer points of the latter's expression probably represent a usage specific to the linguistic habits of the glossator, we shall hope to show that the *CASE RELATIONSHIP* indicating characteristic of the determiner morphology marks the beginnings of a set of grammatical innovations to be found repeated and developed in texts over the next few hundred years.

Nearly all commentators upon the anomalous gender system in our gloss make much of the two "unhistorical" occurrences of a *feminine* definite article in construction with the *masculine* and *neuter* nouns: <ðære wingarde> (OE <wingeard> "vineyard") and <ðære mægdne> (OE <mægden> "maiden"), citing influence both from the gender of the Latin word glossed as well as the dictates of natural gender for the "*gender change*" involved (Waring (1886) p. cxxii; Ross (1935) p. 325). Let us begin by examining, in a fairly extended way, the discourse stretches in which the noun <mægden> appears in the gloss. There are two places where the unhistorical <ðære> determiner appears with the noun and, interestingly, they are in "parallel" passages recording the same event in different Gospels. These relate the account of Jesus curing a young girl from an apparently fatal illness and are to be found at (Mk v/39 ff) and (L viii/49 ff). For the purposes of our argument it will be essential to cite these passages at some length – c.f. 2.10.a on page 72:

## 2.10.a

dead is dohter ðin nælle ðu gestyrege hine  
 MORTUA EST FILIA TUA NON VEXARE ILLUM.

se hælend ða miððy geherde ðis word geonsuarede  
 IESUS AUTEM AUDITO HOC UERBO RESPONDIT

feder ðære mædne nælle ðu ondrede gelef ana  
 PATRI PUELLAE NOLI TIMERE CREDE TANTUM

7 hal hio bið 7 miððy gecuome to hame ne  
 ET SALUA ERIT ET CUM UENISSET DOMUM NON

gelefde ingeonga mið ænig buta petrum  
 PERMISIT INTRARE SECUM QUEM-QUAM NISI PETRUM

fader 7 moder ðære mædne gewoepon ðonne  
 .... PATREM ET MATREM PUELLAE. PLEBANT AUTEM

alle 7 mændon ða ilca soð he cuoeð  
 OMNES ET PLANGEBANT ILLAM AT ILLE DIXIT

nallað ge woepa ne Is dead Ah slepeð 7  
 NOLITE FLERE NON EST MORTUA SED DORMIT ET

hlogun þ teldon hine hia wiston þte dead were  
 DERIDEANT EUM SCIENTES QUA MORTUA ESSET

he ða geheald hond his cliopade cuoeðende  
 IPSE AUTEM TENENS MANUM EIUS CLAMAUIT DICENS

la mægden aris 7 eft-awoende wæs gaast  
 PUELLA SURGE. ET REUERSUS EST SPIRITUS

hire þ ðæra 7 aras ræcone 7 heht  
 EIUS ET SURREXIT CONTINUO ET IUSSIT

hir sealla eatta  
 ILLI DARI MANDUCARE

(L viii/49-55)

Some of the above glosses would tend to lend strong support both to proponents of natural sex and Latin influence. A glossed exemplar like PUELLA with its unambiguous animate, female human reference would seem to make such proposals irresistible. However, despite the anaphoric <hio> (even where there is no Latin pronominal form to be glossed) and the <hire l ðæra>, <hire> in glossing contexts where the Latin form is non sex specific, we still find EIUS glossed by <his>; if we were to argue that the <ðære mægdne> forms reflect an expression of the human female sex of the referent, then we might at least expect the anaphoric marking to be more consistent in that respect. However, the case for sex marking at least seems to be still further reduced when we come to consider the parallel passage to that from (Mk v/39–42):

## 2.10.b

7 in-eode cuoeð to him huætd l forhuon  
ET INGRESSUS AIT EIS QUID

arogie gestyred 7 gie hremas þ mædgen ne  
TURBAMINI ET PLORATIS PUELLA NON

is dead ah slepeð genom ðone fæder 7  
EST MORTUA SED DORMIT...ADSUMIT PATREM ET

moder ðæra mædne 7 infoerde ðer wæs  
MATREM PUELLAE...ET INGREDITUR UBI ERAT

ðæt mæden liande 7 geheald hond dære mægdne  
PUELLA IACENS. ET TENENS MANUM PUELLAE

cuoeð to hir 7 sona aras þ mædgen  
AIT ILLI... ET CONFESTIM SURREXIT PUELLA

It would surely be most unlikely, were the <ðære> forms an attempt to deliberately contravene gender grammaticality for the purpose of marking female sex, that the scribe would in such close proximity to these innovations retain the <þ> neuter determiner. It seems significant that these ungrammatical <ðære> with <mægdne> forms only recur in Gospel passages recounting the same events and in which the discourse relationship

between the nominal lexical items is alike. Given that they do not recur at random in the gloss, we might tentatively suggest that in this particular "possessive" case shape, the unhistorical <ðære> forms perform the same kind of tracking function in the above discourses that we suggested was such a notable feature of <þ>. The passages above show clear instances where there is a sequential expression in the discourse of two co-referential nouns, where the second mentioned is given a surface determiner <ðære> shape to denote its EQUI status *vis-à-vis* the first. In the above passages, <ðære> is the equivalent of <þ> in "possessive" contexts. We might ask, of course, of the two available possessive definite determiners (<ðæs> and <ðære>) why one rather than another should be "selected" for this item in discourse tracking function. We shall elaborate upon the reasons for just such a choice in the following section.

But before we leave off our discussion of unetymological <ðære> determiner forms, we must consider one other often debated instance. There are several places in the gloss where the historically *masculine* noun <wingeard> occurs with this determiner shape. Glossing the Latin item VINEA, it must be stressed that the unetymological *feminine* determiner form is nowhere to be found with <wingeard> in the Gospels other than in "possessive" contexts. There are, however, several instances of the noun in construction with <þ>:

#### 2.10.c

7 ongann ðæm ɏ him on bispellum sprecca  
 ET COEPIT ILLIS IN PARABOLIS LOQUI

wingeard gesette monn 7 sende to lond-buendum  
 VINEAM PASTINAUIT HOMO..ET MISIT AD AGRICOLAS

on tid esne þte from ðæm lond-buendum  
 IN TEMPORE SERUUM UT AD AGRICOLIS

onfenge of wæstm ðære wingarde 7  
 ACCIPERIT DE FRUCTU UINEAE ET

gelahton hine ofslogon 7 gewurpon  
APPREHENDENTES EUM OCCIDERUNT ET EIECERUNT

buta ðæm wingeard hwæt ofðon doeð hlaferd  
EXTRA UINEAM. QUID ERGO FACIET DOMINUS

ðære wingarde cymeð 7 fordoeð ða lond-buendo  
UINEAE UENIET ET PERDET COLONOS

7 seleð þ wingeard oðrum  
ET DABIT UINEAM aliis

To Ross ((1935) p. 323, note 7) such unetymological *feminine* forms pose no problem since, he asserts, they are witness to a change to a *weak* declensional form of the noun and hence to the *feminine* gender:

"ðære wingarde is a weak form corresponding to Mdu. *gaerde* feminine, not a strong masculine like OE *geard*...The form is probably weak: cf. Goth. *garda*, OHG (*win*)*garto*, MLG (*win*)*garte*, OFris *garda* masc., Mdu. *garda* masc. and fem. The feminine gender in *Lindisfarne* is old and not due to any Northumbrian change in gender; cf. the gender in MDu."

It is certainly true that the noun morphology of <*wingeard*> varies systematically in the gloss in the possessive according to the shape of the determiner in construction with it. When "historical" *masculine* <ðæs> forms are present, the head noun in the NP appears as <*wingeardes*> - cf. (L xx/13,15); (L xiii/7). <ðære> determiners appear to trigger <*wingeard+e*> shapes. This might at least suggest that there are two different declensional versions of the noun in the lexicon, each with a distinct gender allocation. Indeed, we could argue further for such a proposal from that fact that in the last two contexts where <ðæs *wingeardes*> is found, we simultaneously witness <*buta ðæm wingarde*>/EXTRA UINEAM, while in the contexts with <*ðære wingarde*> possessives, the same Latin phrase is glossed by <*buta ðæm wingard*>. However, a singular noun morphological class with <-e> possessives and <-ð> locatives is hardly typical of any declensional type in the gloss (Ross and

Stanley (1963), Book Two, pp 40–41).

But that we are in fact dealing with a genuine feminine item <wingeard(e)> is surely belied by three considerations. Firstly, the *feminine* determiner only occurs in this "possessive" context: were the noun even occasionally derived from some weak *feminine* source we might expect to find <sio> and <ða> determiner forms in construction with it as well. Secondly, and reinforcing the first point, why should we find, as we do in the passage just cited, *feminine* and *non-feminine* forms in such close proximity to each other? Surely, having selected a weak morphological variant of the item, the glossator might reasonably be expected, in the absence of any influencing factors, to be consistent in his use. This last point is even clearer in the "parallel" Gospel passage to the one above at (Mt xxi/33–41) where we find a sequence like: <ðone wingeard...buta ðæm wingeard...hlaferd ðære win–gearde...þ wingeard>. Thirdly, as with the <ðære mægdne> cases, the unhistorical <ðære wingarde> forms only appear in what are identical parable environments where the same kinds of internal discourse relationships hold. Here again we should like to suggest that the <ðære> definite article shapes are acting as a signal that a co-referential relationship exists between the noun with which they are in construction and some previously mentioned identical NP. This might seem especially likely in a context such as that in 2.10.c where the unhistorical use of <þ> with <wingeard> has so transparently just such an identical NP marking function.

Consider again:

2.10.d

gaað 7 gie in win-geard miððy efern þ ic sædi  
ITE ET UOS IN UINEAM. CUM SERO

uutedlice geworden wäre cuoeð hlafard  
AUTEM FACTUM ESSET DICIT DOMINUS

ðære win-gearde  
UINEA

(Mt xx/7–8)

where a modern rendering such as "*the master of that (same) vineyard*" would not be out of place for the <ðære wingarde> gloss.

There is one other noun – <(h)rip> (*neuter*) – which also appears with a <ðære> possessive determiner form, but whose regular morphology makes no suggestion that we are to treat it as some kind of "old" Northumbrian "weak" feminine form related to or cognate with some randomly selected items in other Germanic languages. The context in which we find it would seem strongly to suggest that the <ðære> has some kind of "back reference" function:

#### 2.10.e

7 cuoeð him hrippes soðlice feolo wyrendra  
ET DICEBAT ILLIS MESSIS QUIDEM MULTA OPERARI

uutedlice huon beddað forðon drihten  
AUTEM PAUCI ROGATE ERGO DOMINUM

ðære hrippes þte gesende woercmenn on ohtrippe  
MESSIS UT MITTAT OPERARIOS IN MESSEM

his  
EIUS

(L x/2)

*"He said to them: "The crop is heavy but labourers are scarce; You must therefore beg the owner of the crop to send labourers to harvest his crop".*

However, we need to temper our assertion concerning this proposed "demonstrative" role for the <ðære> determiner, since there are three cases where conditions for its use are met, but where "historical" <ðæs> forms still surface, c.f.:

## 2.10.f

monn gesette wingeard 7 ageaf t hia  
 HOMO PLANTAVIT UINEAM ET LOCAUIT EAM

ðæm buendum sende to bigengum esne þte of  
 COLONIS....MISIT AD CULTORES SERUUM UT DE

uæstm ðæs wingardes þte saldon cuoeð  
 FRUCTU UINEAE DARENT... DIXIT

ða t uutedlice hlaferd ðæs wingardes  
 AUTEM DOMINUS UINEAE

huæd ic do  
 QUID FACIAM

(L xx/9-13)

and also (L xx/15), (L xiii/6-7).

There are still a few unhistorical <ðære> forms in locative case contexts and some "object" <ða> forms which we shall leave for consideration until 2.12 and 2.13 below.

2.11 *UNHISTORICAL MASCULINE FORMS*

If we are so far correct in our claim that unhistorical gender determiner forms — especially those involving <þ> — are being utilized by the glossator as a means of tracking discourse connections, we have to ask the question: what happens in those instances where two co-referential NPs in the discourse are in the *neuter* gender in "subject" or "object" case contexts? We suggested above (see p. 48) that we might even interpret an "historical" <þ> in some instances as having a non-grammatical gender marking function, but one of "reference back":

## 2.11.a

7 ymb-sceawade to geseanne hia t ða ilco ðiu  
 ET CIRCUMSPICIEBAT UIDERE EAM QUAE

ðis dyde þ wif uutedlice ondreard  
 HOC FECERAT MULIER AUTEM TIMENS  
 (Mk v/32-33)

perhaps more especially when the determiner occurs in construction with <ilca>:

2.11.b

cuom uif of ðær byrig to ládanne uæter cuæð  
UENIT MULIER DE SAMARIA HAURIRE AQUAM..DICIT

forðon to him þ ilca uif  
ERGO EI MULIER ILLA  
(J iv/7-9)

However, we might very tentatively suggest that there are occasions where, when the first mentioned N of two sequential co-referents in a discourse is *neuter*, then the second takes a *masculine* <ðone> marker (irrespective of gender considerations) just to manifest this shared speaker/hearer knowledge relationship. Consider the passage from (L vi/41–42) illustrated at 2.11.c. on page 80. Here there would appear to be some kind of interplay between *neuter* and *masculine* definite determiner forms within a short area of discourse, between the items <mot> (*neuter*) and <beam> (*masculine*). We have marked historical grammatical gender with <†>, unhistorical with <\*>. It is interesting to notice that each noun has three mentions in the passage, the unhistorical gender occurrences appearing (as we are by now accustomed to observe) at *the second mention slot*. The sequence <ðone beam (*masculine*)...þ beam> accords well with our claims above concerning unhistorical <þ> forms. However, we also wish to air the suggestion here that the sequence <þ lytle mot (*neuter*)...ðone mot> reflects a similar discourse relationship, on this occasion the unhistorical <ðone> acting as though it were a <þ> shape. Conscious that our discourse tracking hypothesis might be open to the charge of being unconstrained, we are nevertheless arguing that linguistic change is here taking place in a direction where speakers are using all available surface contrasts in the service of an innovative rule process whereby phonological determiner shapes are being utilized to mark relationships between items in discourse: <Ø + N<sub>1</sub> (*masculine/feminine*)...þ + N<sub>1</sub>> sequences can also be rendered as <þ + N<sub>1</sub> (*neuter*)...ðone + N<sub>1</sub>>.

## 2.11.c

huæd ðonne gesiist ðu tþ lytle mot in ego  
 QUID AUTEM UIDES FESTUCAM IN OCULO

broðeres ðines tðone beam uutedlice ðio in ego  
 FRATRES TUI TRABEM AUTEM QUAE IN OCULO

ðinum is ne efne-sceauas ðu 7 hu mæht ðu  
 TUO EST NON CONSIDERAS ET QUOMODO POTES

cuoæða broðre ðinum broðer forlet þte ic aworpo  
 DICERE FRATRI TUO FRATER SINE EICIAM

\*ðone mot of ego ðinum he in ego ðinum  
 FESTUCAM DE OCULO TUO IPSE IN OCULO TUO

\*þ beam ne gesiis ðu la legere aworp  
 TRABEM NON UIDENS HYPOCRITA EICE

ær ist tðone beam of ego ðinum 7 ðonne  
 PRIMUM TRABEM DE OCULO TUO ET TUNC

ðu eft-locas þte ðu ofgebrenge tðæt mot  
 RESPICIES UT EDUCAS FESTUCAM

of ego broðeres ðines  
 DE OCULO FRATRIS TUI

Perhaps these comments can be applied to the parallel Gospel passage at (Mt vii/3–5) where we have a <ø + mot (*neuter*)...ðone mot> sequence as well.

Finally, and equally speculatively, we might point to the use of the unhistorical "subject" <se> form in construction with the historically *feminine* <stefn> in a discourse environment much like the preceding:

2.11.d

7 stefn aworden wæs of ðæm wolcne cuoeðende  
ET VOX FACTA EST DE NUBE DICENS..

7 miððy wæs se stefn gemoetad wæs  
ET CUM FIERET UOX INUENTUS EST  
(L ix/35-35)

"then a voice came from the cloud...when that voice was heard.."

2.12 DETERMINER MORPHOLOGY AS A REFLECTION OF  
THE CASE RELATIONSHIPS HOLDING BETWEEN  
ARGUMENTS IN PROPOSITIONS

We must always be careful to bear in mind that, despite the number of instances we have cited above, unhistorical gender NP internal constructions are rare in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. They represent a minority usage, the start up of what was to become a more or less successful set of syntactic innovations in the grammar of Middle English. They by no means dominate the syntactic/morphological characteristics of the language of our gloss and definite determiner usage is by and large much like that found in "classical" West Saxon texts. We have attempted to show, however, that what innovation there is in the gender congruence system was not motivated particularly by any desire to reflect extra-linguistic sex/animacy contrasts, nor could it be regarded as a purely local phenomenon brought about by the influence upon the glossator of the gender of the Latin items being glossed, except in special circumstances which we have highlighted. Rather, if there was any "system" lying behind the ungrammatical gender agreements between determiners and their nouns, it reflected (1) the deictic semantics of the noun itself; whether an item was count/non-count, a single member class type or one involving "inalienable possession" (2) perhaps more generally, the use of unhistorical <þ> forms as a mechanism for "tracking" discourse relationships and reflecting areas where speaker/hearer knowledge concerning the referential criteria of particular items was "shared". (For a similar discourse tracking function involving gender marking morphology in

languages like Yimas and Alamblak, see Foley and van Valin (1984), pp. 361–367)

However, we should not forget that the West Saxon determiner system even though it had a clear discourse marking potential and could be used in ways which signalled the semantic classification of noun "classes" (Mitchell (1986), §§ 220–241), had also an important morphological role to play as a mechanism for reflecting *case relationships holding between arguments in propositions*. That is, the set of arguments pertaining within the domain of a proposition could be reflected in the morphology of the determiners in the NP as well as through that of the noun itself. What we shall wish to propose in this section is that a particular "set" of determiner morphological expressions was coming to be utilized as a means of signalling certain kinds of case relationships appropriate to sentential arguments. We shall attempt to show too that there was phonetic motivation for the "selection" of individual case relationship expressing morphological shapes. The innovative rules we shall propose are, however, to be seen as constituting what was probably a "minor" system, one which only became fully developed in later, Middle English texts.

The standard handbooks dealing with West Saxon normally portray its inflectional system (both nominal and determiner) as reflecting (through a variety of case forms) four principal case relationships in the singular number (Wagner (1969), pp. 271 ff; Wardale (1955), § 137; Mitchell and Robinson (1968), § 193). These are normally referred to under such nomenclatures as "subject" or "nominative"; "object" or "accusative"; "possessive" or "genitive" and "dative": see Hawkins (1986) pp. 18–26). The syntactic/semantic nature of such "cases" has, in recent years, been the subject of considerable debate and it is probably true to assert that constructs like those above have been shown to be grossly inadequate as characterizations of inter-argument relationships in natural languages. We shall not attempt to summarize this large literature in a monograph like this, rather we shall follow Anderson ((1971) and (1977)), Böhm (1982) and to some extent Fillmore (1968) by envisaging only *three* possible types of *case relationship* and where these case relationships are to be expressed in what are essentially *localist* terms. A full set of definitions and descriptions of these three case

relationships is available in the above mentioned works and we shall only attempt summarized versions here:

(1) *ERGATIVE*: the animate instigator (*source*) of the verbal activity

(2) *LOCATIVE*: the directionality associated with the verbal activity. This is usually treated as being either a *source* (ablative) or a *goal* (locative) type perhaps relatable to the presence or absence of a negative adjunct in complex case predication, such that "*the train left London*" can be equated with "*the train came to not be in London*" (Anderson (1977), pp 101–102).

(3) *ABSOLUTIVE*: the *neutral* case: the noun "affected" or "located" by the action implicit in the semantics of the verb itself. Thus, in a proposition like "*John pulled Paul from the room into the corridor*", arguments like *John* and *Paul* are to be treated as ERGATIVE and ABSOLUTIVE respectively, while *room* and *corridor* represent, in turn, LOCATIVE case relationships of a source and goal type.

In addition, these case expressions should be thought of as being able to operate at two "levels" as they relate to propositions. On the one hand they can act as *PARTICIPANTS internally in propositions*; that is, they constitute an expression of the semantic characteristics of predicates. Thus the prepositional phrase "*from the bow to the target*" in the sentence "*The arrow flew from the bow to the target*" serves to identify a predicate like "*fly*" as a *directional* (source/goal) type. On the other hand, case expression can be *extra-propositional*, commenting not on any individual argument, but on the proposition as a whole. Such is the prepositional phrase in the sentence "*From that time on John hated Paul*". Case relationships of this type are referred to as *CIRCUMSTANTIALS* (Halliday (1968)).

We are unable to provide an exhaustive description here of the ways in which West Saxon Old English expressed case relationships like the above either morphologically or serially (Mitchell (1986), pp. 528 ff) although it is important to observe that there was no one-to-one correspondence between morphological *case form* and a particular *case relationship*. While "nominative" determiner shapes such as <se> and <ðe> could on occasion represent case relationships like ergativity,

and <ðone>, <ða> and <þ> concur with absolute expressions, they were just as likely to appear in other argument contexts as well. Consider, for instance, sentences like <ðe monn slepte> and <se mona and ealle steorran underfoþ leoht of ðære sunnan> where the <se/ðe> + N constructions would appear to express *absolutive* and *locative (goal)* arguments respectively. Again, the *absolutive* case relationship (the affected, located person or object) is often superficially expressed in classical West Saxon by case form morphologies appropriate to the "dative" and "possessive". Consider the "object" nouns after the verbs <cweman> "*to please*", <brucan> "*to enjoy*" and <ciddan> "*to blame*" in the following:

## 2.12.a

<seo meinigu...ciddon ðam blīdan>  
                   "*the crowd rebuked the blind man*"  
 <hu he ēode gecweme>   "*how he pleased God*"  
 <bruc ðisses beages>   "*use this collar*"

Again, "accusative"/"object" and "possessive" case forms can be used in West Saxon to denote what are clearly *locative* (directional/goal orientated) case relationships, thus:

## 2.12.b

<Hi wendon him suðweard oðres weges>  
                   "*they went southwards by another route*"  
 <Abraham ða ham gecyrde>  
                   "*then Abraham returned to his home*"  
 <Iohannes..eode wið þas Hælendes>  
                   "*John went along with the Lord*"  
 <Gif ðe cymst on ðone weg and to ðære stowe>  
                   "*If you come by the road to the place*"

(Mitchell (1986), § 1256; § 1386).

Central to much of what follows in this chapter and, indeed, in the remainder of the book will be the proposal that the internalized rule system of the grammar of late Old English and early Middle English was reorganized such that certain morphological shapes were "selected" (regardless of any significance they may have once had for denoting

the inherent gender class of their noun) for their value as *markers of case relationships holding between arguments in propositions*. Definite determiner shapes like <ðæt> were equivocal for "subject"/"object" expression, while <ðære> was a case form utilized in both "possessive" and "dative" contexts. On the other hand, <-ne>, <-s> and <-m> morphological configurations phonetically unambiguously signalled "object", "possessive" and "dative". Our claim will be that, outwith any concern to congruentially indicate nominal gender, <-m> determiner morphological shapes were being used to signal particular types of *locative*, those in <-ne> to mark the *absolutive*, while <-s> types were being generalized to cover that range of case relationships included under the "possessive"/"genitive". Perhaps we can best begin at least to illustrate the principle behind this argument by considering the following passage from (Mk xii/30–33):

### 2.12.c

7 lufa ðu drihten god ðin of alra heorta ðin  
 ET DILEGES DOMINUM DEUM TUUM EX TOTO CORDE TUO

7 of alra sauel ðin 7 (\*)of alra ðoht ðin 7  
 ET EX TOTA ANIMA TUA ET EX TOTA MENTE TUA ET

(\*)of alra mægne ðin...7 þte sie gelufad  
 EX TOTA UIRTUTE TUA...ET UT DILICATUR

of allra heorte 7 (\*)of allra ondget 7  
 EX TOTO CORDE ET EX TOTO INTELLECTU ET

of allra sawele 7 of alra strengo  
 EX TOTA ANIMA ET EX TOTA FORTITUDINE

(cf also (L x/27)). We have used (\*) to mark unhistorical gender congruences between the *feminine* morphological shape <al(l)ra> and the items <ðoht> (*masculine*), <mægen> (*neuter*) and <andget> (*neuter*). One could imagine many scholars arguing that the "new" *feminine* indicators with such nouns shows that they have undergone a "change of gender" either due to the influence of the nearby presence of other *feminine* items or to their (however contrived) semantic relatedness to such nouns or

others in the lexicon with a *feminine* gender. Our contention, on the other hand, is that what is "repeated" in the recurrent <al(l)ra> determiner shapes is not the gender of, say, <heorte> but the *case relationship* all the nouns in the prepositional phrases have with the sentential predicate <lufa>. The exact nature of this relationship need not concern us here — although "*with all your heart*" is clearly not *instrumental*, but perhaps represents some kind of (extra-propositional/circumstantial) sentential "manner" adverbial clause. What we are claiming is that, whatever the status of the nominal arguments <heorta>, <sael>, <ðoht>, <onget>, <mægen> and <streng> in the above sample, *it is shared between them and the main verb and, once "established" by an <alra> signal, is repeated as such in each NP throughout the predication.*

### 2.13 LOCATIVE (DIRECTIONAL) CASE EXPRESSION

The gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* shows a fairly large number of instances where a definite article <ðæm> shape or other determiner forms (notably "strong" adjectives and possessive pronouns) with <-(u)m> morphology are found in agreement with historically *feminine* nouns (Jones (1964), pp. 26–27; 47–48; 52–53). Although the relative paucity of the data makes it impossible for any wholly unified explanation for such occurrences to be offered with too much confidence, a few fairly clear patterns seem to emerge. Let us begin our discussion by considering the historically *feminine* noun <tid> which appears in construction on many occasions with "wrong" <ðæm> "dative" definite articles:

#### 2.13.a

- (1) in ðæm tid gefeade gaste halige  
 IN IPSA HORA EXULTAUT SPIRITU SANCTO  
 "At that moment Jesus exalted in the Holy Spirit"  
 (L x/21)

- (2) tu-cuomon ða sumo ðæm on tid  
 ADERANT AUTEM QUIDAM IPSO IN TEMPORE  
 "At that time there were people present"  
 (L xxx/1)

(3) ða uðuto to sendanne in hine hondo ðæm tid  
 SCRIBAE MITTERE IN ILLUM MANUS ILLA HORA  
*"The scribes wanted to lay hands on him there and then"*

(L xx/19)

(4) 7 gehæled wæs cnæht in ðit (sic) ðæm  
 ET SANATUS EST PUER IN HORA ILLA  
*"And at that moment the boy was cured"*

(Mt viii/18)

and also the instances at (Mt xii/1); (Mt xiv/1); (Mt xviii/1); (Mt xxvi/55) and (Mk xiii/11). Compare these with "historical" <ðære tid> constructions:

### 2.13.b

(1) 7 of ðær tid onfeng hia l ða ilca se ðegn  
 ET EX ILLA HORA ACCEPIT EAM DISCIPULUS

in his hagen  
 IN SUA

*"And from that moment the disciple took her into his home"*

(J xix/27)

(2) of ðær tid se ðreat miðøy geherdon  
 EX ILLA HORA TURBA CUM AUDISSENT

ðas uordo  
 SERMONES

*"After this time the multitude heard these words"*

(J vii/40)

(3) uið nú l wið ðær tid ne gegiuade gie  
 USQUE MODO NON PETISTIS

*"So far you have asked nothing "*

(Mt x/19)

and also the example at (Mt xvii/18).

Both sets of data above involve extra-propositional temporal phrases, phrases whose domain is the entire proposition and which do not merely characterize the predicate itself — *Circumstantials* in Halliday's (1967–68) and Anderson's (1977) terms. Those under 2.13.b —

glossing EX ILLA HORA – show a situation where the time reference is one where there is either a movement *up to (usque)* or *away from (ex)* a given point on a temporal scale; they are characterized by showing either a *source* or *goal* terminus. On the other hand, the examples under 2.13.a are neutral as regards directional source/goal in their temporal domain. They show a time reference appropriate to a particular moment, with no directional implication. They are *ALLATIVES* (Anderson (1977), pp. 117–118). These data therefore suggest the introduction of a rule process whereby circumstantial temporal comment on the proposition (expressed, we claim, in terms of locational characteristics) is marked in prepositional phrases by (a) <–r(e)> determiner morphology when the locational expression is *locative* (ablative or adlative) and (b) by <–m> suffixation when its locational value is neutral (non–source/goal).

However, it might be argued that the instance at 2.13.a.(4): <7 gehæled wæs cnæht in ðit (sic) ðæm> infers not only an allative condition but also manifests simultaneously a *source* characteristic whereby the cure was affected not just *at that moment*, but lasted beyond this "starting point". The "dual" case relationship feature of such types might explain the glossator's occasional use of <ðæm> with them, as in (Mt xvii/18):

### 2.13.c

(1) 7 ge-eade from him ðe diowl 7 gelacned wæs  
 ET EXIIT AB EO DAEMONIUM ET CURATUS EST

ðe cnæht of ðær tid  
 PUER EX ILLA HORA

"the devil left him and at/from that moment  
 the boy was cured"

(2) 7 hal geworden wæs wif of ðæm l ðær tid  
 ET SALUA FACTA EST MULIER EX ILLA HORA  
 "and at/from that moment the woman recovered".  
 (Mt ix/22)

Yet, the tendency is not fully developed and we find *allative* contexts where there has been no <ðæm> innovation:

2.13.d

in ðær tid ge-onduearde hælend cuoeð  
 IN ILLA TEMPORE RESPONDENS IESUS DIXIT  
 (Mt xi/25)

Our hypothesis is strengthened by the occurrence of <ðæm> determiners in temporal constructions involving the *feminine* items <niht> and <worold> in what are clearly *allative* spatial contexts:

2.13.e

(1) ic cuoeðo iuh      ðæm næht      biðon tuoegē  
 DICO UOBIS ILLA NOCTE ERUNT DUO

in hrofe anum  
 IN TECTO UNO

"I tell you on that night there will be two men in one bed"

(L xvii/34)

(2) seðe ne onfoað hunteantig-siðo..ða huile nu  
 QUI NON ACCIPIAT CENTIES TANTUM NUNC

in tide þ life disum..7 in world ðæm to-uearde  
 IN TEMPORE ET IN SAECULO FUTURO

lif éce  
 UITAM AETERNAM

"who will not in this age receive a hundred times as much...and in the age to come, eternal life"  
 (Mk x/30)

but we still find <ðær næht>/ILLA NOCTE in a clear allative context at (J xxi/3).

While we must obviously be wary, given the restricted nature of our data, of the temptation to "fit" all our examples within a limited explanatory framework we might nevertheless offer a very tentative explanation for the "wrong" <ðær> determiner with the etymologically *masculine* <ðreat> in the following:

## 2.13.f

of ðær ðreate l menigo uutudlice menige gelefdon  
 DE TURBA                            AUTEML MULTI CREDIDERUNT

on him  
 IN EUM

(J vii/31)

One might, of course, argue for "influence" from the *feminine* <menigo> or from the Latin gender of TURBA, but this would seem unlikely not least from the presence of an unhistorical < $\beta$  ðreat>/TURBAM in the proximity of the next verse. Constructions like DE TURBA might be construed as "partitive genitive" types such that "*many people among the crowd*" might derive from "*many people FROM (abative) the crowd*" (Anderson (1975), pp. 48ff.) and, as such, involve a *source* locational (circumstantial) case relationship. Just such, we argued above, characterized the circumstantial temporal constructions glossing EX ILLA HORA and which were glossed by "historical" <ðær> determiners.

If we turn our attention to unetymological <ðæm> with *feminine non-temporal* lexical items such as <stow> "place" and <byrgen> "tomb", we find that the form is almost everywhere constrained to occur as part of a verb phrase governed by directional, locational predicate types like <faran>, <cuman>, while in *allative* contexts the "historical" <ðær> surfaces. In the examples which follow it would appear that non-circumstantial (*participant*) prepositional phrases in the context of such predicates denote their *directional goal* features by the use of <ðæm> determiners in construction with their nominal elements:

## 2.13.g

(1) 7 miððy gecuome to ðæm stoue onfeng  
 ET CUM UENISSET AD LOCUM SUSCIPIENS

se hælend gesæh hine  
 IESUS UIDIT ILLUM

"when Jesus came to the place, he looked up"

(L xix/5)

(2) a- þ gewarð ða dæge wæs færende eade  
 FACTA AUTEM DIE INGRESSUS IBAT

on woestigum stowe  
 IN DESERTUM LOCUM  
 (L iv/42)

(3) 7 onæring suiðe arás foerde þ færeñd ðona  
 ET DILUCULO UALDE SURGENS EGRESSUS

eode on woestigum stouo þ styd 7 ðer gebæd  
 ABIIT IN DESERTUM LOCUM IBIQUE ORABAT  
 (Mk i/35)

(4) 7 bær þ him ða roda eode on ðæm seðe  
 ET BAINLANS SIBI CRUCEM EXIUIT IN EUM QUI

is gecuoeden hefid-ponna stoue  
 DICITUR CALUATIAE LOCUM  
 (J xix/17)

*"and carrying his own cross, he went to  
 the place of the skull, Calvary as it is called"*

while with what are apparently non-directional *allative*  
 predicates we find the "etymological" <ðær> determiner:

#### 2.13.h

(1) uæs uutudlice eac iohannes fullwuande  
 ERAT AUTEM ET IOHANNES BAPTIZANS

in ðær stowe æt þ neh salim ðær stoue  
 IN AENON IUXTA SALIM  
 (J iii/23)

(2) ne ða get forðon þ cuome þ se hælend  
 NONDUM ENIM UENERAT IESUS

in þ ceastrā ah wæs ða geone in ðær þ stoue  
 IN CASTELLUM SED ERAT ADHUC IN ILLO LOCO

ðer gearn þ him martha  
 UBI OCCURRERAT EI MARTHA  
 (J xi/30)

but counterexamples with <ðæm> in allative contexts appear at (J Cont vii) and <ðær> with directional verbs at (J x/40) and (J vi/23). Perhaps the most convincing data supporting our contention that "motion" verbs are characterized in the gloss by prepositional phrases containing participant nouns in construction with <ðæm> definite determiners are those involving the *feminine* noun <byrgen> "*tomb*":

## 2.13.i

- (1) eft-færendo from ðæm byrgenne  
REGRESSAE .. A MONUMENTO  
(L xxiv/9)
- (2) flugon of ðæm byrgen  
FUGERUNT DE MONUMENTO  
(Mk xvi/8)
- (3) gearn to ðæm byrgenne  
CUCURRIT AD MONUMENTUM  
(L xxiv/12)
- (4) cuomon to þæm byrgenne  
UENERUNT AD MONUMENTUM  
(L xxiv/1-2)

as well as at (L xxiv/22).

We perhaps might very tentatively include with the above those cases involving the historically *feminine* noun <mæht> "*power*", "*authority*" with which we find post prepositional <ðæm> and <-m> "dative" determiner shapes even in the face of a strong Latin influence context:

## 2.13.j

- (1) ældo l uuto ðæs folces cueðende in ðæm  
SENIORES POPULI DICENTES IN QUA  
  
mæht ðas do 7 hua ðe salde  
POTESTATE HAEC FACIS ET QUIS TIBI DEDIT  
  
ðius mæht  
HANC POTESTATEM  
(Mt xxi/23)

(2) 7 cuoeð iuh on sua huælcum mæht ðas  
ET DICO UOBIS IN QUA POTESTATE HAEC

ic doe þ doam  
FACIAM

(Mt xi/29)

(3) 7 cuoeð la heh fæder alle ðe mæhtiglica  
ET DIXIT ABBA PATER OMNIA TIBI POSSIBILIA

sint þ sindon alle in ðinum mæht  
SUNT

(Mk xiv/36)

Examples such as these we might interpret as involving *ergative* (instigator of the action) and *source* arguments in predication: where "*by what authority*" surfaces for "*from what source does your authority come?*". <ðæm> in such directionality indicating arguments was just what we claimed characterized its use with "motion" verbs. However, we have to point out that in the verse immediately preceding the (Mk xi/29) instance above, we find <on suahuelc mæht>/IN QUA POTESTATE and two verses later: <on sua huelcer mæht> glossing the same Latin phrase. Yet it is possible that the scribe simply omitted to insert an abbreviatory mark for <-um> in the first instance, while there must be some doubt concerning Skeat's interpretation of the abbreviatory symbol used with the latter. But nevertheless we come across difficult examples like the following where, with the historically *neuter* <mægden> we find <ðær> determiner forms in case contexts where as participants to the predicate "give" they are clearly involved in a locational goal relationship:

### 2.13.k

(1) 7 to-brohte heafud his in disc 7 salde  
ET ATTULIT CAPUD EIUS IN DISCO ET DEDIT

þ ðær mægdne  
ILLUD PUELLAE

(Mk vi/28)

(2) 7 gebroht i gefered wæs heafud his  
 ET ALLATUM EST CAPUT EIUS

in disc 7 gesáld wæs ðær mædne  
 IN DISCO ET DATUM EST PUELLAE

(Mk xiv/11)

We have argued above that locational case phrases like "*to the girl*" or "*to the tomb*" which are characteristic of particular predicate types such as "give" or "go" would trigger a post prepositional <ðæm> determiner shape regardless of grammatical gender factors. Either the above represent "exceptions" to such a generalization or our original observations are not well-founded. However, given the fact that both <ðær mædne> outputs are to be found in what are obviously parallel Gospel passages — as were the ungrammatical "possessive" <ðære mædne> types — we might "explain" these too as being discourse tracking devices "referring back" to the <dohtor herodiaðes> /FILIA HERODIADES in the immediately preceding context. But for another interpretation of determiner morphology in "give" predicate contexts, see pp. 151–156 below.

## 2.14 ABSOLUTIVE (NEUTRAL) CASE EXPRESSION

Those arguments in propositions whose case relationships with the predicate are a function of the semantics of the predicate itself are often referred to as *ABSOLUTIVES* and, usually quite misleadingly, as "objects" (Anderson (1977), Chapter Five; Plank (1978)). This semantically "neutral" case relationship (non-ergative, non-loclational) does not represent any kind of participant function whereby predicates can be categorized as belonging to a particular class. For example, the italicised NPs in the following sentences are generally held to be *absolutives* in the modern language: "*The ball* fell"; "*The ball* moved"; "*Henry* is the next *king*"; "*Henry* killed *Bill*". What we should like to argue in this section is that determiner <ðone> shapes and singular attributive forms with <—ne> morphology are used to mark *absolutive case relationships* in propositions, especially when they are not available for subject selection as is "*the box*" in "*the box* moved". However, we shall go on to suggest in Chapter Four that even this constraint on <(ðo)ne> *absolutive*

marking is waived in some Middle English texts.

Yet we still might wish to ask the question as to why such <-ne> forms should be "selected" for this role. In particular, in definite article contexts there would also appear to be available for this function the "historically feminine" <ða> shape (<þæt> forms being now reserved, of course, for discourse tracking and are at any rate phonetically equivocal as potential markers of *ergative* and *absolutive*). Total numbers of "ungrammatical" <ða>, <ðone> and other "object" marking adjectival determiners are not large in the gloss as a whole. Consider the following table showing the numerical occurrences of all (non-<þæt>) types of definite determiner found in *absolutive* contexts in the manuscript (after Jones (1964), pp. 23–25):

#### 2.14.a

GLOSS FORM	WS MASCULINE	WS FEMININE	WS NEUTER
<ðone>/<ðon>	259	13	8
<ðe>/<se>	15	0	0
<ða>	7	58	2
<ðio>/<ðiu>/<ðy>	0	6	0

(we shall return to discuss the "subject" <ðe>/<se> etc. in this absolute context in section 2.16). One interesting fact emerges, however, when we examine the syntactic contexts in which all of the nine unhistorical *feminine* <ða> forms appear. They are completely constrained to occur in determiner slots in NPs with a structure like

$$[{}_1\text{NP} [{}_2\text{DET}_2] \{ {}_3\text{NP} [{}_4\text{ADJ}_4] [{}_5\text{N}_5] \text{NP}_3 \} \text{NP}_1 ]$$

where the determiner is on most occasions an ordinal number (Mitchell (1986) § 563): i.e. in constructions like "*the eighth race*". Consider a typical case from (Mt Prologue, p. 6, ll. 13 ff):

## 2.14.b

in tal i in regel ðone forma gegeadriges i  
 IN CANONE PRIMO CONCORDAT

In regula ða æftera In tal i regla ða ɔridda  
 IN CANONE SECUNDO.....IN CANONE TERTIO

and on in a sequence: <in regele/tal ða fearða/ ða fifta/  
 ða seista/ ða seofunda/ ða aehteða/ ða nioða/ ða teiða>  
 where <regel> is *masculine* and <tal> *feminine* in West  
 Saxon. Again, with *masculine* nouns we see <on monaðe  
 uutedlice ða seista>/IN MENSE AUTEM SEXTO (L i/26);  
 <aworden wæs on dæge ða æhtaðe>/FACTUM EST IN  
 DIE OCTAUO (L i/59), while in construction with <ilca>  
 we have <foerde ða ilca woege>/DESCENDERET EADEM  
 UIA (L x/31); <ðerh wurnon all lond ða  
 ilca>/PERCURRENTES UNIERSAM REGIONEM ILLAM  
 (Mk vi/55) and <in-ræsdon in huse ða ilco>/INRUERUNT  
 IN DOMUM ILLAM (Mt vii/27) where <weg> is  
 etymologically *masculine* and <hus>, <lond> *neuter*.

There seems little to suggest that "new" *feminine*  
 genders have been ascribed to any of the above items  
 either under the influence of semantically related forms or  
 direct Latin glossing. Rather, it appears as though <ða>  
 represents, in this type of syntactic configuration, some kind  
 of morphologically empty definite determiner shape with  
 neither gender or perhaps case relationship significance.  
 We shall return to these forms briefly in our discussion of  
 <ðe> "object" occurrences in the next section.

It might seem then that of the "accusative", "object"  
 determiner morphological forms available, only those with  
 <-ne> were usable as *absolutive* markers. However, it  
 has to be pointed out that the tendency to so do is not  
 very well established in this gloss and not all the instances  
 we quote will be equally convincing. Consider:

## 2.14.c

wæccas forðon forðon nuuto gie ðone dæge ne  
 UIGILATE ITAQUE QUA NESCITIS DIEM

ðone tid  
 HORAM

(Mt xxv/13)

It could of course be argued that the "new" <ðone> form with the historically *feminine* <tid> results from the influence of the *masculine* gender of the contiguous <dæg>. However we wish to claim that what is being re-iterated in the <ðone tid> construction is the *absolutive case relationship it shares with the <dæge> argument to the "know" predicate in the proposition.* Again:

## 2.14.d

(1) latuas blindo gie worðias ðone flege  
DUCES CAECI EXCOLANTES CULICEM CAMELUM

uutedlice glutientes  
AUTEM

(Mt xxiii/24)

"*Blind guides! You strain off a midge, yet gulp down a camel"*

(2) 7 miððy geheht ɏ gehatend uæs ðone menig ɏ  
ET CUM IUSSISSET TURBAM

ðone here ofer heg ɏ gers  
DISCUMBERE SUPER FAENUM

(Mt xiv/19)

(3) englas hiora in heofnum symle gesceas  
ANGELI EORUM IN CAELIS SEMPER UIDENT

ðone onsione faderes mines seðe in heofnum is  
FACIEM PATRIS MEI QUI IN CAELIS EST  
(Mt xviii/10)

(4) miððy ðonne gie geseað ðone wroht  
CUM AUTEM UIDERITIS ABOMINATIONEM

from-slittnise stondende Ȧer ne rises  
DESOLATIONIS STANTEM UBI NON DEBET  
(Mk xiii/14)

where <flege>, <menigu> and <onsion> are etymologically *feminine*, while <wroht> is *neuter*. Other examples can be found at (L xi/27), (Mt xviii/27), (Mt

xvii/9), (L Pref 3/5), (Mk Argum 14), (Mt xxiii/16) and (Mt Cont xlivi) and, perhaps, the instance of <ðone> with the historically *neuter* <mot> already cited above under 2.11.c. Here too we might include the unhistorical <-ne> forms of the personal pronouns in construction with absolute arguments, as in <bero ðinne> (Mt ix/6), <ungeleaffulness minne> (Mk ix/24) (with *feminine* nouns) and <geoc minne> (Mt x/29) with a *neuter*.

Mainly of interest as a possible first instance of a construction we shall see much of in Middle English texts, especially the *Peterborough Chronicle* (see § 4.6) is a singleton example of an unhistorical <-ne> inflected adjective in construction with the *neuter* item <hus> in a transparently *LOCATIVE*, goal directed case relationship:

#### 2.14.e

on sua-huelcne      hus      gie ingæeð ærist cuoeðað  
IN QUAM-CUNQUE      DOMUM INTRAUERITIS PRIMUM DICITE

sibb      ðissum      huse  
PAX      HUIC      DOMUI

(L x/5)

a construction echoing that like <Moyses spæc to þone Almihtiga Gode> (vii/16:7) in the twelfth century *Homilies* of Ms Bodley (Belfour (1909)). The conditions for the "spread" of the absolute marker into locative environments will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

#### 2.15 "POSSESSIVE" ARGUMENTS

Those case relationships traditionally listed under a "genitive" or "possessive" case morphological form in earlier Old English would appear to belong to a diverse group none of which has any obvious relationship to "ownership" or "possession" (Mitchell (1986) §§ 1264–1344, pp. 535–565). Absolute case relationships appear superficially marked in this way: <Ðæt we sceolden fremena friclan> "that we might desire benefits" (*Cædmon*) as are ablatives characteristic of "partitive" genitives <se cyning bebead..þæt ælc mann drince þas deorwurðan wines> "the king commanded that each of the men drink (some of) the expensive wine" (*Elfric*). There are a number of

"unetymological" possessive morphological markers in our gloss and they almost all occur in *absolutive* or *allative* case relationship arguments within propositions. With historically *feminine* nouns, for instance, we find

#### 2.15.a

(1) ne gemynes  $\ddot{\imath}$   $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$  hefignise  $\ddot{\imath}$   $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$  ofersuiðunge  
NON MEMINIT PRESSURAE

fore  $\beta$  glædnise  $\ddot{\imath}$   
PROPTER GAUDIUM

(J xvi/21)

(2)  $\beta$  hus gefyilled uæs of suot stenc  
DOMUS IMPLETA EST EX ODORE

$\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$  smiriness  
UNGENTI

(J xii/3)

(3) 7 miððy ongéton  $\ddot{\imath}$  oncneawan hine waras  
ET CUM COGNOSSENTE EUM UIRI

stowes  $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$   
LOCI ILLIUS

(Mt xiv/35)

(4) to/from duru  $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$  byrgennes  
AD/AB OSTIUM/O MONUMENTI  
(Mt xxvii/60)(Mk xv/46)(Mk xvi/3)

and also at (Mk xiv/3), (Mk iii/29) and (L xxi/59). We should simply wish to claim that < $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{æs}$ > in the above examples is to be interpreted as the non-gender significant surface "genitive" shape for the various case relationships that form could denote. < $\ddot{\text{ø}}\text{ære}$ > with its locative marking potential was rejected for this role.

#### 2.16 <PE> IN ABSOLUTIVE CONTEXTS

The casual observer of the history of the gender marking role of definite determiners in the English language would note that while the grammar of early Old English produced

a fairly wide selection of attributive forms signalling the three genders in a variety of case forms, by the early fifteenth century this had ceased to be so and there was only an "invariable" <ðe> or <the> article shape. We have endeavoured to show in the above paragraphs that such a change was not achieved in a single sudden "step", but that speakers came to use the originally gender sensitive morphology of determiners to show the case relationship between the arguments with which they were in construction, and, in addition, as a means of tracking the discourse relations between nominal elements in the text. What is perhaps surprising is that the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* shows hardly any evidence for the use of <ðe> as a generalized definite determiner shape for all case relationship environments. There are a mere half a dozen or so instances where we find <ðe> — always in construction with historically *masculine* nouns — and then only in in *absolutive* contexts. Consider the following:

## 2.16.a

- (1) lufa ðe neste ðin sua ðec seolfne  
**DILICES PROXIMUM TUUM SICUT TE IPSUM**  
(Mt xix/19)/(L x/27)
- (2) geonduardon him ðe hælend natzarenisca  
**RESPONDERUNT EI IESUM NAZARENUM**  
"who are you looking for? They answered 'Jesus of Nazareth'"  
(J xviii/5)
- (3) gelæddon forðon se hælend from caifa biscope  
**ADUCUNT ERGO IESUM A CAIPHA**  
(J xviii/28)
- (4) gesæh se hælend  
**UIDENS IESUM**  
(J v/12)

while <-ne> and <ðe> determiner forms are found side by side in the same *absolutive* context in:

2.16.b

(1) lufa ðone ðe neesta ðin suæ ðeh seolfne  
DILIGES PROXIMUM TUUM SICUT TEIPSUM  
(Mt xxii/39)

(2) ðe unmiltheort<sup>n</sup>e welige gihuadne .i.  
INMISERICORDEM DIUITEM PURPURATUM

mið felle 7 ðone ðorfe inlædde  
ET PAUPEREM LAZARUM INTRODUCENS  
(L Cont 1xv)

## 3

## THE TENTH CENTURY

THE LATE OLD ENGLISH GLOSS TO  
THE DURHAM RITUAL

## 3.1 GENERAL REMARKS

The Durham Cathedral manuscript *A.iv.19*, often referred to as the *Durham Ritual*, provides us with extensive data for Northumbrian Old English of the tenth century, but like the *Lindisfarne Gospels* materials we examined in the previous chapter, they again come in the form of an interlinear gloss upon a Latin original with all the disadvantages of that medium for the student of historical morphological and syntactic change. There has been considerable debate as to whether the glossator of the *Durham Ritual* was the same Aldred as that responsible for the interlinear Old Northumbrian of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* writing some thirty or so years later; for a summary of the arguments, see Ross, Stanley and Brown (1956), Chapter iv, pp. 25 ff. The matter is of some concern to us, for were both glosses to be the product of the same scribe our conclusions relating to the development of gender marking in the noun phrase through the morphology of adjectives and other determiners for this whole period may only have the status of applying to the grammatical rule system of a single and perhaps, given the rather odd nature of the linguistic exercise being undertaken, somewhat untypical idiolect. However, given the paucity of the data from this period, we must make do with what we have and exercise an appropriate degree of caution. The conclusions we shall eventually reach from a comparison of attributive word gender marking in noun phrases in the two glosses will frustratingly both support and refute a single glossator hypothesis. The overall developmental pattern is similar, but the type of texts being glossed are so different that much of the discourse marking potential provided by the *Gospels* materials is simply not available in the *Ritual*. Indeed, the Latin text of the *Durham Ritual* is a very complex one and, not surprisingly, the glossator appears on many occasions to have mis-interpreted it (for details, see Lindelöf (1927) pp. lxv–lxx). In addition, and on many occasions it will provide real difficulties for us, the scribe's extensive and apparently sometimes mysterious use of abbreviatory symbols at word terminations makes it extremely difficult to determine precisely what morphological shape he has in

mind at a particular time. Generally, the late Northumbrian materials provided by the *Durham Ritual* gloss have been sadly neglected by most scholars of historical linguistics in this generation and deserve much more detailed study than they have so far received (Lindelöf (1901; 1890); Stevenson (1840); Skeat (1879); Lieberman (1874); Squires (1971)). That the *Ritual's* glossator shows clear differences in marking nominal grammatical gender from the habits adopted by West Saxon writers has been long known:

"The Gender of nouns in D.R. is very uncertain. It is hardly necessary to enter into details, yet a few striking examples may be quoted. Such are e.g. *populum tuum..securum*, *folc ðin.... sorgleasne* 40,8; *uitam sempiternam..presentem*, *lif ece..ondveardne* 48, 15."

The reader will no doubt forgive our eschewing of Lindelöf's reticence for entering into a detailed discussion on this subject, since even the briefest of examinations of nominal attributive word morphology quickly shows that the type of example he cites is far from typical of the kinds of "unhistorical" gender congruences which abound in the manuscript. However, before we undertake a detailed survey of the unetymological expression of gender agreement in NP constructions in the *Durham Ritual*, let us briefly review the main conclusions we reached concerning this phenomenon in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

(a) historical gender agreement between attributive words and those nouns with which they are in construction was, by and large, like that to be found in "classical" West Saxon texts. "Wrong" gender agreement was statistically rather rare.

(b) despite their relative infrequency, however, unetymological congruences did appear to fall into fairly well definable patterns, the two principal of which were:

(1) unhistorical "neuter" <þ> forms were being used as discourse tracking mechanisms and as a means of expressing the extent of shared knowledge between reader and writer concerning individual nominal items.

(2) determiner morphology was being "selected" to reflect the expression of arguments and case relationships holding internally in propositions. There appeared to be

two main manifestations of this. Firstly, particular morphological shapes were used for the expression of individual case relationship types. We tried to show, for example, that circumstantial temporal comment would be marked attributively by <-m> morphology whenever it expressed an *ALLATIVE* argument (neutral directional value) and by <-re> suffixation whenever *ABLATIVE* or *ADLATIVE* locational directionality was expressed in the argument. Recall:

## 2.13.a

in ðæm tid gefeade gaste halige  
 IN IPSA HORA EXULTAUT SPIRITU SANCTO  
*"At that moment Jesus exalted in the  
 Holy Spirit"*

(L x/21)

## 2.13.b

uið nú t wið ðær tid ne gegiuade gie  
 USQUE MODO NON PETISTIS  
*"So far you have asked nothing in my name"*

(Mt x/19)

where <tid> is historically *feminine*. Secondly, and fully recognizing that we may be imposing too sophisticated an interpretation upon a very limited data set, we observed that there appeared to be at least a tendency to *generalize a particular CASE FORM spelling* for whatever range of case functions might be "collapsed" under it. Most obviously, we noted that <-es> morphological expression was being extensively employed as the "preferred" *case form* for whatever *case relationships* were to be realized through the "possessive". The motivation for the choice of such generalized case forms was, we suggested, a function of their phonological shape. While both <-s> and <-re> "possessive" morphological markers were available in the grammar, the latter was also a signal for "locative"/"dative" case forms, and only the former was phonologically unambiguous as a "possessive". The same kind of argument held for the selection of <-(u)m> locative case form markers.

At the same time, we deliberately held back another, and we shall see extremely important feature of NP

attributive morphology in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss: the tendency to realize "endingless", "undeclined" or "morphology-less" shapes with all nouns regardless of their historical gender classification. We shall rectify this omission in the discussion which follows where we shall see just how prominent a feature this was of the morphological rule system of the late Northumbrian of both glosses.

### 3.2 UNETYMOLOGICAL <þ> FORMS IN THE GLOSS TO THE DURHAM RITUAL

Perhaps one of the most striking features of this gloss is its relative lack of definite determiners. For a text of its considerable length, the actual number of tokens for the word "*the*" is rather small: there are only 133 occurrences in all. When definite determiners do appear, they do so on the vast majority of occasions showing *historical* gender congruence with the nouns with which they are in construction. In this respect both late Northumbrian glosses are very alike. However, there are interesting deviations from the West Saxon "norm"; 3.2.a shows the distribution of the tokens for singular definite article forms in the *Ritual* gloss (following Jones (1964) page 101). Obviously there is no evidence here of any wholesale unetymological use of definite determiner gender shapes. Only in *locative* and *object* contexts do we see any substantial non-historical use of <ðæm> and <þ> forms and their orthographic variants. On the other hand, our data show none of the "wrong" gender <ðæs> or <ðære> forms which were quite frequent in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, nor is there any evidence at all for a "spread" of *mASCULINE* <ðone> forms to nouns whose West Saxon gender assignment would be *neuter* or *fEMININE*. However, if we isolate out the unetymological <þ> determiner usage we see a picture emerging which is not at all unlike that we described for the *Gospels*. The majority of such forms are to be found in construction with lexical items which refer to objects which in the real world have non-animate, non-human characteristics; as such, they might well be explained away under Ross' (1935) *neutralization* hypothesis. The items in question include: <lofsong> "*hymn*" (47/16); <deað> "*death*" (94/12); <oest> "*devotion*" (104/20–21); <lufu> "*love*" (57/4); <berhtnisse> "*brightness*" (2/16); <gihriord> "*feast*" (116/19);

## 3.2.a

## WEST SAXON GENDER

masculine feminine neuter

## Form in DR

## subject

<se>/<ðe>/<te>	26	0	0
<sio>/<ðio>/<ðiu>	0	5	1
<þ>/<ðæt>/<ðaet>	1	0	1

## object

<ðone>	25	0	0
<ða>	1	3	1
<þat>/<ðaet>	4	5	6

## possessive

<ðæs>/<ðaes>	11	0	2
<ðære>/<ðaere>	0	6	0

## locative

<ðæm>/<ðaem>	14	7	3
<ðære>/<ðaere>	0	11	0

<ondspvrnis> "offence" (11/7). (All references are to page and line in Lindelöf's (1927) edition) There is, albeit a solitary instance, the case of an unetymological <þ> with the animate masculine <drihten> "Lord God" at (172/7) which must obviously make us nervous, as did similar cases in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, about accepting Ross' view too readily.

On the other hand, if we follow our practice in the preceding Chapter and look at these unetymological <þ> forms in the general discourse context within which they occur, we immediately see patterns with which we are by now rather familiar. Consider the following instance:

## 3.2.b

god ðv ðe ancend bearn' ðin' f'e allvm  
 DEUS QUI UNICUM FILIUM TUUM PRO OMNIBUS

vsig on deað rod' lvstvma gisaldest  
 NOBIS IN MORTEM CRUCUS SPONTE DEDISTI

gilef allvm vs rehtlice gilefendv þte  
 CONCEDE OMNIBUS NOBIS RECTE CREDITIBUS UT

ðerh þ ilca deað frō deaðe ecv  
 PER EANDEM MORTEM A MORTE PERPETUA

vie sie alesen  
 LIBEREMUR

(94/10-12)

where <deāð> is historically of the *masculine* gender. Here it is fairly clear that we have a discourse context involving two sequentially mentioned NPs which are lexically identical: an *equi-NP* situation. The second mention in the discourse of the noun <deāð> brings with it the <þ> determiner much in the same way as we saw for those instances in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* under 2.5.1. Again, the surface shape of the determiner <þ> with the second mentioned NP has no gender indicating value, but is used as a means of indicating identical co-reference, in this instance "re-inforced" by <ilca> "same". Although, as we saw above, the total number of unhistorical <þ> tokens is small in the *Durham Ritual* as a whole, many of them fit this pattern:

## 3.2.c

(1) ðio ðe oest hire brengeð of ðon  
 QUAE TIBI DEUOTIONEM SUAM OFFERT A QUO

7 ðio þ ilce oest ondfeng  
 ET IPSA EANDEM UOTUM ASSUMPSIT

(104/20-21)

(2) to ondveard hond his in ðis' vætre fyr  
 AD PRESENS *MANUM SUAM* IN HAC AQUA IGNE

vallende gisende þte nængo woerding  
 FERUENTE MISERIT.. UT NULLA LESIO

þ yfelgiornisse in ðæt ilca hond ædeava  
 UEL MALICIA IN EANDEM MANU APPAREAT  
 (102/3-6)

(3) gisvngan halga wares svoelce lofsong  
 CANTEBANT SANCTI QUASI *CANTICUM*

nive ær þ f'e sedle 7 nænig mann  
 NOUUM ANTE SEDEM ET NEMO

mæhte gicvoeða þ lofsong  
 POTERAT DICERE *CANTICUM*

(47/14-16)

where <oest> and <hond> are etymologically *femimine* and <lofsong> *masculine*. Notice too the use of this identity marking function of <þ> in *relative pronoun* contexts where female human reference is involved:

### 3.2.d

eadges ag' þ ilca ve worðiað  
 BEATE AGNETIS....QUAM UENEREMUR  
 (50/20-21)

There is also one interesting example at (116/18–19) where an unhistorical <þ> definite determiner occurs in construction with a noun which, although it has a phonologically identical "equivalent" in the immediately preceding context, does not share referential identity with it. Consider:

## 3.2.e

bloetsiga gihriord ðas' svæ gibloedsade  
 BENEDICERE EPULAM ISTAM SICUT BENEDIXISTI

þ gihriord hab' is' ia'  
 EPULATIONEM HABRAHE ISAAC IACOB

where <gereord> "food" is historically *feminine*. Leaving aside the significance (if any) of the abbreviatory symbol with <ðas'>, it is interesting to note that a sentence like the above evidences a construction still to be found in the modern language: "*Paint this room the same colour as you did that one last week*". Obviously, in such an NP<sub>1</sub>>NP<sub>2</sub> discourse situation involving lexical items with the same phonetic shape, the discourse function of the "*this...that*" alternation is one of "*now...then*" or "*here...there*", where the "*that*" demonstrative denotes an N knowledge of which is shared by the speaker and hearer: "*I didn't like this ice cream as much as that one we had (you remember) last week*".

The few remaining unetymological <þ> determiner usages in the *Durham Ritual* gloss can perhaps all be accounted for in terms of their function of identifying a lexical item knoweldege of whose referent is either shared by the speaker and hearer/reader or is one which belongs to such a restricted lexical class that it is unlikely to be involved in any further subclassification. Perhaps the most obvious example of this latter type is that involving the lexical item <drihten> "*Lord God*" which is historically *masculine*:

## 3.2.f

ðerh þ ilca driht' vser' hæl' svnv ðin  
 PER EUNDEM DOMINUM NOSTRUM IESUM FILIUM TUUM  
 (172/6-7)

There is no specific reference in the immediately preceding context to another <drihten> lexical item and it would seem rather clear that in this liturgical formula the function of the <þ ilca> phrase is to identify what is to the writer and reader the maximally known-about and

un-subcategorizable Being. Such an instance is rather like those we cited in our last chapter under 2.6.1 where we pointed to those cases where lexical items knowledge of which could be expected to be shared by speaker/hearers were also signalled by <þ> regardless of the grammatical gender of the nouns involved:

## 3.2.g

eaðor    is    uutedlice    þ    heofon    7    þ    eorðo FACILIUS EST    AUTEM                    CAELUM    ET    TERRAM	þte foregleore PRAETERIRE
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------

(L xvi/17)

We might include here from the *Ritual* materials as examples of this type the following where the historically *feminine* <lufu> and <ðrovung> are involved:

## 3.2.h

ða    þ    ilca    lvfū    7    ðrovng    soðlice    dyde QUOS    EADEM    FIDES    ET    PASSIO    UERE    FECIT	þte vere    rehtgibroðro ESSE                    GERMANOS
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

(57/4-5)

where once more there is no "identical" previously mentioned <lufu> in the surrounding discourse, but where the function of the <eadem>/<þ ilca> phrase is to denote the "uniqueness of reference", the "one and only-ness" of that "very" faith and love under discussion. Perhaps in this vein too is a case like the following where the glossator can be seen to use the <þ> determiner (with the etymologically *masculine* <sige>) in a context where a particular and special version of the "lexical field" or "reference area" is alluded to, demonstrated and labelled:

3.2.i

þ acenn' is frō gode f'sviðeð middang'  
QUOD NATUM EST EX DEO UINCIT MUNDUM

7 ðios is þ sig ðio f'sviðeð middan'  
ET HAEC EST UICTORIA QUAE UINCIT MUNDUM

gileafe vsra  
FIDES NOSTRA

(28/1-2)

The two remaining instances where a "wrong" gender <þ> determiner is found in the gloss to the *Durham Ritual* are not so readily categorized and we should perhaps resist the temptation to try to "fit" them into any kind of system. However, we might very tentatively propose that in their context they denote a relationship between the lexical item with which they are in construction and its "owner", "possessor" which is a *unique* one, a kind of *inalienable possession* involving the abstract, rather than the physical characteristics of the human animate under discussion:

3.2.j

(1) allm' ece god fy11 middangeard  
OMNIPOTENS SEMPITERNE DEUS...IMPLE MUNDUM

wvldor ðin 7 vnderðiodo ðe folcvm ðerh  
GLORIA TUA ET SUBDITIS TIBI POPULIS PER

lehtes ðines aedeava þ berhtnise  
LUMINIS TUI APPARE CLARITATEM

(2/13-16)

(2) svnv gicerr to gode 7 f'let synno  
FILI CONUERTERE AD DEUM ET RELINQUE PECCATA

ðino gibidde wvt' ondwliote his 7 wona  
TUA PRECA AUTEM FACIEM EIUS ET MINUE

þ ondþyrrnis'  
OFFENDICULUM

(11/6-7)

Since the <þ> determiner can be substituted for by a <you> second person possessive pronoun in both the above examples, they consequently might be felt to reflect a usage of the type we outlined in the previous chapter under 2.7. Alternatively, such types in 3.2.j might be considered to show <þ> as a marker of some kind of "unique specification".

### 3.3 DETERMINER MORPHOLOGY AS A MARKER OF PROPOSITIONAL CASE RELATIONSHIPS

Thus far the kinds of contexts where "unetymological" <þ> forms are to be discovered in the *Durham Ritual* by and large resemble those we pointed to in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. True, they do not occur in such numbers in the *Durham Ritual* nor do they appear in the same variety of syntactico-semantic contexts as in the earlier manuscript, but that variety may anyway at least in part reflect our over-ingeneous analysis of a very small linguistic corpus. However, the evidence so far discussed for the innovative usage of *Durham Ritual* determiner forms puts few obstacles in the way of those who see a single hand at work in the composition of both glosses.

We made the major claim in the last chapter, and it is one which we shall pursue in those which follow, that speakers of late Northumbrian Old English re-interpreted the singular number originally case/gender sensitive morphology of attribute words in NPs in terms of *case marking only*. Essentially, we claimed two things: (a) specific case relationships or arguments were signalled by specific attributive morphological shapes. Thus, <-ne> was associated with ABSOLUTIVE arguments, while <-(u)m> signalled the various LOCATIVE (directional and non-directional) case relationships holding between verbal and nominal groups in propositions. (b) especially in those various case relationships collectively superficially signalled by what are traditionally labelled "possessive" and "dative" *case forms*, the *Gospels* data showed that there was a tendency to generalize <-es> and <-um> outputs to all noun modifiers, the <-re> shape being rejected as a result of its ambiguous *case form* expression.

To what extent can we find evidence for similar developments in the *Durham Ritual*? The answer would appear to be that while instances of the (a) type are

considerably rarer and less clear, those of type (b) are much more extensive in their occurrence than they were in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss. At the same time, we shall see that there is a propensity in the *Ritual* for the use of morphology-less attributive forms to an even greater extent than in the earlier manuscript. However, let us begin by examining the frequency and nature of the (a) type above. Looking again at the distribution of definite article forms in the *Durham Ritual* as presented in 3.2.a above, we immediately notice that the gloss provides no examples whatsoever of unetymological <ðone>, <ðæs> or <ðære> forms. There are, however, a few "wrong" <ðæm> examples and it might be interesting to see if they, at least, parallel the usage we suggested for their counterparts in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. Recall that we postulated two main contexts for such unetymological <ðæm> forms in the *Gospels* gloss: (1) "motion" verbs like <faran>, <cuman> triggered prepositional phrases showing <ðæm> definite determiners regardless of nominal gender class:

## 3.3.a

flugon of ðæm byrgen  
FUGERUNT DE MONUMENTO  
(Mk xvi/8)

together with the other instances listed under 2.13.i/j on pp. 90–92 above. (2) temporal constructions with neutral directional locational values – *allatives*:

## 3.3.b

in ðæm tid gefeade gaste halige  
IN IPSA HORA EXULTAUT SPIRITU SANCTO  
(L x/21)

together with those under 2.13.a above. That such usages also occur in the *Durham Ritual* would appear to be beyond dispute. Consider as an instance:

## 3.3.c

in ðæm tide sprecend væs hæl'  
IN ILLO TEMPORE LOQUEBATUR IESUS  
(107/7)

while *iam* is everywhere glossed by <ðæm tide> (e.g. 165/21; 162/16) and *in omni tempore* by <ælcv tide> (e.g. 165/13; 124/9; 34/8; 184/20), where <tid> is, of course, historically *feminine*. Likewise, glossing the Latin "accusative of time when", a temporal location with no directional features, we find:

## 3.3.d

in ðassv tide efernlic  
 IN HANC HORAM UESPITERNAM  
 (179/13-14)

as well as at (131/19–20), suggesting that in general the <–m> morphological marker performed an *allative* (non-directional) temporal marking function. Yet our data are far from being the best we could wish for and we do not find in the *Durham Ritual* contrastive <ðære> instances like those in the earlier gloss which appeared to denote locative/directional temporal constructions, as those at 2.13.b. The most promising context in the *Ritual* merely produces a literal Latin rendering:

## 3.3.e

ða ðe ðv giworhtest frō gigoðhade ðin við  
 QUAE GESSISTI A IUUENTUTE TUA USQUE  
 in ðas ældes tid  
 IN HANC AETATI HORAM  
 (170/7-8)

while within the space of a very few lines on the same manuscript page, we find conflicting glosses such as:

## 3.3.f

gemeodvma driht' næhte ðissv bvtan synne vsig  
 DIGNARE DOMINE NOCTE ISTA SINE PECCATO NOS  
 gehalda gehalda ðv gimeodvma driht' god  
 CUSTODIRE...CUSTODIRE DIGNERIS DOMINE DEUS

. . in ðisser næhte hearto vsa  
 IN ISTA NOCTE CORDA....NOSTRA

(182/3-6)

Yet again, it is possible to discover parallels in the *Ritual* to the situation in the earlier gloss where <ðæm> is the preferred surface definite determiner form in prepositional phrases controlled by "motion" directional verbs:

## 3.3.g

- (1) vætro of sido ðinv gilædedo  
 AQUAS DE LATERE TUO PRODUCTAS  
 (115/2)

- (2) 7 æc gifearria frō ðæ stove  
 ATQUE DISCEDAT AB EO LOCO  
 (120/7)

where <stow> and <sidu> are etymologically *feminine*. But it would be wrong to treat such examples in isolation, since the *Durham Ritual's* glossator would seem to have generalized <-m> attributive morphology in spatial (*non-temporal*) locational contexts even where a non-directional *allative* is indicated:

## 3.3.h

- (1) ic bya ivih mið on stove ðissv on eorðe  
 HABITABO UOBISCUM IN LOCO ISTO IN TERRA  
 (36/11)

- (2) giscilda alle byeno in ðissv  
 DEFENDAT OMNES HABITANTES IN HOC  
 giwvnvn'  
 HABITACULO  
 (122/20-21)

contexts where, we suggested, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* showed a contrast with directional *locatives* and retained the "etymological" gender <ðær> determiner form intact:

## 3.3.i

ah wæs ða geone in ðær ɬ stoue ðer  
 SED ERAT ADHUC IN ILLO LOCO UBI

gearn him martha  
 OCCURRERAT EI MARTHA  
 (J xi/30)

Once more it might be the case that our interpretation of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* materials has been over-subtle, or that the later gloss is simply showing a tendency to generalize <ðæm> forms to all locative situations, temporal/non-temporal, allative/directional. For this interpretation we shall find considerable support when we come to examine the behaviour of attributive forms other than the definite article.

The figures in the following table (3.3.j) represent the count of individual tokens of <-um>/<-re> morphological markers (and their orthographic variants) as they are to be found in the *Durham Ritual* with attributive forms like the possessive pronoun, demonstrative pronouns, definite articles and "strong" adjectives mapped against the etymological genders of those nouns with which they appear in construction (following Jones (1964) pp. 101; 106; 114 and 119). These figures are remarkable in two ways. Firstly, there is no "spread" whatsoever of etymologically *feminine* morphological markers into *neuter* or *masculine* noun contexts. On the contrary, it would appear from these data that the <-r(e)> attributive morphological termination is coming to be non-productive in the grammar of this late Northumbrian writer in singular locative contexts.

## 3.3.j

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<-(u)m>	115	120	61
<-r(e)>	0	26	0

Figures like these would strongly suggest that the internalized rule system of this grammar was coming to generalize the <-(u)m> case termination as the *case form* for signalling all of those *case relationships* for which a "locative"/"dative" was appropriate — instrumentality, location (directional and non-directional), etc. It was *not* being utilized as a specialized signal for particular kinds of case relationships after the fashion we have suggested for the *Lindisfarne Gospels* usage. Thus

## 3.3.k

ðio ðe vil gihera clæn̄v ðohte clænvm  
QUE TIBI UULT SERUIRE PURA MENTE MUNDOQUE

heorte  
CORDE

(104/6-7)

shows a <-um> termination on the attributive word in construction with the historically *feminine* <heorte> as a reflection of the fact that it enjoys the same argument status in the proposition as does the immediately preceding "historical" construction <clæn̄v ðohte>. Recall a similar type of instance in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* in cases like <of alra heorta ðin...of alra sauel ðin...of alra ðohr ðin> at (Mk xii/30–33): see 2.12.c above. Consider as well examples like:

## 3.3.1

bloedsa erfevardnisse ðin̄v l ðinræ  
BENEDIC HEREDITATI TUAE (sic)  
(173/10-11)

showing what appears to be the "equivalence" of the <-um>/<re> terminations as "dative" case forms, here expressing the *absolutive* case relationship, triggered by the Latin verb <benedico>. Perhaps the best we can say is that while it is likely that the scribe of the earlier gloss utilized <-(u)m> terminations to express specific types of locational arguments in propositions, the author of the later gloss appears to have generalized this process to all those arguments requiring a superficial "dative" *case form*

expression.

A phenomenon like this we have, of course, already met in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss itself. We saw there that the glossator apparently was coming to use a single < -es> type termination for all those case relationships (be they absolutives, locatives or whatever) which Old English superficially manifested by the "possessive" *case form*. If anything, this tendency is even more marked in the gloss to the *Durham Ritual* as the following table shows. Again we map total numbers of < -(e)s> /< -r(e)> termination tokens in the gloss for those attributives like definite determiners, possessive pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and "strong" adjectives against the historical grammatical gender of those nouns with which they appear in construction:

### 3.3.m

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<-(e)s>	138	73	53
<-r(e)>	0	40	0

(following Jones (1964). pp. 101; 106; 114 and 119). More than 64% of the total of attributives in construction with historically *feminine* nouns show an < -(e)s> suffix. Although we tended to dismiss the importance of any predilection the glossator of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* may have had for literally rendering Latin attributive words, it might yet be the case that the glossator of the *Ritual* was more inclined in this direction, thus enabling us to explain away congruential idiosyncracy as a mere glossing characteristic. However, if we compare even the above unetymological < -(e)s> gender congruences with the gender of the Latin words glossed, we see that this cannot be so:

## 3.3.n

LATIN ITEM GENDER			
	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<i>unetymological</i>			
<-(e)s>	1	61	8

Nor would there appear either any argument whatsoever to be made for the existence of some unique *case relationship* expressing function for these unetymological "possessive" <-(e)s> attributive forms. Compare, for instance, the following occurrences of <ðines>/<ðinræ> with the historically *feminine* nouns <gefe> "gift" and <wræþþu> "anger" in what are clearly very closely related *case relationship* contexts: "*the aid of your gift*"; "*the indignation of your anger*" — perhaps some kind of source locational argument: "*that indignation which has as its source your anger*".

## 3.3.o

(1) þte gefe ðinre velfremniso mæhtigo  
UT GRATIAE TUAE BENEFICIA POTIORA

ðerhfoe  
PERCIPIAT

(71/22-72/1)

(2) fvlvme gefe ðinræ gihreme ve  
AUXILIUM GRATIAE TUAE...IMPLORAMUS  
(37/2-3)

as well as the examples at (99/100–101; 98/6; 37/20–21; 123/4), as against:

## 3.3.p

- (3) **ða vsig giðinge gefe ðines wyrðo**  
 QUE NOS EXPIANDO GRATIAE TUAE DIGNOS  
**gifrēmo**  
 EFFICIENT

(23/11)

- (4) **gionn vs helpe gefe' ðines**  
 PRESTA NOBIS...AUXILIUM GRATIAE TUAE

(16/15)

and also at (8/4–5; 7/10–11). While with <*wræþþu*> we find:

## 3.3.q

- (1) **svyppa ðines vraððo ymbwoend**  
 FLAGELLA TUAE IRACUNDIAE....AUERTE

(8/19–20;15/13)

- (2) **iorre ðinræ wræððo ymbwoend**  
 IRAM TUAE INDIGNATIONIS AFERTE

(42/17;43/12)

It might even be claimed that given the incipient tendency for nominal ā-stem morphology to be used as the model for other, originally distinct declensional types in both late Northumbrian glosses, we might not be surprised to discover attributive <–(e)s> shapes to be overall more common when that shape was coming to be generalized as the "possessive" terminator for the *nouns* of most declensions and genders (Lindelöf (1901) pp. 108 ff; Ross (1937); Blakeley (1949); Carpenter (1910); Kellum (1906); Foley (1903)). But the situation is not as neat as this and we are just as likely to find "historical" attributive forms in construction with *feminine* nouns showing "unhistorical" <–es> terminators:

## 3.3.r

- (1) **somnvnges ðinræ**  
 CONGREGATIONIS TUAE

(173/2)

(2) bloetsvnges ðines gefe  
 BENEDICTIONIS TUAE CRATIAM  
 (91/21; 95/6)

### 3.4 ABSOLUTIVE (NEUTRAL) CASE EXPRESSION

We argued in our previous chapter that the case relationship whose argument status in the proposition was a function of the semantic make up of the predicate – i.e. the *ABSOLUTIVE* or neutral case relationship (Anderson (1974) pp. 115–120) – was from time to time indicated by the use of <–ne> terminations on attributive words in NPs regardless of the gender class of the head noun:

#### 3.4.a

wæccas	forðon	forðon	nuuto gie	ðone dæge
UIGILATE	ITAQUE	QUIA	NESCITIS	DIEM
ne ðone tid				
NE HORAM				

(Mt xxv/13)

Here, we suggested, the <ðone> in construction with the *feminine* <tid> expressed the fact that it shared the argument status of <dæg> *vis-à-vis* the predicate <nuuto gie>. While there was some evidence from the gloss to suggest that an innovation like this had taken place in the internalized rule system of late Northumbrian Old English, we did stress that it by no means represented the most prominent characteristic of "unetymological" attributive morphology in respect of nominal case relationship expression, but was rather some kind of "minor rule" manifestation. Indeed, we shall see very soon below that our deliberate omission of certain data from our *Lindisfarne Gospels* discussion may have accorded even such a minor rule system more status than it deserved. In the *Durham Ritual* there are also a few instances of unetymological <–ne> attributive terminations in construction with historically *feminine* and *neuter* nouns but none of these involves the definite determiner: *there are no unetymological <ðone> determiner forms in the Ritual text.* Nevertheless, there are a few places where we find possessive pronouns and "strong" adjectives in *absolutive*

argument contexts marked by attributive word <-ne> morphology:

## 3.4.b

(1) þte symle bloedsvng of' ðiosne  
UT.....SEMPER BENEDICTIO SUPER HUNC

stove 7 of' allo byendo  
LOCUM ET SUPER OMNES HABITANTES

in ðæm  
IN EO PERMANEAT

(100/8-9)

(2) allm' ece god bliðelicor ðæm  
OMNIPOTENS SEMPITERNE DEUS PROPENSUS HIS

dagv ðinne miltheort' ve gifylga  
DIEBUS TUAM MISERICORDIAM CONSEQUAMUR

(34/16-17)

(3) to affleanne alne mæht fiondes  
AD EFFUGANDUM OMNEM POTESTATEM INIMICI  
(121/10)

(4) allm' ece god ðv. ðe ðisses  
OMNIPOTENS SEMPITERNE DEUS QUI HUIUS

dæges arwyrðne haligne æc glæd' eadges  
DIEI UENERANDAM SANCTAMQUE LAETITIAM BEATI

apostol' ðines ioh' gisaldes  
APOSTOLI TUI IOHANNIS..TRIBUISTI  
(47/3-5)

(5) halne do folc ðinne driht'  
SALUUM FAC POPULUM TUUM DOMINE  
(173/10)

(6) ðio ærist lif gisilið ece  
 QUE PRIUS UITAM PRESTITIT SEMPITERNAM

þ t ðon mæht ongeatta t wvta  
 QUAM POSSET NOSSE

ondveardne  
 PRESENTEM

(48/15-16)

where the items <stow>, <miltheortnis>, <mæht> and <glædñis> are etymologically *feminine*, while <folc> and <lif> are *neuter*. Other examples are to be found at (61/21; 76/16–17; 40/7–8; 163/13 and – if the abbreviation can be expanded – 100/5). The total number of unetymological <–ne> tokens is extremely small in the gloss as a whole (only eleven in all – see Jones (1964) page 130) and might therefore be dismissed as being of little statistical interest, reflecting some kind of exceptional, idiosyncratic usage occasionally (but by no means always) triggered by a direct translation of a Latin attributive word. However, we bring these instances to the reader's attention both to draw the parallel to similar forms in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and to prepare the ground for what may prove to be a similar and more extensive usage in later, Middle English materials, notably the *Peterborough Chronicle*. At the same time, this type of construction in the main body of the gloss appears to be reflected in the materials to be found in the rather strange alphabetically arranged word-list which we find near the end of the *Durham Ritual* – the *HAE SUNT NOTAS PREDISTINATAS* (pp. 187–192 of Lindelöf's (1927) edition). This list includes a number of realizations for some of the definite article and demonstrative pronoun attributive forms – the omission of others being a feature to which we can perhaps ascribe a positive interpretation. There (as outlined in 3.4.c below) we find the following late Northumbrian/Latin "equivalences", where the *hinc* Latin form is clearly a corrupt rendering for *huic*. Such data are clearly interesting, although the dubious status of the word list and our lack of knowledge as to what principles (if any) lie behind its compilation, should make us cautious about placing too much reliance upon it.

## 3.4.c

DEFINITE ARTICLE		POSSESSIVE PRONOUN	
Northumb	Latin	Northumb	Latin
<ðone>	quem	<ðis>	hoc
<þ>	quam	<ðios>	hēc
<þ>	quod	<ðiosne>	hunc
<ðæs>	cuius	<ðissæs>	huius
<ðæm>	cui	<ðissv>	hinc ( <i>sic</i> )
<þ. ðe ilca>	idem	<ðassv>	hāc

However, it is noticeable that the list contains no separate <-re> *feminine* "possessive" or "dative" case forms, <-s> and <-m> types having been generalized and this fits in well with the conclusions we have reached from our study of the main materials from the gloss. Again it is interesting to observe that the *NOTAS* provide only two absolute case relationship markers for the definite determiner — <ðone> and <þ> — and one for the demonstrative — <ðiosne>. There is no inclusion of *feminine* shapes like <ða> or <ðas>. Now we should resist rushing to too obvious a conclusion on the basis of such limited and specialized evidence, but given our remarks concerning the overall function of <þ> in the gloss as a discourse tracking device and as an indicator of shared hearer/speaker knowledge — and in this respect the *NOTAS* gloss of *idem* by <þ. ðe ilca> is significant — it would appear that the *NOTAS* point to the availability of *only one case form for attributive terminations in NPs in absolute argument contexts* — <-ne>. As in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss <ða> "object" definite determiner shapes appear to be confined in the *Ritual* to "complex NP" environments both in their historical and (singleton) unetymological use as in:

## 3.4.d

hæbbendo geleafo gesetta had ða læassa  
 HABENTES LICENTIAM CONSTITUERE GRADUM MINOREM  
 (194/18-19)

where <had> is etymologically *masculine*. See too the "historical" <ða> examples in <ða ilca...girihtnise> (56/14–15); <ðerh ða halga cirica> (113/16) and <for ða haligan ðrinesse> (114/10): c.f. 2.14.b above.

Yet we must not allow these observations to disguise what is unquestionably the principal innovation in the inflectional morphology of attributives to nouns which are in *absolutive* arguments in propositions in both glosses. Possessive pronouns and "strong" adjectives in particular are appearing with *zero morphology* in this neutral case function environment. While we shall be content to cite only a few of the many instances below, the token count of "endingless", "inflectionless" forms for such syntactic items in both glosses as set out in 3.4.e speaks for itself (details from Jones (1964) pp. 114 and 119). There would appear to be little doubt that those nouns whose argument status in their propositions is a direct function of the semantic structure of the sentential (verbal) head are assigned attributive words showing *zero morphology*. This is, of course, unsurprising since we might well expect that the case function with no independent locational, source–goal characteristics and which was the least available for subject selection should historically be the most likely to appear in a morphologically depleted environment.

### 3.4.e

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<hr/>			
<i>min/ðin</i>			
<i>LG</i>	48	27	34
<i>DR</i>	28	55	28
<hr/>			
<i>st adj</i>			
<i>LG</i>	27	34	28
<i>DR</i>	20	11	13
<hr/>			

For a final time we might stress too that such developments would appear to reflect ongoing linguistic usage rather than be the result of any direct or literal rendering of Latin attributive forms. The following table maps the individual tokens of the "unhistorical"

morphology-less expressions of the possessive pronoun in the *Durham Ritual* onto the genders of the Latin words they gloss:

## 3.4.f

LATIN GENDER		
masculine	feminine	neuter
31	62	18

a distribution offering no support whatsoever for innovative <min/ðin> shapes being a reflection of the Latin *neuter* gender. Having said this, however, we must recall our earlier remarks on the high level of abbreviation used in attributive and nominal terminations in the *Ritual* gloss and bear in mind that at least some of our endingless tokens may represent instances where the scribe intended to place an abbreviatory <'> symbol. The following represent a few typical instances of the kind of usage we have been describing:

## 3.4.g

- (1) ðv ðerhsend gast halig  
TU PERMITTE SPIRITUM SANCTUM  
(111/11)
- (2) driht' hal do ðone cynig  
DOMINE SALUUM FAC REGEM  
(175/21)
- (3) heofonlic bloetsvng onfoe  
CÆLESTEM BENEDICTIONEM ACCIPIAT  
(97/12)

- (4) besih' driht' ðiven' ðin' ðe  
 RESPICE DOMINE FAMULÆ TUE TIBI  
 agenlic þ ned hernise  
 DEBITAM SERUITUTEM  
 (106/8)

where <gast> and <cynig> are historically *masculine* and <bletsung> and <herenise> *feminine*. Other instances are to be found at (6/1; 91/1; 27/19; 173/8; 177/2; 121/5) and full references are available in Jones (1964) pp. 110, 113 and 115–116.

In conclusion we should also note that *morphology-less* attributive shapes occur in both the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and *Durham Ritual* glosses with *possessive pronouns only* in a few case relationship contexts normally expressed by "locative"/"dative" case forms. They are perhaps too few in number (a mere half dozen or so in the *Ritual*) for us to draw any conclusions as to their *case function* distribution, but the majority of those in the later gloss are to be found in prepositional phrases denoting locational (directional) *source/goal* arguments:

### 3.4.h

- (1) divblica synna ða ðe ðv giworhtest  
 SCELERA QUAE GESSISTI  
 frō gigoðhade ðin  
 A IUUENTUTE TUA  
 (170/7)
- (2) aspringa þ to lvfv ðin  
 DEFICERE AD AMOREM TUUM  
 (72/12-13)
- (3) se ymbvoended wræðo ðin 7 wælm' ðin  
 AUERTATUR .... IRA TUA ET FUROR TUUS  
 frō ceastrē ðin  
 A CIUITATE TUA  
 (11/1)

a construction we shall have cause to discuss again in our *Peterborough Chronicle* materials in the following chapter.

Such *zero morphology* attributive forms in arguments which would have demanded in West Saxon Old English some kind of "dative"/"locative" case form are even more rare in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. Indeed, they appear to be confined to a rather special context which we have had reason to discuss in the last chapter (see pp. 82–84). That environment is where we find a "repeated" set of complex NPs, each sharing an identical argument *vis-à-vis* the predicate in the proposition:

## 3.4.i

7 lufa ðu drihten god ðin of alra heorta  
 ET DILIGES DOMINUM DEUM TUUM EX TOTO CORDE

ðin 7 of alra ðoht ðin 7 of alra mægne ðin  
 TUO ET EX TOTA ANIMA TUA ET EX TOTA MENTE TUA  
 (Mk xii/30–33)

and see also (L x/27). Perhaps in the prepositional phrase instances we are witnessing an "endingless" possessive pronoun in a post-posed position in its NP due to the fact that the argument status of the prepositional phrase has already been clearly signalled both by the <–ra> morphology of the first attributive word and the introductory prepositional particle case form.

# 4 THE TWELFTH CENTURY

## THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE

### 4.1 THE GENERAL SITUATION

Let us turn our attention for the first time to non-glossing data in the hope that we may be able to see there those kinds of morphological developments with which we have up till now been concerned, but operative in a more "natural" linguistic context than that which we were compelled to deal with in our documentation from the tenth century. We shall devote this chapter to a detailed examination of the nominal attributive morphology, especially that of the definite determiner, in what is often referred to as one of the earliest Middle English texts by those scholars who set store by the sub-division of the diachronic process into "major" periods. Our data will be taken from the annals comprising that part of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle known as the *Peterborough Chronicle* – Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 636 (Clark (1970); Whitelock (1954); Ker (1957), pp. 424–6). This important twelfth century East Midland dialect text is of interest to the historical linguist in almost every department of language change and innovation:

"This text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was written, at intervals between 1121 and 1155, at Peterborough; and the annals from 1122 onwards were not merely written but also composed there. And, as Peterborough monks, its writers were probably also natives of the district; for in the twelfth century and the thirteenth, established abbeys recruited their monks locally, and this was probably the practice in the earlier twelfth century also. So, because it is so precisely dated and localized, The Peterborough Chronicle is important as a linguistic record, since, apart from the Ayenbite of Inwyd, there is hardly another Middle English text of which it can be said both that it is an original, not a garbled copy, and also that its date and provenance are firmly established."

(Clark (1970), p. xxxvii)

Of real interest to us is the fact that the data provided by this manuscript might almost be considered to be a microcosm of the range of innovations to attributive nominal morphology across the entire temporal span

covered by this monograph. In it we find a spectrum of determiner and other attributive nominal inflection ranging from something like that to be found in "classical" West Saxon texts (with historical gender, case and number sensitive accretion shapes) to one where noun phrase attributives are "morphology-less", and especially where definite determiner forms are confined in all gender, number and case environments to an accretion-free <þe> manifestation.

We can see this spectrum in the various sections into which the annals comprising the *Peterborough Chronicle* are usually sectionalized. Traditionally, the *Peterborough Chronicle* is sub-divided (principally on paleographic evidence) into three main parts: (i) *Text A* — the annals up till 1121; (ii) *Text B* — the annals from 1122–1131; (iii) *Text C* (sometimes known as the *Continuations*) — the last section of the manuscript, containing the annals from 1132–1154. There is, in addition, a fourth section which will play an important part in our study — the *Peterborough Interpolations*: these inserts occur to the *Text A* annals but appear to have been written by the scribe responsible for the composition of *Text B* (Clark (1970), pp. xv–xxviii). Nevertheless, despite this we shall see in the pages which follow that *Text B* and the *Interpolations* are far from identical in their treatment of nominal attributive morphology and show interesting and significant differences in detail suggestive of a more innovative grammatical rule system underlying the latter.

The *A Text* by and large shows a nominal attributive morphology reflecting both the case relationship, number and grammatical gender of the head noun in the construction in a way almost identical to that characteristic of "classical" West Saxon models:

#### 4.1.a

Sume of ðam cnihtan ferdon upon þone upplore 7  
 scotedon adunweard mid arewan toward þam  
 haligdome swa þet on þære rode þe stod bufon þam  
 weofede sticodon on manige arewan

(1053/17–20)

(All references are to Clark's (1970) edition, annual date and line number.)

Yet even in this "conservative" part of the manuscript we find "wrong" gender concord between attributive word and head noun:

#### 4.1.b

- (1) Ðus wæs se mynstre of Burch forbærnd 7  
forhærgod  
(1070/56)
- (2) 7 þet duged þet wæs on Englalande forð  
mid se cyng  
(1114/23-24)
- (3) 7 dyden hit eall þa in þone cyrce  
(1070/54)

where <mynster> "*monastery*" is historically *neuter*, <duged> "*nobility*" and <cirice> "*church*" historically *feminine*.

At the other end of the spectrum, the *C Text* (annals 1132–1154) bears witness to an almost "morphology-less" nominal attributive situation. Attributive words, notably "strong" adjectives and demonstrative pronouns show no postpositional signals either for nominal case relationships or grammatical gender while the definite determiner appears in almost all environments as <þe> /<se> /<te> :

#### 4.1.c

Dis gear com Henri king to þis land. Þa com  
henri abbot 7 ureide þe muneces of Burch to þe  
king forþi ðat he uuolde underþeden ðat mynstre  
to Clunie, sua ðat te king was welneh beþaht 7  
sende efter þe muneces. 7 þurh Godes milce 7  
þurh þe bисcop of Seresbyri 7 te bисcop of Lincol  
7 te oþre rice men þe þer weron, þa wiste þe  
king ðat he feorde mid suicdom  
(1132/1 – 7)

although even at this point it is interesting to notice that the determiner <ðat> is still to be found in this late part of the Chronicle in what some would claim to be "historical" gender congruence with the *neuter* item

<mynter>.

It is when we turn our attention to that portion of the manuscript represented by *Text B* and the *Peterborough Interpolations* that we find a type of innovative usage in nominal attributive morphology which is at once reminiscent of that we have already noted as characteristic of the two late Northumbrian glosses yet on other occasions is quite unlike anything we found there. These sub-sections of the Chronicle show "wrong" attributive word grammatical gender marking in almost every line of the text:

#### 4.1.d

- (1) 7 benam ælc ðone riht  
(1125/9)
- (2) Se kyng Henri geaf þone biscoprice  
(1129/25)
- (3) wæs swiðe micel wind on þet dæi xi  
Kalendarum April i  
(1122/9-10)
- (4) Þa wæs abbot on þære minstre, Egbalθ wæs  
gehaten  
(686/2-3)

where we see what were in the grammar of classical West Saxon "direct object" masculine marking <þone> shapes in construction with the etymologically *neuter* <biscoprice> "bishopric" and *feminine* <hond> "hand", while etymologically *neuter* <þet> and *feminine* <þære> configurations are found in congruence with nouns like <dæi> "day" and <minstre> "monastery", which in Old English were usually lexically marked as having respectively a *masculine* and *neuter* grammatical gender classification.

Further, it is in these parts of the *Peterborough Chronicle* where we come across attributive morphological usage of a kind hardly in evidence at all in our late Northumbrian data. Especially in construction with nouns which represent locative arguments in the proposition, we persistently find the use of attributive morphological shapes traditionally associated with ABSOLUTIVE arguments:

4.1.e

- (1) 7 Se kyng geaf þone biscoprice æfter  
Michelesmesse þone abbot Henri his nefe  
(1129/25-26)
- (2) 7 brohton hem to þone kinge  
(1124/22)
- (3) On þes ilces geares let se kyning nimen  
his broðer Rothbert fram þone biskop Roger  
of Særesbyri  
(1126/12-13)
- (4) Com to þet mynstre on Medeshamstede  
(675/31-32)

where in classical West Saxon and even late Northumbrian data we would normally expect to find constructions such as: <(to/from) ðæm cyninge/abbote/mynstre>. Nor are these innovative attributive case forms confined to nouns whose historical gender assignment would "accept" them had they been in absolute argument contexts, they are also to be found in environments where traditional gender congruence is also violated:

4.1.f

- (1) Syððon comen alle dræuednysse 7 ealle  
ifele to þone mynstre  
(1066/19-20)
- (2) 7 swa to ðet stede þet man cleopeð Folies  
(656/44)

where <stede> "place" is historically of the *masculine* gender. Such usage clearly presents us with problems of a different order of magnitude from anything we have come across in the data considered in our two previous chapters, and equally clearly they suggest to us that we are looking not merely at a linguistic phenomenon whereby language users, whose grammar is "losing" lexical grammatical gender assignment to nouns, are "making mistakes" in a random way in the allocation of individual lexical items to a particular gender class set. Rather, we are witnessing what

appears to be a dramatic shift away from earlier usage whereby speakers are coming to generate determiner shapes historically inappropriate for the expression of the *case* relationships characteristic of the nominal arguments with which they are in construction. But before we turn to propose a solution to this difficult problem, let us consider a type of development with which we have become by now familiar.

#### 4.2 THE DETERMINER <þET> IN THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE

The reader will not be surprised at this juncture if we immediately isolate out for separate discussion those forms of the definite determiner in <þet>, since we have endeavoured to show in the last two chapters that, even by late Northumbrian Old English, this form had been assigned a particular semantic role in the grammar, a role which was no longer related to the superficial marking of nominal grammatical gender classification. In our deliberations on the glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and *Durham Ritual*, we suggested that the functions of the <þet> determiner were principally twofold: it acted (a) as a means of "tracking" the semantic identity relationships holding between temporarily sequential items in extended discourse; (b) as a device for highlighting the status of the presuppositions holding between speaker and hearer concerning the semantic range of reference of certain types of lexical item. We came forcefully to the conclusion that <þ(a/et)> forms, even in the late Northumbrian glosses, could be non-gender significant: certainly their unhistorical gender congruence occurrences need not conote any reclassification of the inherent gender class of the noun to which they were an attribute. In fact, nearly all students of definite article morphology in the period between, say, 950 and 1250 agree that some such new function for the <þet> determiner was being introduced into the grammar, but their comments on the phenomenon are usually vague, characteristically those of Clark ((1970), pp. lxi-lxii):

"a new development is observable: the shift of þet from nom./acc. neuter article to independent emphatic demonstrative. This is not yet complete, for not until

the *Ormulum* is þat recorded with animate as well as inanimate nouns. Both the *Interpolations* and the *First Continuation*, however, show þet used with singular inanimates of any original gender, in contexts where an emphatic form is appropriate and especially with the antecedent of a defining relative clause, thus, þet ilce forgiueness..þet he scolde hauen"

These observations are quite confusing. We might not unreasonably ask precisely what is meant either syntactically or semantically by an "emphatic" form of the definite article: such a "cover" nomenclature will hardly embrace, as we shall see, all those environments in which the <þet> form appears with unhistorical gender congruence in the *Chronicle* text. Certainly, it is quite useless as descriptive terminology for the vast majority of the innovative <þ> usage characteristic of the late Northumbrian glosses. It is disturbing too to read Clark's categorical statement concerning the non-occurrence of <þ> with animate nouns (presumably in unhistorical gender congruence contexts) in texts prior to the thirteenth century. It is clearly contradicted by the evidence of occurrences like <þ cnæht> etc. that we have shown to be such an outstanding characteristic of the tenth century Northumbrian materials. Her feeling too that there might be some significance for historical <þet> distribution in the animacy/inanimacy characteristic of head lexical nominals is nowhere statistically justified but may reflect some residual adherence to a position like Ross' *neutralization* (see her own remarks on what she terms the phenomenon of "masculinization" in the *Peterborough Chronicle* in Clark (1957))

Can we in any way relate the contexts where nouns of whatever historical gender set are found in construction with <þet> attributives in the *Peterborough Chronicle* with those we proposed for the late Northumbrian glosses? There is no *a-priori* reason, of course, why <þet> attributes should surface in like environments in texts which are different both in date and in dialect, but the kinds of proposals which we have been supporting for the earlier data might the more readily be accepted were we able to produce evidence of parallel correspondence in later materials.

### 4.3 <PET> AS A "DISCOURSE TRACKER" IN THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE

We have already observed on many occasions that perhaps the syntactic context where unetymological <þ> forms surfaced most commonly in our tenth century data was that of EQUI NP: where two referentially identical Ns appeared sequentially in a discourse, the second of the two was regularly marked in both late Northumbrian glosses by a <þ> determiner to reflect this equivalence of semantic reference:

#### 4.3.a

7	gesald uæs him boc ðæs witges esaie
ET TRADITUS EST	ILLI LIBER PROPHETAES ESAIAE
7	þte þ miðdy untynde þ boc
ET UT	REVOLUIT LIBRUM

(L iv/17-20)

See pages 45–48 above. Not surprisingly, discourse environments like this are also to be found throughout the *Peterborough Chronicle*. Consider the following instances from both the *B* and *C Texts* and the *Interpolations*:

#### 4.3.b

- (1) Þæræfter þe Tywesdæi æfter Palmes Sunendæi  
wæs swiðe micel wind on þet dæi xi  
*Kalendarum Aprilis*  
(1122/8-10)
- (2) 7 þes ilces geares ferde se forensprecene  
abbot Henri ham to his agen minstre to  
Peitou...God ælmihtig haue his milce ofer  
þet wrecce stede!  
(1128/9-16)
- (3) Crist ræde for þa wrecce muneces of Burch 7  
for þet wrecce stede!  
(1131/38-39)

- (4) cume to þet mynstre on Medeshamstede, 7  
 have þet ilce forgiuenesse of Crist 7 Sancte  
 Peter 7 of þone abbot 7 of þone muneca þet  
 he scolde hauen gif he to Rome fore  
 (675/31-34)

where <stede> "place" is historically *masculine* and <forgiuenesse> "mercy" *feminine*. We noted in our discussion on page 57 above, that although phonological identity between referentially alike Ns in the discourse was a common characteristic of the unetymological <þ> attributive environments in the glosses, it was not always a precondition for the construction:

#### 4.3.c

monn sum adune astigade...from hierusalem	
HOMO QUIDAM DESCENDEBAT	AB HIERUSALEM
in ðær byrig se diacon miððy wæs neh	
IN HIERICHO LEUITA CUM ESSET SECUS	
þ stou	
LOCUM	

(L x/30-32)

For examples like the last, we postulated an underlying "non-locationally specific" place lexical entry for such "proper" nouns as /Jerusalem/, precise locational reference being supplied attributively: /some place: some place which is called Jerusalem/. And it was to that "non-specific" place characteristic that subsequent locational nouns in the discourse like <stow>/<stede> referred. Our example at 4.3.b (1) shows an identity between two discourse Ns which is both semantic and (at least partially) phonological, while those at (2) and (3) are rather like that in 4.3.c. 4.3.b (4) is particularly appropriate here, the discourse showing a <þet> determiner shape appended to the first of two identical (<forgiuenesse>) Ns, the second of which has itself been pronominalized: /he shall have at Peterborough the same forgiveness as the forgiveness he would have received had he gone to Rome for the forgiveness/.

Nevertheless, such types should not be regarded as peculiar to the domain of unhistorical gender agreements, a

point we stressed too for the <þ> forms in the glosses (see page 48 above). Consider the following examples where we might argue for the determiner <þet>/<ðat> as a signal for an equi-noun rather than as a surface expression of nominal grammatical gender:

## 4.3.d

- (1) 7 diden an scærp iren abuton þa mannes  
throte...oc bæron al ðat iren

(1137/31-34)

- (2) On þis gear wærð se king Stephne ded 7  
bebyried þer his wif 7 his sune wæron  
bebyried æt Fauresfeld, þet minstre hi  
makedon

(1154/1-2)

*"..at the monastery of Faversham which  
they had founded"*

- (3) þa com Henri abbot 7 uureide þe muneces  
of Burch to þe king forþi ðat he uuolde  
underþeden ðat mynstre to Clunie

*"then came abbot Henry and accused the  
monks of Peterborough to the king of  
wanting to make that monastery subject  
to Cluny"*

(1132/3)

We should recall here too that especially in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss, we saw unetymological <þ> determiners with locational nouns like <stow> "place" (feminine) and <stede> "place" (masculine) almost entirely constrained to occur when precise geographic (locality) identification was provided in the form of a post-posed "defining" relative clause. In this way, the semantic "scope" of the head noun's locational reference was defined in the discourse for the reader: recall the following illustrative examples from the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

4.3.e

- (1) uæs ðonne in þ styd ðer ahoen  
 ERAT AUTEM IN LOCO UBI CRUCIFIXUS  
 uæs lehtun  
 EST HORTUS

(J xix/41)

- (2) 7 sætt fore ðæm heh-sedle in þ styd  
 ET SEDIT PRO TRIBUNALI IN LOCUM  
 seðe is gecuoeden i. est lapide stratus  
 QUI DICITUR LITHOSTRATUS  
 on ebrisc  
 HERBRAICE

(J xix/13)

as well as the other cases cited under 2.6.3 (a–e). Our *Peterborough Chronicle* data show examples not unlike these involving the congruence of <þet> with nouns which are both historically neuter and otherwise. Consider:

4.3.f

- (1) 7 swa to ðet stede þet man cleopeð Folies  
 (656/44)
- (2) 7 fra Isendic to þet steode þe man  
 cleopeð Federmude  
 (656/45)
- (3) swa þurh Merelade on an to þet wæter þet  
 man cleopeð Nen  
 (963/45)
- (4) cum to þet mynstre on Medeshamstede  
 (675/31-32)

(but note that at (656/47) we find <to þe riht ae þe gað to Elm>) as well possibly as the following where the precise terms of an agreement or condition – <foreweard>: <saht> *feminine* – are spelt out in detail:

- (5) Her on þis tima leot Ceolred abbot of  
 Medeshamstede 7 þa munecas Wulfrede to hand  
 þet land of Sempigaham to þet forewearde þet  
 æfter his dæi scolde þet land into þe  
 minstre  
 (852/1-3)
- (6) 7 makede ðat sahte ðat te king sculde ben  
 lauerd 7 king wile he liuede  
 (1140/67-68)

It is interesting to observe that in many of the above examples we find this "complete information" signalling, "proper noun" identifying <þet> attributive used with propositional arguments where historically we might have expected a "dative"/locative case form, i.e. <to þam mynstre>. It would therefore certainly appear to be the case that, in this kind of referential scope identifying function, the <þet> determiner was coming to be used across the entire nominal paradigm regardless of the argument status of the noun with which it appeared in construction. For a possible use of <þare> with this function in "dative" case form contexts, see § 5.8 below.

#### **4.4 <p> MARKING NOUNS WITH RESTRICTED SET MEMBERSHIP**

A common trigger for the selection of unetymological <þet> determiner forms in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* was that class of lexical item whose referential "scope" was such that WH-questions were inappropriately asked of it: both speaker and hearer could identify without recourse to further restrictive clause or other modification the precise semantic delimitation of the item in question. Perhaps the most convincing examples of this phenomenon from the gloss were:

##### **4.4.a**

- (1) geseton him þ rod to bearanne  
 IMPOSUERUNT ILLI CRUCEM PORTARE  
 (L xxiii/26)

(2) eaðor is uutedlice þ hefon 7 þ eorðe  
FACILIUS EST AUTEM CAELUM ET TERRAM

þte foregleore  
PRAETERIRE  
(L xvi/17)

Consider, by way of comparison, the following sentences from the *A Text* portion of the *Chronicle*:

4.4.b

- (1) Dæreæfter on Iunies monde ætywde an steorra  
norðan eastan...7 his leome stod toforan him  
on þet suðwest...he wæs gesewen on bæc on  
þet norðwest gangende  
(1110/15-18)
- (2) Se steorra ætwyde innon þet suðwest...7  
swilce ormæte beam geþuht norðeast scinende  
(1106/12-14)

The grammatical gender classification of items like <suðwest>, <norðwest>, <suðeast> and <norðeast> is not clear from the evidence provided by Bosworth-Toller (1882–98): only one example where an unambiguous gender reference is indicated is cited by them — <se þridda norþwest> *Orosius* 1,1 — and such items are most commonly quoted as the reduced remnants of locational prepositional phrases. However, it is evident that the directional/locational circumstantial arguments such items represent are not normally open to further situational, geographic specification: they represent unique or single member locational sets. Perhaps we might include here too the following, containing <þet> in construction with items knowledge of whose semantic domain can be said to be shared by speaker-hearers:

## 4.4.c

- (1) 7 þa arcebiscopes 7 biscopes 7 þet dugeð  
þet wæs on Englelande forð mid se cyng

(1114/23-24)

*"And the archbishops, bishops and  
nobility of England supported the King."*

- (2) Þis wæs sægon 7 herd fram þat he þider  
com eall þet lente(n)tid onan to Eastren

(1127/71-72)

*"This was seen and heard from the time  
of his arrival all through Lent and right  
up to Easter."*

- (3) 7 nama hit gauen Medeshamstede, forðan  
þat ðær is an wæl þe is gehaten Medeswæl;  
7 hi ongunnon þa þet grundwalla 7 þær on  
wrohton

(654/4-5)

- (4) Oc se ilce Heanri dide þonne king to  
understandene þet he hæfde læten his  
abbotrice for þet micele unsibbe þet wæs on  
þet land

(1127/26-27)

where in (3) <grundwalla> "foundations" (historically *masculine*) bears some kind of "inalienable possession" relationship to <Medeshamstede>, while in (4) <unsibbe> (historically *feminine*) represents a state of unrest which the scribe appears to assume is known about by the reader. Finally, it is interesting to note in the following example the <þet> determiner shape surfacing with a single member set lexical item (albeit etymologically *neuter*) in an argument where historically we might have expected a <ðam> "dative" form:

- (5) Landfranc arcebiscop, gewat of þissum life,  
ac we hopiað þet he ferde to þet heofanlice  
rice

(1089/2-3)

#### 4.5 CASE RELATIONSHIP MARKING AND THE ARGUMENT CONTEXTS FOR <PONE>

Besides the innovative use of the <*þet*> determiner, perhaps the principal syntactic change to affect nominal attributive words in the late Northumbrian glosses was, we suggested, the tendency for their morphology to reflect the case relationships of their head nouns in arguments in propositions. We proposed that ABSOLUTIVE arguments tended to throw up nouns whose attributive words manifested <-ne> morphological shapes; while those in LOCATIVE argument environments were signalled by postpositions with <-m> accretions. Such a phenomenon is not altogether an unlikely one in terms of what might be "naturally" possible in the light of the serialization status of the predicate in English at the close of the tenth century. There is considerable evidence to suggest that the language was evolving from a mixed SOV/SVO serialization posture to one which was strongly SVO (Traugott (1979); Venneman (1972); Lightfoot (1981); Vincent (1976); Beam (1985)), and that, as a consequence, post-posed morphological accretion as a device for signalling, for example, nominal case relationships was giving way to one where such semantic information was presented in a nominally pre-posed serialized way. It has been the basis of our argument in the last two chapters that such ante nominal signalling was not confined to prepositional particles like <*at*>, <*to*> or <*from*>, but was also manifested in the morphology of pre-posed attributive words at the "expense" of their earlier, simultaneous role of indicating the grammatical gender class of lexical items. It is this type of innovative development for which the data provided by the *Peterborough Chronicle* (especially the annals of the *B Text* and *Interpolations*) is invaluable. Without them, the changes to classical West Saxon attributive morphology that we described in Chapters Two and Three could probably be dismissed as the invention of an individual scribe, while in their absence the information concerning this area of the grammar provided by later texts like *Lazamon's Brut* would appear anomalous. Above all, the Chronicle materials will enable us with some confidence to finally dispense with the view all too often stated in handbooks on the history of the English language, that with speakers unable to recover inherent nominal gender, attributive words simultaneously

and immediately became morphology-less. However, perhaps the *Peterborough Chronicle's* greatest interest for us lies not merely in the fact that it supports the kinds of conclusions we have reached earlier in this monograph, but that it shows developments in attributive word morphology that seem to represent "syntactically natural" rule generalizations of a system like that we proposed for the late Northumbrian materials. A language learner exposed to a system like the latter might not unreasonably be expected to produce the types of innovations to it that we shall suggest are a feature of the *B Text* and *Interpolations* of Laud Misc. 636. (Baron (1971)).

If, following Jones ((1964); page 165), we take the simple token count of definite determiner shapes in the *B Text* (annals 1122–131) mapped against the West Saxon gender classification of those nouns with which they are in construction, we witness (at 4.5.a, page 145) what at first sight looks to be a very confusing picture (<þet> shapes are not included). If we compare this type of distribution with that in 2.2.b for the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, we immediately see that there is little to justify a claim that for the writers of these parts of the Chronicle a "sense" of historical nominal gender assignment processes survived. We are clearly not dealing here with some kind of "minor rule" innovation situation, since there would appear to be wholesale infringement of the gender congruence system throughout. <þone> forms are especially prominently "ungrammatically" assigned, while there would appear to be a complete displacement of the historically expected locative <þam>/<þære> forms by the <þone> "object" shape. Observe too, however, that although "morphology-less" <þe>/<se> definite determiners are to be found throughout the case relationship and gender paradigm, they are still statistically a minority anomaly compared with <þone> types.

## 4.5.a

## PC forms      WEST SAXON GRAMMATICAL GENDER

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
--	------------------	-----------------	---------------

**subject**

<se>/<þe>	70	5	4
<þone>	0	0	1

**object**

<þone>	19	5	17
<se>/<þe>	9	0	1
<þa>	3	2	0

**possessive**

<þas>	24	2	0
<þone>	0	1	0
<se>	0	0	6

**locative**

<þam>	1	0	1
<þone>	14	1	2
<se>	5	0	2
<þære>	0	1	0
<þa>	1	1	1

Let us begin by examining in some detail these unetymological occurrences of <-ne> definite determiner morphological shapes in both the *B Text* and the *Peterborough Interpolations* with the intention of seeing whether we can relate them in any way to a rule system which is endeavouring to produce prepositional indicators of the argument status of nouns in propositions. Following Anderson (1977) and Plank (1978), we have suggested in several places above that in addition to case relationship expressions such as ERGATIVE and LOCATIVE (both, we claimed, showing localist attributes of source and goal respectively) there was also a "neutral" non-directional case relationship called the ABSOLUTIVE. We observed that although this case expression was often confusingly conflated with whatever is meant by "direct object", we

chose to define it as that which represented those arguments in propositions whose case relationship with the head predication was inferrable from the semantic composition of the predicate itself. No participant function was expressible through the ABSOLUTIVE, rather it represented that argument affected by the predicate in propositions: it has a "neutral", non case-specific expressing function. At the same time, and perhaps in consequence, it is the case relationship least readily available for "subject selection" in sentences (Anderson (1977) page 23; Fillmore (1968)).

Our argument in the last two chapters has been that the syntax of late Old English produced a rule system whereby this "neutral" case (or, simply the category of case) found expression through <-ne> nominal attributive morphology. In other words, <þone> definite determiner forms could be regarded by late Old English as being merely a pre-posed expression of this non-participant argument, regardless of any concern as to whether it reflects an appropriate signal for the speaker's knowledge (however residual) of the inherent grammatical gender set of a particular lexical item.

We should like to claim here that the twelfth century manuscript which is the subject of this chapter illustrates a considerable extension of this system such that in certain sections of the text it would seem that speakers have no set of rules for assigning inherent grammatical gender specification to nouns at all, yet have retained a few of the surface expressions of such an earlier productive rule system, utilizing them in a much more "entrepreneurial" and generalized fashion than in the late Old English glosses (although there such innovations were a minority in competition with what looks to have been a fairly intact system whereby nominal grammatical gender was still reflected in attributive nominal shape). This is nowhere clearer than in the syntactic contextual distribution of <þone> definite determiners in those annals constituting the *B Text* and *Interpolations*. In the following sentences selected from those portions of the text, we should wish to claim that the <þone> determiner shape is being produced to reflect the "neutral", ABSOLUTIVE case relationship those arguments which they modify bear to the sentential predicate. Consider the following cases where, although it is clearly no longer important for our argument that they

should be so identified, we find <þone> in congruence with nouns whose historical gender is non-*masculine*:

4.5.b

- (1) þet he scolde beieton him þone mynstre of  
Burch (1130/18)
- (2) þet he scolde begeton hem ðone mynstre of  
Burch (1131/34-35)
- (3) seide þet he hæfde forlæten þone mynstre  
mid ealle (1130/13-14)
- (4) þet he scolde cumen to him 7 betæcen him  
þone abbotrice of Angeli (1131/15-16)
- (5) he hæfde underfangen ðone ærcebiscoprice (1123/60)
- (6) Se kyng Henri geaf þone biscoprice (1129/25-26)
- (7) geaf se kyng þone biscoprice of Baðe þes  
cwenes canceler (1123/67-68)
- (8) and hæfde ða baðe togedere þone kinerice  
on Scotlande 7 þone earldom on Englalande (1124/38-39)
- (9) ða nam man an 7 an 7 benæm ælc ðone riht  
hand (1125/8-9)
- (10) 7 leot maken þone mynstre (963/13)

As well as at: (1127/48-49); 1123/34-35); 1127/38;  
1127/40-41; 1123/71-72; 1125/18-19). For complete details,  
see Jones (1964) pp. 152-154. The implication of our  
argument is, of course, that such an interpretation of the  
function of <þone> holds also for those instances where it  
occurs as an attribute to historically *masculine* nouns:

## 4.5.c

- (1) 7 iæf hine þone eorldom  
(1127/16-17)
- (2) he brohte mid him þone eorl Waleran  
(1126/5)
- (3) 7 se dæcne hafde ongunnen þone godspel  
"Preteriens Iesus"  
(1122/4-5)

and also at (ll23/76–78; ll24/38–39; ll27/21–22; ll26/6; ll24/20–21; ll27/45). All the predicates in question in the above propositions are clearly absolute—requiring in their case frame lexical entry: "to take", "receive", "give", "have", "acquire", "possess", "begin", "bring", and the absolute arguments which they command semantically "complete", "exhaust", or "fill out" the semantic scope of the predicate item itself. In such cases as the above, we can see well developed instances of the kind of innovation we saw beginning to appear in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

## 4.5.d

wæccas	forðon	forðon	nuuto gie	ðone dæge
UIGILATE	ITAQUE	QUIA	NESCITIS	DIEM
ne	ðone tid			
NE	HORAM			

(Mt xxv/13)

## 4.6 &lt;ÞONE&gt; IN LOCATIVE CONTEXTS

Our remarks above on the absolute case expressing function of the <þone> attributive are interesting enough but at best only represent a statistically more pervasive characteristic of that already found in the late Northumbrian glosses. This function does not, however, constitute the main innovation in determiner morphology evident from even a casual examination of the *B Text* and *Peterborough Interpolations* where <þone> is to be found with considerable regularity in NP environments where a "dative" or "locative" determiner form in <ðam> or

<ðære> might be expected to surface in all earlier texts in the English language. Indeed one of the most persistent characteristics of the *Peterborough Chronicle* data lies in the way in which those earlier <ðam>/<ðære> forms are displaced by <þone>:

4.6.a

Ic Wulfere, gife to dæi Sancte Petre 7 þone  
abbode Saxulf þas landes  
(656/38-39)

Although we pointed to what looked like a similar example in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

4.6.b

on sua-huelcne hus gie ingæð  
IN QUAM-CUNQUE DOMUM INTRAUERITIS  
ær ist cuoeðað  
PRIMUM DICITE  
(L x/5)

where perhaps we see a locational directional goal argument (<on sua-huelcne hus>) being assigned an absolute case form expression. But in that gloss <-m> case forms were still a prominent feature of attributive morphology and were indeed being innovatively used for the expression of a whole range of both circumstantial and participant argument types (see 2.13). The *Peterborough Chronicle* conspicuously lacks such a development and much of its text shows such "dative" shapes consistently and, we shall attempt to show in what follows, systematically displaced by <þone> types.

We have to mention, nevertheless, that not all scholars accept such "unhistorical" <þone> usage – be it in absolute or other case indicating contexts – as *bona fide* evidence for ongoing syntactic change. Clark ((1970) pp. lxi ff) notably finds it difficult to accept <þone> expressions at their face value. She observes the almost total realization of all definite determiner forms as <þe> for all nominal case relationships, genders and numbers in the *C Text* annals. She suggests that such would also probably have been the case for the spoken language of the annalist composing the *B Text* since he was writing a

mere thirty years earlier and used the same regional dialect: "For the orthography of the First Continuation suggests that the scribe, aware that by the standards of the *Schriftsprache* his own usage was both provincial and new fangled, was trying to palliate his own provincialism and modernity." Likewise, she argues that the trivial orthographic substitutions in the *B Text* of <se> for <þe> can be explained as manifestations of the scribe's level of consciousness of either linguistic formality/informality or standard orthographic use versus some non-standard spelling custom. Both these stances lead her to a remarkable conclusion:

"The unhistorical uses of þone are to be explained by an analogous substitution, on the assumption that in Peterborough speech [þə] occurred for accusative masculine and neuter as well as for cases where it had evolved phonetically....and so gave rise to another equation [þə] = West Saxon <þone>. So the apparent conservatism of the First Continuation proves to be false archaism and evidence of advanced spoken usage, probably with undeclinable [þə]."

(page lxi)

Such random substitutions of <þone> forms in the *B Text* annals where, according to Clark's assertions, the contemporary spoken language would have manifested a morphology-less <þe>, run contrary to all that has been uncovered in the last twenty years in relation to sociolinguistic/situational formality item alternation. Likewise the totally unconstrained fashion in which we are invited to dismiss the syntactic significance of innovative determiner <þone> forms as "formalizing-up" orthographic devices must give us pause. "False archaism" is a recourse made by a linguistic model devoid of explanatory power. Indeed, it is difficult to come to any firm conclusion as to what Clark's views actually are in relation to the morphological situation in the manuscript. In footnote 1 to page lix she confidently asserts that although she has abandoned her earlier (1957) conclusions relating to non-West Saxon gender assignment in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, she now

wants to say "that gender had been lost, with some originally masculine forms temporarily generalized before all gender forms were superceded by indeclinable *þe*." How are we to relate such a temporary generalization with false archaism? Why should such a generalization have taken place at all and why of the <*þone*> determiner shape and not some other?

It has been our contention that "unhistorical" gender <*þone*> forms in the *Peterborough Chronicle* must be taken as evidence for on-going morphological practice and as such represent pre-posed markers of the absolute argument status of their nominal heads. Can the "spread" of this <*þone*> to environments where "dative"/"locative" case forms (and, as we shall see, others as well) would be appropriate for a West Saxon grammatical output be related to such a phenomenon? If we examine closely those syntactic contexts where <*þone*> attributives (regardless of gender considerations) are to be found with "dative" case-form-accepting arguments, then we find that they are constrained to occur in two environments which, at first sight, look rather unlike each other. We shall try to show that, in fact, both these environments can be characterized in terms of the nature of the locational/directional source/goal argument to be associated with their sentential predicate.

#### 4.6.c PREDICATES WITH INTRINSICALLY ORIENTATED DIRECTIONAL PROPERTIES

Consider the following clauses from the *Peterborough Interpolations* and *B Text*:

- (1) 7 swa þet seo Cuðbriht geaf þone abbote  
1 punde þære fore  
(777/5)
- (2) forþi ðet he hit wolde giuen into  
Medesh amstede, Sancte Peter 7 þone abbote  
þe þa was  
(777/13-14)
- (3) geaf þa þone cyng xl marc goldes to  
sahtnysse  
(1066/17-18)

- (4) Se kyng Henri geaf þone biscoprice æfter  
Michelesmesse þone abbot Henri his nefe  
(1129/25-26)
- (5) Mid him com se cwen 7 his dohter þet he  
ærer hafde giuen þone kasere Heanri of  
Loherenge to wife  
(1126/3-5)
- (6) Ealle þa þing...Kynesuith geafon 7 getton  
Sancte Peter 7 þone abbot  
(675/53-55)
- (7) Ic, Wulfere, gife to dæi Sancte Petre 7  
þone abbode Saxulf 7 þa munecas of þe  
mynstre þas landes 7 þas wateres  
(656/38-40)

These instances represent almost all the occurrences in the *B Text* and *Interpolations* sub-sections where <þone> appears in what might traditionally be termed an "indirect object" context and in a noun phrase which is not itself part of a larger prepositional phrase. If, as we have claimed above, <þone> is being used in this manuscript as a marker of absolute arguments, what is absolute about "indirect objects"? The precise syntactic/semantic characteristics of "indirect objects" is a complex one (Jackendoff and Culicover (1971)) and bound up with the constraints involved in the movement of the prepositionally controlled item into "direct object" positions in the sentence ("dative movement"):

#### 4.6.d

- (a) John gave the book to Mary
- (b) John gave Mary the book

Anderson ((1977) pp. 178 ff) has convincingly demonstrated that such displacement of the absolute "object" "book" in (a) by what he demonstrates to be a locative ergative N "Mary", is a function of the SUBJECT SELECTION HIERARCHY (Filmore (1964)) whereby, in this particular instance, items with [locative, ergative] relational characteristics "outrank" those with [absolute] alone, in this way permitting their prior serialization in the utterance. Our examples in 4.6.c show both dative movement and non-dative movement types: (2) and (4) manifesting the

[locative, ergative] argument serialized to the far right position; (1), (3) and (7) where it has been fronted and where it displaces the "direct object". That such a displacement does not involve the two affected items as being treated as direct objects is clear as Anderson ((1977) pp. 54 ff) shows from the possible semantic ambiguity arising in Modern English between utterances such as: "*John taught Bill French*" / "*John taught French to Bill*" as well as from the holistic/partitive interpretations associated with "*Bill loaded the wagon with hay*" contrasted with "*Bill loaded hay on the wagon*". Interestingly, in our early Middle English examples where no [ergative, locative] fronting has occurred, the presence or absence of a prepositional particle would appear to be a function of the animacy/inanimacy characteristic of head noun in the phrase, a usage Mitchell ((1986) § 1210, pp. 512–513) claims to be a common feature of the syntax of Old English. But if indirect objects are indeed to be characterized by [locative, ergative] case relationship configurations, why should they be attributively signalled by what we have claimed to be a marker of absoluteness – <þone>? The semantic hallmark of the absolutive case relationship is "completion", "exhaustiveness" and that which is inherent in the semantic reference of the sentential predicate. Thus, the "direct object" in "*John read a book*" reflects both the exhaustive/completed feature of its sentential argument status and the fact that the semantic reference of an item like "*read*" requires just some affected object to be "*looked at*". Again, it is this exhaustive, absolutive mark of the simultaneously [locative] "*wagon*" which infers its "holistic" interpretation in a sentence like "*John loaded the wagon with hay*" (Anderson (1977) page 54).

In the types of sentence in the *Peterborough Chronicle* which we have been citing under 4.6.d above – "*The King gave the abbot the property*" – we should like to claim that not only do verbs like /give/ display an [absolutive] "direct object" lexical specification (in this case "*the property*") but they also manifest inherent directionality: the act of giving assumes a locational goal (as well as a source, as we shall see below). But, more importantly for our argument here, that directionality itself has an INTRINSIC DIRECTIONAL PROPERTY; a goal-only directional path. Predications like "*come*" and "*go*",

although likewise having intrinsically directional status are nevertheless unspecified as to their source/goal route. It is just that exhaustiveness of directional orientation which, we suggest, supplies the [locational, ergative] "indirect object" with an absolute relational property in /give/ predication. And that particular property is signalled in these early Middle English data by the preposition-less <þone> attributive in noun phrases.

#### 4.7 PREDICATES WITH NON-INTRINSICALLY ORIENTATED DIRECTIONAL PROPERTIES

There is a second major environment where the data from the *Peterborough Chronicle B Text* and *Interpolations* show <þone> attributives in construction with etymologically masculine and non-masculine nouns whose argument status in the proposition would historically have generated some kind of <þam> or <þære> form. Consider the following:

- (1) brohton hem to þone kinge  
(1124/12)
- (2) ac iedon ealle samodlice to þone kyng  
(1123/22-23)
- (3) He com fyrst to þone kyng on Normandi  
(1125/14)
- (4) Des ilces geares com fram Ierusalem Hugo  
of þe Temple to þone kyng on Normandig  
(1128/17-18)
- (5) Syðdon comen ealle dræuednysse 7 ealle  
ifele to þone mynstre  
(1066/19-20)
- (6) Elfside abbot of burh...for to þone  
mynstre þe is gehaten Boneual  
(1013/2-3)

All the predicates in these examples are "motion" verbs with inherent locational properties, their directional orientation (whose source goal path is NOT intrinsic) being manifested by the preposed particle <to>. Similarly, in a

case like <He macode fyrst þa wealle abutan þone mynstre> (963/78-79) the locational disposition of the object under construction is prepositionally signalled by <abutan>. All the above locational NP items occur as part of a prepositional phrase, unlike those occurring as the recipient part of /give/ predication under 4.6.c above. Preposition-less contexts were those where goal-only direction was possible, preposition-full where the predicate permitted variation in the directionally characteristic of its various arguments; directional pathway was not deducible from the inherent semantic characteristics of the predicate itself. While with the former we suggested that the ungoverned <þone> attribute was selected as a signal for the exhaustive, compleptive nature of ergative locatives with an absolute characteristic, in the latter it is its "neutral", unspecified participant function as a marker of "case" only which is manifested – specific locational information being provided by the particle serially preceding it.

Perhaps too the mark of directional constancy which we claim to be a feature of the preposition-less <þone> attributive with /give/ predication will account for the fairly high statistical frequency (especially in the *B Text*) of the form in "subject" environments in passive type constructions. Consider the following:

#### 4.7.b

- (1) he was gehalgod to biscop fram þone  
ærcebiscop Willelm of Cantwarabyri  
(1129/27-28)
- (2) Dis geares wæs se mynstre of  
Cantwarabyri halgod from þone ærcebiscop  
Willelm  
(1130/2)
- (3) þet wes all ("done") ðurh þone kyng Heanri  
of Engleland  
(1127/19-20)
- (4) 7 wæron þær underfangen of þone Pape  
Honorius mid micel wurðscipe  
(1125/31-32)
- (5) bohte þa þær æt þone abbot 7 æt þe muneceſ  
Sancte Florentines lichaman  
(1013/5-6)

(6) 7 haue þet ilce forgiueness of Criste 7  
 Sancte Peter 7 of þone abbot 7 of þone  
 muneca

(675/32-33)

All these instances involve an animate ergative SOURCE (both singular and plural) for predication involving "selling", "giving", "sanctifying" and "doing": "*The monks sold the body*"; "*The monks will provide the forgiveness*", etc. These "subject" ergative source arguments in such predication are displaced, through passivization, by the sentential absolutive-only argument. Such a displacement brings with it a mandatory surface expression of the ergative, ABLATIVE source semantics of the "subject" through the agency of a "locative/ablative" prepositional element - <of>, <from>, <at>. But in these cases, like those in 4.6.c above, the directional characteristic of the donor, merchant are invariably [ablative] and source: this invariability of directional orientation is, we suggest, expressed through the [absolutive] signalling <þone> nominal attributive. However, we shall return to "subject" environment <þone> forms in § 4.10 below.

#### 4.8 <PE> IN NON-SUBJECT CONTEXTS IN THE B TEXT AND INTERPOLATIONS

The above observations, like those we made for the two late Northumbrian glosses, are clearly at odds with the long held traditional view that with the loss, for usually unexplained reasons, of nominal gender class marking on attributive words in the noun phrase there appeared a universal, "undeclined" and invariable <þe> determiner with neither case, number or gender expressing value. All diachronically intermediate unhistorical gender congruences were either the results of production error or change of gender class by individual lexical items under conditions of semantic analogy which were more or less far-fetched (von Glahn (1916); Classen (1919); von Fleischhacker (1888); Gibbons (1955)). Neither of the late Old English glosses showed much evidence for such an innovative morphology-free <þe> definite determiner, although on the few occasions when it was to be found it was in congruence with nouns with an absolutive-only argument

status in their propositions. However, the later annals of the *Peterborough Chronicle* provide us with some of the earliest extensive evidence for the kinds of syntactic contexts in which this "undeclinable" <þe> can occur and its distribution in the *B Text* and *Peterborough Interpolations* is particularly interesting.

As the marker in classical West Saxon of the ergative and usually animate argument to predicates in propositions, we might reasonably expect that the most "natural" context for its innovation in early Middle English materials might be as a replacement for other "subject" determiner shapes like <seo> and <þæt>, especially when they were serialized before the main verb. However, the data from this and other early medieval texts do not do bear out this hypothesis of an initial "subject" case form "spread" at all. <þe> is just as likely to appear as a replacement for "object", "possessive" and "dative" case forms as it is for "subjects". Interestingly, however, there are subtle differences between the overall frequency and context of occurrence of the morphology-less determiner shape in the two sub-parts of the Chronicle of immediate concern to us here. The *B Text* is *par excellence* the place where <þone> generalization to absolute-type environments is supreme: although there are, as we shall see, several occurrences of the de-morphologized definite article in those annals too, they are restricted in number and constrained to occur only in certain case relationship environments. While they are "in competition" with <þone> forms as indicators of the participant function of absolute arguments, it is very revealing that they rarely, if ever, appear in constructions controlled by those "motion" verbs which inherently manifest directional properties. In the *B Text*, <come to þe kyng> expressions seem to be wholly absent and even on those occasions where the proposition contains a "motion" predication, the participant function marked by the argument NP in which <þe> occurs tends to be non-directional (non source/goal) and be ALLATIVE or static:

## 4.8.a

- (1) 7 brohten him toforen se kyng  
(1123/34)
- (2) 7 Swa he ferde mid þe cyng to Wincestre  
(1127/2-3)

It is not surprising therefore that a major context where the morphology-free <þe> surfaces in the *B Text* is where we find extra-propositional, circumstantial, non-directional temporal and spatial reference: the ALLATIVE:

## 4.8.b

- (1) Da sone in þe lenten ferde se ærcebiscop  
to Rome  
(1123/49-50)
- (2) Dis gear æfter Cristesmesse on an Monenniht  
æt þe forme slæp wæs se heouene o ðe norð  
half eall swilc hit waere bærnende fir  
(1131/1-3)
- (3) Pis wæs segon on þe selue derfald in þa  
tune on Burch  
(1127/66-67)

(where we assume <þa> to be an orthographic equivalent of <þe>, both representing [þə] – c.f. <þa wearð swiðe micel wind fram þa undern dæies to þa swarte nihte> (1122/15-16)). There appears to be only a singleton participant absolute argument context witnessing a <þe> determiner (with an historically neuter noun) and where there is no prepositional particle element present:

## 4.8.c

þa com se fir on ufenweard þone stepel 7  
forbearnde ealle þe minstre 7 ealle þa gersumes  
(1122/5-7)

although even here we could interpret the absolutive-only relationship of <þe mynstre> as being a candidate for subject selection with an "intransitive" predicate like /burn/capable of taking a non-ergative "subject". We do not, in other words, find the morphology-free definite determiner in those "direct object" absolute participant arguments where we observed <þone> frequently surfacing: <Se kyng geaf þone biscoprice> (ll29/25-26). But where we do discover the morphology-less shape in competition with <þone> in the *B Text* is in examples like the following:

#### 4.8.d

- (1) 7 (he) wæs þære sone gebletsod to biskop  
fram se biskop of Lundene 7 se biskop Ernulf  
of Rouceastræ 7 se biskop Willelm Gifard of  
Winceastræ 7 se biskop Bernard of Wales 7  
se biskop Roger of Searesbyrig  
(1123/46-49)
- (2) Dis wæs eall gedon ðurh se biskop of  
Seresbyrig 7 þurh se biskop of Lincolne  
(1123/25-26)
- (3) Þæt wæs eall don þurh his dohtres ræd 7 þurh  
se Scotte kyng Dauid hire earn  
(1126/15-16)

In these cases we see participant arguments which are typified as ergative and ablative (source) in a "passive" context rather like those we cited above at 4.7.e: <he was gehalgod to biskop fram þone ærcebiscop Willelm of Cantwarabyri> (ll29/27-28). Perhaps it is the eminent eligibility of [ergative, ablative] arguments for subject selection and pre-predicate serialization which early resulted in their attributives being assigned a surface shape generally accorded to such "subject" NPs (together with [ergative, absolutive] types) in non-passive constructions. And this tendency may have been accentuated by the strong tendency to restrict <þæt> determiners to the type of non-case relationship indicating functions that we have outlined at the beginning of this chapter. But we shall return in § 4.10 to the whole difficult question of "subject"

attributive morphology in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

When we come to examine the insertions making up the *Peterborough Interpolations* we find a rather different picture. Morphology-less definite determiners are everywhere used alongside <þone> forms in precisely the kinds of contexts that we said so typified the latter in the annals making up the *B Text*. Those, we recall, were: in construction with absolutive "direct objects" and in prepositionally headed noun phrases which are participant arguments to "motion" predicates:

#### 4.8.e

- (1) **Ic, Agatho Papa of Rome, grete wel seo  
wurðfulle Eþelred Myrcene kyning 7 se  
ærcebiscop Theodorum of Cantwarbyrig 7  
seo Myrcene biscop Saxulf**

(675/9-11)

- (2) **Da man halgode seo mynstre**  
(656/25-26)

- (3) **7 seo mynstre halgode seo ærcebiscop  
Deusdedit**  
(656/28)

(for the <se>/<seo> orthographic correspondence, see Clark (1970) page lix)

- (4) **Syððon þa com he to se cyng Eadgar**  
(963/9)

- (5) **Com þa to þe cyng**  
(963/26)

- (6) **Þa seconde seo kyning to Rome to seo Papa  
Uitallanus**  
(656/117-8)

and also at (963/6-7; 777/11-13; 852/9-10; 963/1). We also find singleton instances where the <þe> determiner occurs in both ergative source participant arguments as well as in allative (non source/goal) circumstantial contexts: <bohte þa feola cotlif æt se king> (963/16); <And ic will

þet markete beo in þe selue tun> (963/47). But nowhere in either the *B Text* or the *Interpolations* do we find <þe> unsupported by a prepositional particle as a marker of an [adlative, locative] argument with predicates manifesting predictable directional orientation: we do not, in other words, find sentences like \*<he geaf þe biskop þone ærcebiscoprice> where <biskop> has an absolutive-only case feature.

But perhaps one of the most notable innovative contexts where the scribe of the *Interpolations* selects a <þe> morphology-free determiner shape is where an animate lexical item is locationally identified through the mechanism of a reduced, post-posed relative clause with an existential predicate: [person<sub>x</sub>][Rel Pro<sub>x</sub> + be + N [locative, ablative]]: sentences corresponding to the Modern English: "*Isla comes from Girvan*" / "*Isla belongs to Girvan*" types, where some kind of locational source is used to identify the sentential topic, unlike instances such as "*Isla is now in Girvan*" where the prepositional phrase is an allative circumstantial. Consider the following:

#### 4.8.f

- (1) 7 Cuðbald munec of þe selue mynstre was  
coren to abbot  
(656/133-134)
- (2) 7 Man cæs þa sona oðer abbot of þe sylfe  
mynstre, KENVLF, wæs gehaten  
(963/76-77)
- (3) Þa cæs man oðer abbot of þe silue minstre,  
þe wæs gehaten Elfsi  
(963/81)
- (4) Ic, Wulfere, gife to dæi Sancte Petre 7  
þone abbode Saxulf 7 þa munecas of þe  
mynstre þas landes  
(656/38-39)

Perhaps related to these are the following traditionally labelled "possessive" participant arguments:

## 4.8.g

- (1) **be his swustre red Kyneburges 7 Kyneswiðes 7  
be se ærcebiscopes ræd, se wæs gehaten  
Deusdedit**  
(656/6-7)
- (2) **Dis wæs don on þe cininges tune  
Freorichburna hatte**  
(777/18-19)
- (3) **fyrst fra Witlesmære eall to þe cynges  
toll of Nordmannes Cros hundred**  
(963/49-50)
- (4) **Ic haue geheord seo kyninges Ædelredes  
geornunge**  
(657/13)

where, by now not unexpectedly we find a *B Text* rendering for this construction like: <Se kyng of France brohte þone eorles sunu Willelm of Normandi> (ll27/15–16).

Clearly none of the sub-sections of the *Peterborough Chronicle* shows any real evidence for the kind of generalization of <-es> and <-m> morphology in attributive words in construction with historically "possessive" or "dative" case form nouns which was such a prominent characteristic of both late Northumbrian glosses. Only in the *B Text* do we find two solitary instances of unhistorical <-es> "possessive" attributive markers:

## 4.8.h

- (1) **geaf se kyng ðone biscoprice of Baðe þes  
cwenes canceler**  
(1123/67-68)
- (2) **7 þes niht viii Kalendarum Augusti wæs  
swiðe micel eorðdynne ofer eal Sumersetscire**  
(1122/12-13)

It is perhaps worth recording here too the *B Text* characteristic whereby circumstantial (allative) temporal

expressions, which typically of West Saxon Old English could be superficially expressed by "possessive" <-es> attributive and nominal morphology (Mitchell (1986) pp. 540–542), very frequently show this allative case relationship simultaneously marked by a preposed particle <on>. Compare:

4.8.i

- (1) þet wæs þæs dæiges Annuntiatio Sancte Marie  
(1123/69)
- (2) Pa gelamp hit on þes dæges Annuntiatio  
Sancte Marie  
(1124/4-5)

and also at (ll24/32; ll24/41; ll25/32).

4.9 <P<sub>EM</sub>> AND <P<sub>ERE</sub>> FORMS

Our assertion in the last section that neither the *B Text* nor the *Interpolations* shows any tendency to utilize <-m> attributive morphology to superficially mark "dative"/locative nominal arguments in the way it had been, we suggested, in the two Northumbrian glosses, requires a little modification. Unhistorical <þam> definite determiners are to be found in the *Peterborough Chronicle* but they are confined to those annals brought together under the *A Text* (those to ll31). The most traditionally "West Saxon" looking section of the Chronicle, it nevertheless shows divergences from classical West Saxon realization of nominal attributive morphology which are of interest both in the light of some of the observations we have made in Chapters Two and Three as well as for the claims we have made earlier in this. An examination of those instances where we find <þam> definite articles in construction with etymologically feminine nouns quickly shows that they are constrained to occur in this early part of the manuscript with prepositional phrase expressions which represent extra-propositional, circumstantial comment upon the sentential predicate. The following are typical examples:

## 4.9.a

- (1) Da ferde se cyng to Hæstingan to þam  
Candelmaessan  
(1094/8-9)
- (2) Dises geares eac se biskop Rannulf to þam  
Candelmaessan ut of þan Ture  
(1101/26-27)
- (3) Sona swa hit com to þam Eastran, þa ferdon  
hi 7 heregodon 7 bærndon  
(1088/12-13)
- (4) Her se cyng bær his corona 7 heold his  
hired on Winceastre to þam Eastran 7 Swa he  
ferde þet he wæs to þam Pentecosten  
æt Wæstmynstre  
(1086/1-2)
- (5) Þa to þan Eastran heold se cyng his hired  
on Winceastre  
(1103/5)

Despite the presence of a goal directional prepositional particle <to> in all the above cases, it is difficult to see how such temporal expressions could be interpreted other than as non source/goal allatives – "at Candlemass", "at Easter" (cf "When the train came to Austin"/"When the train arrived at Austin"). As such they would appear to reflect a usage which we claimed marked allative temporal circumstantial in the Old Northumbrian gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

## 4.9.b

in ðæm tid gefeade gaste halige  
IN IPSA HORA EXULTAUT SPIRITU SANCTO  
(L x/21)

Historical gender marking <þam> forms do occur in the *B Text* and *Interpolations* too, but their paucity does not enable us to make any confident generalizations concerning the syntactic contexts in which they appear. However in

passing it is perhaps worth noting their appearance with the predicate /say/. Such a lexical item might be interpreted in a way rather like that we have proposed above for /give/: namely, it is not only marked as directionally implicit, but the nature of that direction is unitary — while it takes an [absolutive]-only "direct object", it also usually presumes the existence of some [absolutive, locative] "indirect object". Hence, we are not surprised to discover a sentence in the *B Text* like:

4.9.c

he sæde þone kyng þet hit wæs togeanes riht  
(1123/41)

where the prepositionless "indirect object" has displaced the absolute-only argument, having its predictable directional quality as well as its "exhaustive" absolute semantics marked by <þone>. But observe that such a "dative movement" rule with /say/ is constrained in the modern language in various ways. When the "direct object" is non-complex, the dative movement tends to be blocked: while "*He said something to Paul*" is well formed, "*He said (to) Paul something*" is not. However dative movement appears to be permitted when the absolute argument is represented by a complex NP:

4.9.d

- (a) he said that he was sick to John
- (b) he said to John that he was sick

but such movement must always apparently involve the entire [absolute, locative] prepositional phrase: \*"*he said John that he was sick*" is not well-formed. Just in those contexts where this happens to be a complex NP direct object complement (in this instance, direct speech) do we find the *B Text* and *Interpolations* manifesting not merely dative movement involving the entire [absolute, locative] prepositional phrase, but apparently uniquely utilizing <-m> determiner attributive morphology:

## 4.9.e

- (1) *þa aseh dune se bispoc of Lincolne 7 seide  
to þam kyng, "Laferd kyng, ic swelte"*  
(1123/8-9)

- (2) *ða cwæð se kyning to þan abbode: "La, leof  
Saxulf..."*  
(656/10-12)

The *Interpolations* section of the Chronicle still has two puzzles left for us. One of them is that in it we find all but one of the instances where <þære> locative determiner shapes are to be found in congruence with nouns whose historical gender assignment is non-*feminine*. There are only four instances in all and we must obviously be on our guard against giving too much significance to their apparent syntactic distribution especially in such a relatively brief data sample as the *Peterborough Interpolations*: our remarks must therefore be regarded as extremely tentative. Nevertheless, it is worth recalling that we faced a similar problem with the neuter noun <mægden> in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* gloss, where "*feminine*" <dære>/<ðære> attributives were to be found in construction with it adjacent to manifestations of the same item with "*neuter*" definite article forms. Recall, for instance, (2.10.6):

## 4.9.f

þ mægden ne is dead ah slepeð...  
PUELLA NON EST MORTUA SED DORMIT

genom ðone fæder 7 moder dæra mædne  
ADSUMIT PATREM ET MATREM PUELLAE  
(Mk v/39-42)

The main thrust of our argument so far has been that with speakers unable to recover lexical grammatical gender assignment, the superficial attributive morphological shapes which had reflected such assignment and mapped it on to a surface reflection of nominal argument status was being re-interpreted as a means for (a) providing a phonologically distinct representation for case relationships

and (b) as a device for highlighting relationships holding between items in the discourse. We shall see below, however, that speakers in so doing did not always utilize the residual morphology of grammatical gender in the same way, but that in some dialects different "solutions" to what morphological shapes to adopt especially for case relationship representation were "experimented" with. We suggested in chapter one that perhaps examples like that in 4.9.f showed the residual "dative/possessive" feminine attributive morphology being utilized as a non-subject/object <þ>. With the <ðæs> determiner shape confined to marking "possessive" case relationship forms, we tentatively argued that <ðære> could be used as an expression of lexical item identity in the discourse — a "morphologized" <þ>.

Now while the *Peterborough Interpolations* can, as we have already seen, use <þet> in locative-type contexts in what we described as providing "complete" or "exhaustive" information:

#### 4.9.g

7 swa to ðet stede þet man cleopeð Folies  
(656/44)

it would appear that it was also possible for the <þære> shape to fulfil such a function as well:

#### 4.9.h

Syððan com se bispoc Aðelwold to þære mynstre  
þe wæs gehaten Medeshamstede, ðe hwilon wæs  
fordon fra heðene folce  
(963/17-18)

(and note too the single *A Text* instance: <þis wæs don on  
þære tuna þa man cleopeð Burne> (III4/27-28)). Yet as  
the following examples would seem to suggest, the principal  
environment for <ðære> selection seems to be one where  
there is an NP<sub>i</sub>>NP<sub>i</sub> discourse situation where both head  
nouns are referentially, if not phonologically, identical:

## 4.9.i

- (1) On þas kinges dæi Offa was an abbot on  
Medeshamstede Beonne gehaten. Se ilca  
Beonne, þurh ealle þa muneke red of þere  
minstre, þa let he Cuthbriht ealdorman  
x bonde land  
(777/1-3)
- (2) þæs Cædwala gef into Sancte Peteres minstre  
Medeshamstede Hoge: þet is in a igland  
Heabureahg hatte. Þa wæs abbot on þere  
minstre, Egbath wæs gehaten  
(686/1-3)
- (3) Min brodor Peada 7 min leoue freond Orwi  
ongunnon an mynstre Criste to loue... Ic  
ic wile ðe gebidden, la, leoue freond,  
þet hii wirce æuostlice on þære werce  
(656/14-17)

The example at (777/1-3) is especially interesting in the light of our earlier assertions that this was a context where the *Interpolations* scribe regularly utilized the morphology-free <þe> determiner shape. Indeed, nearly all the instances we cited for this latter tendency at 4.8.e also involved back-reference to an identical N in the preceding discourse. But that identity was almost always signalled by the presence of some <selue> attribute in the second of the two NPs:

## 4.9.j

Þa cæs man oðer abbot of þe silue minstre  
(963/81)

so that we might tentatively suggest that our instances under 4.9.i of <of/on þære minstre> can be interpreted as an alternative expression to that with <selue> in construction with the morphology-less <þe>.

#### 4.10 <þONE> IN "SUBJECT" POSITIONS AGAIN

The second difficult set of examples that require some comment are those where we find preposition-less <þone> forms in construction with nouns of all historical genders in those syntactic contexts (serially pre-predicate) which we would normally associate with "subjects" and where we might therefore expect to find definite determiner shapes like <se> /<seo> /<þæt>. Before we turn to these, however, we can put to one side an *A Text* instance like <eall þet þider com, þet waes þone hæcce> (l070/51), since post "be"-predicate slots are those where absolute "subjects" are often realized with "object" configurations: "*c'est moi*"; "*it's me*". Likewise, a *B Text* case like <þus earmlice wæs þone abbotrice gifen> (l127/53) shows an absolute object triggered by a /give/ predicate retaining its absolute shape even under passivization. Yet the following example is unlike either of these:

##### 4.10.a

Ic forbeode þe 7 ealle þe biscopas...þet  
ge nan onsting ne hauen of þet mynstre buton  
swa þone abbot wile

(675/38-40)

where we appear to have an [absolute, ergative] "subject" <abbot> in construction with what would traditionally be interpreted (and is certainly by Clark (1970); page lx) as a "direct object" attributive word shape. However, it is worth noting also that in the *Interpolations* there occur two passages which appear to be very similar in syntactic shape and semantic content to that in 4.10.a:

##### 4.10.b

- (1) Ic forbede þet ne kyning ne nan man ne haue  
nan onsting buton þon abbot ane  
(656/123-124)

- (2) 7 seo kyning freode þa þet mynstre...swa  
 þet nan man ne hafde þær nan onsting buton  
 Sancte Peter 7 þone abbot  
 (777/16-18)

All three sentences in 4.IO.a/b involve <buton> introduced clauses containing the wayward <þon>/<þone> determiners in construction with that clause's "subject". Considering 4.IO.b.(2) first, it would seem that the <þone abbot> NP marks a directional source, the underlying "subject" of the /give/ predication which has been passivized to some kind of "*have from*" shape. Recall that we noted above the implicational, inherent directionality of /give/ predicates and the fact that they infer not only a unidirectional goal (to), but also a unidirectional (usually ergative) "subject" ablative source. Such directionally exhaustive (absolutive containing) arguments were, we claimed, signalled by a <þone> determiner supported by a prepositional particle when they were serialized post-predicatively:

#### 4.IO.c

7 haue þet ilce forgiueness of Criste 7 Sancte  
 Peter 7 of þone abbot 7 of þone muneca

Possibly we might similarly explain the <þon> occurrence in 4.IO.b (1). Yet the 4.IO.a case still looks rather different from either of the two last. Clearly the abbot is the source of the giving of the <onsting> and, importantly, the UNIQUE source — as is clear from the use of <butan>. Such a pre-predicate "subject" context ([ergative, ablative]) with its unique directional source orientation might just give rise to the use of a <þone> determiner unsupported by a prepositional (directional) particle, after the same fashion as directionally inferable locative "indirect objects": <Cuðbright geaf þone abbot 1 pund> (777/5). In other words, the unsupported <þone> determiner can reflect the implicit, non-variable locational case relationships entered into by a lexical item like /give/ when both pre- and post-predicatively serialized.

## 5

## THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

## LAZAMON'S BRUT AND VICES AND VIRTUES

## 5.1 LAZAMON'S BRUT

Although our twelfth century materials described in the last chapter had the advantage, unlike the data available to us from the late Northumbrian period, of being syntactically "natural", they were nevertheless rather sparse in volume and it could be argued that our interpretation of the innovations witnessed in their nominal attributive morphology was limited by that very characteristic. Perhaps that restricted quantitative nature of the data made us over ready to accord too great a significance to individual aberrations from earlier Old English usage. No such difficulty faces us when we turn our attention to some of the texts dating from the next century; texts which can still manifest both a large measure of survival of the "classical" West Saxon Old English rule system of marking nominal gender and case on attributive words and at the same time show that rule system undergoing what appears to be substantial innovative modification and change. Although there are several extant manuscripts where such a situation prevails, we shall devote this chapter to a study of two which are especially interesting and which provide us with an extensive and contrasting data set. We shall begin by providing an exhaustive analysis of one of the most comprehensive pieces of Middle English literature, the metrical historical chronicle written in what is probably a South Western dialect form and generally known as *Lazamon's Brut* (Madden (1847); Brook and Leslie (1963; 1978); Bøgholm (1870)). Surviving in two manuscript versions, this text runs to in excess of sixteen thousand lines in the two volume Brook and Leslie edition. We are fortunate too in that, in addition to its provision of such an ample supply of data, our manuscript survives in two versions, versions which — in the view of many scholars — are very different from each other and which are not to be seen as two parallel and linguistically close copies of a lost original. Nor can we assume that one is an attempt at being a faithful copy of the other. They would appear to be independent creations (Wells (1926), pp. 191–195) each with its own linguistic peculiarities and with one apparently composed some half a century later than the other. These two extensive manuscripts are in the Cotton collection of

the British Library, the earlier labelled *Caligula A.ix*, the later *Otho C.xiii*.

In this chapter we shall present a detailed study of the nominal attributive morphology (especially that of the definite article) of both the *Caligula* and *Otho* sources, paying special attention to the first eight thousand lines (Book One of Brook and Leslie (1963)) although we shall, where appropriate, present many data from the remaining part of the text as well. We have already noted in our Introduction the conclusions of earlier scholars on what were confidently claimed to be changes undergone in lexical grammatical gender assignment in nouns which led to the "unhistorical" nominal attributive congruent shapes so common in texts of the late Old English and early Middle English periods (Hoffman (1909); Pervaz (1958)). It has been a characteristic of our model, however, that such innovative attributive shapes are not to be interpreted as the result of any *genuswechsel* or lexical gender reclassification and we shall endeavour to convince the reader that in this thirteenth century text too a great many of the unetymological attributive word to noun congruences can be accounted for along the twin parameters of discourse relationship and, especially, case relationship in proposition signalling. Indeed, we shall demonstrate that the kinds of innovations to the "historical" West Saxon nominal attributive morphology that we find in *Lazamon's Brut* are remarkably similar to those we suggested were operative in the *B Text* of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. Any differences which exist between the two tend, if anything, to reinforce our interpretation of the vagaries in the nominal attributive morphology in the earlier text rather than compel us to make major revisions to that model.

We might expect that in a manuscript dating from the first half of the thirteen century, especially in one fifty or so years later in date than the latest annals of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, there would be little vestige of the "classical" West Saxon rule system whereby at least some of the propositional case status and the inherent gender classification of nouns was "repeated" or "reflected" in the morphology of the attributive words with which they appear in construction in noun phrases. Indeed, as we pointed out in the last chapter, a token count of attributive forms in the *Peterborough Chronicle B* and *C Texts* suggested that language users had lost any "feel" for the surface marking

of nominal gender classification (cf. 4.5.a above). However, a token count of all singular definite article, possessive pronoun and "strong" adjective forms in "subject", "object" and "dative"/locative case contexts suggests that for the two manuscript versions of *Lazamon's Brut* this was hardly the case. Table 5.1.a maps the occurrence of such forms against the gender classification historically assigned to the nouns with which they are in agreement in a West Saxon context or which appears against them in Middle English dictionaries such as the MED (Kurath and Kuhn (1963)) and Stratmann (1958). The data are from Book One of Brook and Leslie (1963).

## 5.1.a

	masc		fem		neut	
attribute	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>
<i>subject</i>						
<þe>	125	118	18	44	6	25
<þa>/<þæ>	6	0	29	2	3	0
<þeo>	4	0	1	0	0	0
<þes>	2	3	0	3	0	0
<þeos>	2	0	2	2	0	0
<þat>	7	2	4	0	66	25

(cont'd)

## 5.1.a (contd)

*object*

&lt;þæne&gt;/&lt;þone&gt;/

<þene>	87	59	10	13	3	1
<þan>	4	5	1	1	0	0
<þisne>	15	12	0	0	0	0
<-ne>	123	44	16	5	2	0
<þinne>	11	0	0	0	0	0
<þe>/<þa>	3	0	52	3	2	0
<þes>/<þas>	0	0	11	1	12	0
<þis>	4	0	1	4	5	2
<þes>	1	0	0	3	1	0
<þat>	15	10	5	0	63	29
<þe>/<þæ>	6	14	16	35	1	6

*locative*

<þæm>/<þan>	133	86	8	23	57	47
<þere>/<þare>	11	9	122	37	11	5
<-re>	4	0	124	20	2	1
<m/þire>	1	0	39	0	0	0
<þissere>	2	1	12	18	8	1
<-ne>	6	7	0	2	2	1
<þe>	3	4	1	6	1	0
<þat>	2	0	0	0	0	0
<þis>	5	0	0	5	0	0

Although we shall show below that we must be cautious about reaching too readily for conclusions based upon data presented in this fashion, the statistics in the above table quite clearly appear to point to some rather interesting and novel features of the nominal attributive morphology of our two *Lazamon* manuscripts. In the first place, if we compare the above data to those in 4.5.a we immediately see that they "preserve" to a much greater degree the characteristics of attributive gender/case representation traditionally associated with classical West Saxon models. The writers' morphological rule system quite regularly produces attributive/noun concord of a kind typical of the language several hundred years earlier and only reaches levels of "irregularity" like those to be found in the late Northumbrian glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and

*Durham Ritual.* For instance, on the basis of our token count, the *Caligula* text shows only an 11.6% frequency of unetymological <-ne> "object" feminine/neuter congruences, while in *Otho* that percentage rises to only 14.7: compare this with the approximately 55% occurrence of <þone> "object" definite determiners with nouns of non-masculine genders in the *Peterborough Chronicle B Text* (see 4.5.a above).

We shall endeavour to demonstrate in what follows that the innovative characteristics of the attributive usage in both versions of *Lazamon's Brut* while relatively small, are not at all random and can be directly related to the usage we have already described for texts of an earlier date. However, before embarking upon a detailed examination of individual cases, let us summarize what would appear to be some of the more important conclusions to be drawn from the table at 5.1.a above concerning the "non-etymological" features of determiner and other attributive word morphology in our two *Lazamon* texts:

(1) both *Caligula* and *Otho* show a clear set of instances where <-ne> inflectional forms are used with attributes assigned to lexical items whose historical genders are *non-masculine*.

(2) there is a complete absence in our data of any evidence to suggest the "spread" of <-um> "dative"/locative shapes in possessive pronoun and "strong" adjective attributes in construction with historically *feminine* items; indeed, there would appear to be no instances whatsoever of "dative" morphological expression involving <-um> in either lengthy manuscript, with the possible exception of <þan> forms to be discussed below.

(3) <-ne> attributive shapes, in West Saxon confined to absolutive, "object" case contexts, are here — as in the *Peterborough Chronicle B Text* — surfacing in locative (and we shall see "subject" and "possessive") case relationship environments as well.

(4) while "morphology-less" <þe> forms are indeed to be found in non-etymological contexts in *Lazamon's Brut*, we can see from our data in 5.1.a that they are by no means a statistically glaring characteristic of the definite determiner morphology, and that their appearance is "controlled" by some kind of case relationship hierarchical preference, with "subjects" for example showing a greater preponderance of <þe> expression with nouns of

all historical genders than, say, locatives.

(5) Although none of the observations under (1) – (4) should surprise us in the light of our earlier discussion of the features of the nominal attributive morphology of the *Peterborough Chronicle B Text*, we have to note that both the *Caligula* and *Otho* manuscripts of *Lazamon's Brut* attest to a not inconsiderable (11.6% and 18% respectively) "spread" of <–re> attributive morphological shapes into contexts where <–(u)m> would normally be expected were etymological gender assignment rules still operative. This innovative use of <–re> expressions is all the more interesting in the light of the apparent complete loss of possessive pronoun and "strong" adjective attributive <–(u)m> morphological output from the grammar as noted above under (2).

(6) <þan> definite determiner forms are to be found with nouns of all genders in both "direct object" and "dative" case form contexts. Are we to regard such a shape as representing some kind of phonological development of the West Saxon and early Middle English <þem>/<þam> "dative" shape or is it to be viewed as an innovative definite determiner output modelled upon the "direct object" <þane> form?

(7) Unetymological <þet> definite determiners are a characteristic of *Lazamon's Brut* as they are of all the texts we have so far examined. However, it seems clear from the data in 5.1.a that they represent a very limited tendency, although we shall demonstrate that small as it is it is clearly parallel to the kind of usage we have already described for such forms in both the late Northumbrian glosses and the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

## 5.2 INNOVATORY ATTRIBUTIVE MORPHOLOGY AS AN EXPRESSION OF CASE RELATIONSHIPS HOLDING BETWEEN ARGUMENTS IN PROPOSITIONS

### 5.2.a <–NE> AS A MARKER OF ABSOLUTIVE NOMINAL ARGUMENTS

The above observations would suggest that in one important way the morphology of attributes in noun phrases in both texts of *Lazamon's Brut* operates in a fashion very similar to that of the *Peterborough Chronicle B Text*: <–ne> forms appear to predominate in absolute argument

environments and can be seen "spreading" to case relationship contexts normally reserved for "dative" case forms. However, those observations clearly suggest too that, rather unlike the twelfth century Chronicle, the *Lazamon* texts show both an invasion of "dative" case form space by unetymological <-re> attributive terminations as well as a rather puzzling output of <þan>/<þen> determiner shapes in both locative and absolute contexts. Our first instinct might be to interpret these facts as evidence for the existence of two competing attributive morphological case relationship marking "paradigms": a "subject"/non-"subject" <þe>/<-ne> expression alongside one where we find a tripartite "subject"/"direct object"/locative <þe>/<-ne>/<-re> case relationship distinction. However, we shall see below that a detailed examination of the data shows that other, more complex factors are involved.

That in *Lazamon's Brut* <-ne> attributive shapes with historically *feminine* lexical items like <moder> "mother" <fierde> "army" and <byrne> "corslet" were being utilized to express an ABSOLUTIVE case relationship between their head nouns and the propositional predicate is clear from examples like the following:

### 5.2.a.1

- (1) Nefde ȝe ba enne fader and beie enne moder  
(*Otho* 2159)
- (2) (h)im he bi-tahte þane wo(d)e and þane ferde  
(*Otho* 13581)
- (3) warp he an his rugge a ræf swiðe deore  
ænne cheisil scurte 7 ænne pallene curtel  
ænne burne swiðe deore ibroiden of stele  
(*Otho* 17631)

There seems little to be gained from arguments like those typified by Pervaz (1968; page 38) to the effect that the unhistorical *masculine* gender congruence with items like <moder> and <ferde> reflects – just on these occasions – their gender reclassification due to the contextual proximity of the preceding *masculine* items <fader> and <wudu>. Such an "explanation" is especially unsuited to the <-ne> forms in our third example where <chisel> and <pallene> as relatively recent lexical innovations to

the language cannot be said with confidence to have been assigned to any particular gender class, even though the MED lists <chesil> as *neuter* on the basis of its appearance with <þat> determiners, determiner forms which, we have repeatedly argued, are notoriously unreliable for gender indication. All the above cases look like clear instances of the phenomenon which we have earlier described as "case form repetition" — that is, multiple identical case relationships in a shared predicate are expressed by a shared case form. Recall from the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the repetition of the <-re> locative case form with historically *masculine* and *neuter* items following its introduction in the discourse on historically *feminine* nouns:

### 5.2.a.2

7 lufa ðu drihten god ðin of alra heorta ðin  
 ET DILEGES DOMINUM DEUM TUUM EX TOTO CORDE TUO

7 of alra sauel ðin 7 (\*)of alra ðoht ðin 7  
 ET EX TOTA ANIMA TUA ET EX TOTA MENTE TUA ET

(\*)of alra mægne ðin  
 EX TOTA UIRTUTE TUA

(Mk xii/30-33)

The <-ne> attributive forms in construction with <moder>, <ferde> and <burne> items are to signal that they stand in the same ABSOLUTIVE participant relationship to the <hebban>, <bi-taccen> and <werpen> predicates as do the items <fader>, <wode> and <chesil>. After such a fashion too we might treat the appearance of the <-re> attributive termination with the historically *masculine* <erde> "country" in

### 5.2.a.3

Heo com to þere ferde þe icumen wes to  
 þissere eärde

(Cal 2494)

The following represent a selection of the occurrences of "unhistorical" <-ne> attributive morphological expressions with nouns whose West Saxon gender classification is *feminine*:

## 5.2.a.4

- (1) In þere temple he lette beornen enne  
blase of fur  
*(Cal 1428)*
- (2) Feþere he nom mid fingres. and wrote mid  
his honde  
and þe soþe word sette togedere  
and þane hilke poc took us to bisne  
*(Otho 26-28)*
- (3) Erest he makede anne borth and Kayr Eubrac  
hine cleopede  
*(Otho 1332)*
- (4) He makede anne riche borth and hehtene  
Winchestrē  
*(Otho 1408)*
- (5) for þere muchele blisse. heo arærden  
enne burȝe  
*(Cal 4775)*
- (6) her-uore heo hæfden muchelne kare  
*(Cal 6747)*
- (7) Of nane quike monne. næuede he care nænne  
*(Cal 5226)*
- (8) Þa hæhuede Adionard ænne dohter swiðe deore  
*(Cal 5945)*
- (9) Þes king hæufuede enne dohter þe wes  
him swiðe deore  
*(Cal 5443)*
- (10) what bitacnieð þa draken þe þene dune  
makeden  
*(Cal 7989)*
- (11) Þu fræinest of þan draken þe þene dune  
makeden  
*(Cal 7998)*
- (12) Ne do þu me neuere þane scome  
*(Cal 2509)*
- (13) iherden þa tiðende of Wiðer þon kinge  
whulcne scome he him hæfden idon  
*(Cal 4594-5)*

- (14) we..scullen senden..ænne ælpi verde  
 (Cal 6186-7)

while with those that are historically *neuter* we find:

### 5.2.a.5

- (1) þa aræste here vnfridē ouer-al me brac þene  
 griðe  
 (Cal 2013)
- (2) he dude þer muchelne wunde(r)  
 (Cal 3735)
- (3) nime þane munec child 7 makien Brut-londes  
 king  
 (Cal 6614)
- (4) Appas eode to bure 7 þesne balu mæinde  
 (Cal 8812)
- (5) ne durste nauere gume nan oðerne ufele  
 igreten  
 (Cal 10799)

The "completive", "exhaustive" nature of the absolute arguments in the above examples to such predicates as "*take*", "*make*", "*raised up*", "*have*", "*cause to be in existence*" and "*break*" is clear and signalled, so runs our hypothesis, by the use of nominally preposed < -ne > attributive morphology. So pervasive was the < -ne > attributive shape as a marker of absolute case relationships in our manuscripts, that it appears to have been generalized on occasion to *plural* contexts as can be seen from the following examples:

### 5.2.a.6

- (1) 7 ich wulle mine rihte faren to stal-fehte.  
 to-gene þene swerd broþeren þe beiene beoh  
 for-sworene  
 (Cal 2067-68)
- (2) 7 falden þene ælden nomen æfter heore wille  
 (Cal 3552)

## 5.2.b &lt;-NE&gt; IN LOCATIVE CONTEXTS

- (a) with predicates showing inherent (lexical) locational characteristics

We stressed in the previous chapter the importance of the *Peterborough Chronicle's B Text* for showing the syntactic innovation whereby <-ne> attributive morphological terminations were coming to be used in contexts where synchronically earlier grammars of the language had produced locative marking surface attributive forms in noun phrases. Central to our argument there was the notion that certain predication (notably "give") were DIRECTIONALLY INVARIANT or DIRECTIONALLY CONSTANT: in other words, a lexical item such as "give" would be specified in the dictionary as associated with an [ergative, ablative] "subject", an [absolutive] "direct object" and an "indirect object" which was invariably [(ad)locative] in direction — <the book was given by John to Bill>. In such predication we found in parts of the *Peterborough Chronicle* the use at "indirect object" — without preposed particle — of <-ne> attributive terminations in construction with nouns of all historical genders. The invariance of direction feature of the "indirect object" being signalled by the use of a morphological shape generally characteristic of absolutive expressions with their connotations of "exhaustiveness" and "completeness", recall:

## 5.2.b.1

Se kyng Heanri geaf þone biscoprice æfter  
Michelesmesse þone abbot Henri his nefe  
(1129/25-26)

As we have already noted in our general presentation of attributive form data in the text, *Lazamon's Brut* also shows <-ne> attributive terminations in arguments with just such an "indirect object" characteristic in "give" predication in noun phrases which themselves are not governed by prepositional particle heads. Consider the following cases where we find <-ne> attributive shapes in construction with nouns which are historically masculine, feminine and neuter respectively:

### 5.2.b.2



where we see constructions which precisely parallel those which were so prominent a feature of the *Peterborough B Text* and *Interpolations* and where the directional properties of the argument nouns <cniht>, <sunne> and <beorn> are uniquely specified in the semantic configuration of the predicate "give". The case relationship manifested by such nouns in the above utterances is *locational goal only*. Perhaps under this type too we might include "indirect object" arguments in construction with predicates like "promise":

5.2.b.3

- (1) Hii bi-hehte Goffare þane king þat hii  
him wolde helpe  
(*Otho* 815)

(2) He sende þurh Brittaine into Cornuaille.  
7 hehte þane duc stronge herizen in suð londe  
(*Cal* 1867-8)

(b) *in prepositional phrases with  
directionally specific controllers*

The second observation we made concerning the doubly wayward use of <-ne> attributive morphology in the *Peterborough B Text* and *Interpolations* was that it was almost entirely constrained to occur with "motion" predication in a prepositional phrase controlled by a *locationally specific preposed particle*. Consider again examples like:

## 5.2.b.4

- (1) He com fyrst to þone kyng on Normandi  
(1125/14)
- (2) Syððon comen ealle dræuednysse...to  
þone mynstre  
(1066/19-20)

Instances of this type are common in both manuscript versions of *Lazamon's Brut* although, unlike the *Peterborough Chronicle*, they exist more or less as occasional forms alongside prepositional phrase constructions involving locative case forms: <þa wenden to þere welle> (*Cal* 9885); <sende..to þere quene> (*Cal* 1755); <sende to þon kinge> (*Cal* 4113: 5305: 5325: 5336: 7398: 7436: 7544: 7789); <com/eode to þon kinge> (*Cal* 7400: 7463: 7537: 7752: 7809):

## 5.2.b.5

- (1) heo hine flemden out of þane londe  
(*Cal* 164)
- (2) þat heo comen mid him to þane castle of  
Sparatin  
(*Cal* 301)
- (3) 7 Liuius Callus gæinde to anne castle  
(*Cal* 5370)
- (4) þæne kæisere he eode neor  
(*Cal* 4430)
- (5) In-to France he verde..to þane kaisere  
(*Otho* 809-810)
- (6) Hamund (to) þane wode fleh  
(*Otho* 4669)
- (7) ȝef ȝe me wolleþ leade..riht to þane weie  
(*Otho* 2805-6)

We might repeat here the explanation we have given for such a construction as it was found in the twelfth century *Peterborough Chronicle*. In those locational arguments to "motion" predication whose directional orientation is not intrinsically expressed in the semantics of the predicate lexical item itself, but rather where the source/goal nature of that directionality requires to be shown through the agency of a nominally preposed particle, <-ne>

attributive termination shapes tend to surface. Why should this be? We have seen how the context *par excellence* where this termination is to be found is with attributive words which are in construction with nouns of all grammatical gender classifications standing in an *absolutive* argument relationship to their sentential predicates. As such they signalled the "caseless" nature of such words in arguments whose relational status with their predicate was inferrable from the internalized semantics of the predicate. The appearance of <-ne> terminated attributes in prepositional phrases headed by locationally specific and directionally unambiguous particles once more represents their "empty" case specifying characteristic. In these cases where the participant argument's source or goal features are superficially expressed by nominally preposed direction indicating particles like <to>/<from>, then further preposed case signalling for nouns would appear to be "redundant" and post-prepositional attributives assigned a case form which is directionally "neutral".

It is interesting to notice how in sentences containing "*send*" predication we are just as likely to find locational goal direction expressed through the agency of a preposed particle in a prepositional phrase as to see the goal argument realized in a way characteristic of predicates whose orientational features are lexically predictable:

#### 5.2.b.6

- (1) A writ he lette makie..  
al wiþ-houte gretinge sende Cesar þane  
kinge (Otho 3650-1)
- (2) Hii nemen hire sonde and sende to Yrlonde  
to þane leod-kinge Gillekaoz ihote (Otho 5016-7)

#### (c) other related contexts

Consider the following instances where the attributes of "*misery*" and "*wellbeing*" are being attributed to animate humans:

## 5.2.b.7

- (1) w̄ake wes on londe wa wes þone vnstronge  
(*Cal* 2016)
- (2) (Wa) wr̄ðe auer þene smið þa þe mid honden  
smeo[ð]ðede  
(*Cal* 783)
- (3) Ofte was þane maide wo and neuere worse  
þane þo  
(*Otho* 1550)
- (4) Wo worþe þane man þat lond haueþ to wille  
(*Otho* 1678)
- (5) Wel worþe þane man þat folweþ wisdome  
(*Otho* 11646)

Despite the fact that in classical West Saxon texts the recipient of the (mis)fortune in sentences like those above is normally ascribed a locative/"dative" case marked attributive as it indeed is still in a few *Lazamon* cases – <*Wa was þan kinge*> (*Cal* 7619); <*was þere quene wa*> (*Cal* 3156) – and even given such possible renderings for sentences of this type as <*Let there be woe to...*> in the modern language, we might suggest that the semantic relationship pertaining between the "woe" argument and its sentential predicate is, in fact, an *absolutive* one. That is, the exhortative proposition is one such that what is being wished upon the animate "subject" is that he/she *have, be in possession of* (however figuratively) the absolute argument items "woe" or "wellbeing". If this is indeed an acceptable interpretation of the semantics of the arguments in such propositions then it is not surprising that a locative case form is supplanted by that which is the realizer, *par excellence*, of "exhaustive", "completive" absolute case relationships.

Yet another "dative"/"object" case form substitution found in our manuscript can be seen from an instance like the following:

## 5.2.b.8

Pohte Corgwind þane king her-of swiþe sellich  
þing  
(*Otho* 3084)

with the *Caligula* version reflecting the West Saxon construction where the "*king*" argument to the "*seem*" proposition manifests a "dative" case form: <þuhte Gurguint þon kinge>. Yet it is surely the case that in such instances the "*king*" argument represents an absolute, animate (non-ergative) case relationship and, as such, in our model triggers attributives with <-ne> morphological characteristics. Perhaps under this head too we might include an example like:

### 5.2.b.9

Galoes wes feirest of alle þan oðren  
 leouest þone kinge  
 (*Cal* 1358-9)

where once more the "*king*" argument might be interpreted as a non-ergative, absolute "subject": <*the king held her to be the most precious*>, an argument historically expressed by a "dative" attributive case form as it is in several places in the *Brut* itself: <*Galoes was fairest..leuest þan kinge*> (*Otho* 1358-9); <*Kaer Leir hehte þe burh: leof heo wes þan kinge*> (*Cal/Otho* 1455) (Hawkins (1986) pp 26 ff.). Other unhistorical <þone> shapes which occur in our manuscript are less easy to explain. Consider the following:

### 5.2.b.10

- (1) 7 anan leiden to þan grunden of þane Freinsce  
 þreo þusende  
     (*Cal* 836)
- (2) of þane folke he sloh muchel folk and onifoh  
     (*Otho* 4288)

We shall see below how it is possible to interpret such <þane> forms as mere mechanical substitutions for <þan> shapes which we might normally expect in prepositional phrases governed by a particle like <of> historically selecting a locative case form. However, it is worth observing too that such "partitive genitive" type constructions as those under 5.2.b.10 have been convincingly attributed by Anderson (1979) to *ablative, source* case relationship status, such that a construction like <"many

*Texans">* can be shown to represent an underlying argument relationship like <*"many from the total number of Texans"*>. Clearly, if directionality, location is involved in such partitive quantificational constructions, then the nature of that direction is "inherent", unique, in this case *source only*. We have, of course, argued many times above that just in such directionally invariant arguments to predicate relationships, <-ne> terminated attributive forms tend to surface. In this context too we might quote the following sentence where there is clearly some kind of "unique source" relationship under consideration: <of anne kunne we beoð icummen> (*Cal* 3666), where <kunne> is etymologically *neuter*.

### 5.3 <PAN> UNETYMOLOGICAL GENDER AND CASE FORM USAGE: A PARADOX

It is worth quoting here once more that part of our general token count table (5.1.a) dealing with the distribution of what are normally interpreted to be the "dative" definite determiner forms <þan> /<þare> /<þere>:

5.3.a

	WEST SAXON GENDER					
	masc		fem		neut	
	CAL	OTHO	CAL	OTHO	CAL	OTHO
<i>object</i>						
<þan>	4	5	1	1	0	0
<i>locative</i>						
<þan>	133	86	8	23	57	47
<i>locative</i>						
<þere>	11	9	122	37	11	5

These figures are interesting for a number of reasons. In the first place, the vast preponderance of <þan> forms in historically *masculine* and *neuter* locative contexts strongly points to their being treatable as a phonological (or even scribal (Hoffman (1909))) development of the West Saxon <þæm> shape. On the other hand, that such forms — as we shall see — also occur in what are unambiguously *absolutive* argument types might suggest that they be treated as a genuine intrusion of etymologically locative shapes into *absolutive* case relationship contexts and not merely be viewed as some kind of scribal variant for the historical *absolutive* <þone> shape. But more of this later. Secondly, there is clearly an intrusion of the apparently non-*feminine* attributive shape <þan> into *feminine* lexical item locative contexts, especially in *Otho*, much as there was in both late Northumbrian glosses and in the *Peterborough Chronicle*. However statistically this intrusion is not great and is not, as we have already observed, "supported" by any parallel "spread" of <-um> inflection in strong adjectives or possessive pronouns with nouns which are historically *feminine*. Indeed such a <-um> post position with these syntactic categories is entirely absent from both texts of *Lazamon's Brut*, a noteworthy feature in itself. Thirdly, unlike any of the materials we have so far examined, there does appear to be a fairly marked tendency to use <-re> postpositions in construction with lexical items whose etymological gender is non-*feminine*.

Let us begin by examining those instances where we find <þan> definite determiners in congruence with etymologically *feminine* lexical items. These fall into two main contexts:

- (a) *post prepositionally in temporal circumstantial allative (non source/goal) comments to propositions:*

### 5.3.b.1

- (1) he a-ras to þan mid-nihte  
(*Cal* 3781)
- (2) Stille i-wende sone Maximien of Rome  
i þan seouen-nihte mid alle his cnihten  
(*Cal/Otho* 5799-5800)

- (3) þa hi[t] com to þan nihte þo dealde  
hire[d]-cnihtes (Otho 7488)
- (4) wið-innen þan fif niht þe king iwræð  
fere forð-riht (Cal 15274)
- (5) Hit ilomp an ane time to þan White-sume-tide (Cal 15736)
- (6) he in þan ilke nihte he h..[al]le his cnihtes (Otho 14168)

Such a usage in extra-propositional temporal circumstantial was, we recall, also a prominent characteristic of both late Northumbrian glosses:

### 5.3.b.2

in þæm tid gefeade gaste halige  
IN IPSA HORA EXULTAUT SPIRITU SANCTO  
(*Lindisfarne Gospels*: L x/21)

as well as the *Peterborough Chronicle A Text*: <Da ferde se cynyng to Hæstingan to þam Candelmæssan> (1094/8–9) (see § 4.9.a above). However, we have to stress that in both texts of the *Brut* <–re> attributive forms are the norm with the historically *feminine* <niht> in circumstantial temporal environments – there is a total of ten instances from the two manuscripts in Book One as against only three with <þan>. Yet that we are dealing with a genuine innovative <þan> usage in such a context would appear to be suggested by the fact that with the historically *masculine* item <time> "time", only <þan>, <ðon>, <þen> and <þeon> shapes are to be found in construction in circumstantial temporal locative environments, with no intrusion of unetymological <–re> inflectional forms which are otherwise such a distinctive feature of the text: <A ðon ilke time com þe duc> (Cal/Otho 3181), <Com hit to þan æuen-time> (Cal/Otho 6417;7122) and see also Cal/Otho 1940; 5229; Cal 5531.

We might note here too the prepositionless temporal circumstantial involving historically *feminine and neuter* lexical items in construction with attributives with *absolutive* morphological shapes:

## 5.3.b.3

- (1) Nes he þer buten enne niht  
(*Cal* 4690)
- (2) (bi)-wakede al þane niht  
(*Otho* 13388)
- (3) ænne stunde he wes blac and on heuve  
swiðe wak  
(*Cal* 9924)
- (4) 7 swa al þene dæi-liht i-laste þis  
muchele fiht  
(*Cal* 11588)
- (5) Al þene dæi-lihte Vðeres cnihtes slogen  
and nomen  
(*Cal* 9763)
- (6) mid þan feo sculden faren  
æuer-alcne zere to Oðres þeon ture  
(*Cal* 3884-5)

Although the above would appear to represent "extended duration" contexts as against "single point in time" environments typical of the <þan> examples under 5.3.b.2 – compare <Seouen niht 7 enne dæi þe king seoc lai> (*Cal* 5493) and <þeo fihten wið þone duke al þene dæi longe> (*Cal* 3192) alongside <Herigal wes þes kinges mæi þet wes hærm a þen ilke dæi> (*Cal* 4059) (Mitchell (1986) § 1383, p. 580; Yamakawa (1980) pp. 1–19; Mustanoja (1960) pp 107–108). Nevertheless, we still have to deal with an example like that at *Otho* 3050: <In þan oþerne dæi he com to Denemarke> – paralleling the *Cal* <A þene oðerne dæi..> – where absolutive and locative morphology indicating shapes appear in the same prepositional phrase, suggesting perhaps that <þan> determiner shapes were so characteristic of temporal circumstantialials that they were intruding into "non-durative" contexts as well.

- (b) *in locative arguments headed by direction indicating particles*

The *Peterborough Chronicle B Text and Interpolations* were unusual, we argued, by virtue of the fact that they had generalized <-ne> attributive morphological shapes not merely to absolutive arguments to predicates, but also

to those which reflected the "directional orientation" of "motion" predicates especially in prepositionally controlled constructions: <brohton hem to þone kinge> (1124/12). In the gloss to the *Lindisfrane Gospels*, such arguments, regardless of the inherent gender characteristic of the head noun, customarily showed attributive shapes like <þam> and <-(u)m>: <cuomon to þam byrgenne/ UENERUNT AD MONUMENTUM> (L xxiv/1-2). We have shown above that while both *Lazamon* texts bear witness to the first of these construction types — <heo comen mid him to þane castle of Sparatin> (*Cal* 300) — there yet appears to exist in competition with it the use of non-gender significant <þan> definite determiners in locational arguments to predicates whose directional characteristics are not unique:

### 5.3.c.1

- (1) Þe king lette..þat ne moste þer na mon  
in cumen  
ne wið-inne þon castel-buri na quic mon  
iboren  
(*Cal* 3345-6)
- (2) Hii nemen hire wepne and forþ gonne wende  
wonderliche faste to þan borth of Excestre  
hii wenden wel to bi-stelen in-to þan borwe  
(*Otho* 4863-5)
- (3) fort hii come to þan [e]rþe þar Belyn lay  
mid his ferde  
(*Otho* 2679)

as well as in Book Two:

### 5.3.c.2

- (4) Hii comen to þan ferde at þan east eande  
(*Otho* 13728)
- (5) a[n]d fo[r]þ..to þan b[orh] of Par[is]  
(*Otho* 13418)
- (6) Þe king sende his sonde to Igerne þan hende  
(*Otho* 9249)

- (7) þat þe [k]ing was awend vt of þ[a]n ferde  
(*Otho* 9517)

While we have already indicated that such a construction is the norm throughout both versions of the *Brut with non-feminine nouns* (c.f. <sende to þan kinge> (*Cal* 4113)), the intrusion of <þan> shapes into constructions with historically *feminine* nouns is confined almost entirely to the *Otho* manuscript version.

The above two contexts represent by far the majority of unhistorical <þan> locative usage in both *Lazamon* versions although we shall proceed to discuss two others which, although it must be stressed are relatively rare, show the <þan> determiner distributed in such a way which will on the one hand lend some support to some of the very tentative proposals we shall offer below for the unhistorical <-re> termination's distribution. At the same time, however, they may cause us to be less confident concerning some of the proposals we have been putting forward for general <-ne>/<þan> innovation in *Lazamon's Brut*.

#### 5.4 EXCLUSION OF <ÞAN> FROM CIRCUMSTANTIAL, NON TEMPORAL (ALLATIVE) CONTEXTS: A NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENT

In essence we have been proposing in this chapter that the attributive morphology of noun phrases in *Lazamon's Brut* is essentially a combination of that which individually characterized the late Northumbrian glosses on the one hand and certain parts of the *Peterborough Chronicle* on the other. In the first place, we witnessed the generalization of "accusative" absolute <-ne> accretions to attributives in construction with nouns which historically were to be regarded as "locative" in their case relationship status. Secondly, we saw how <þan> definite determiners were being innovatively used in two contexts — one where the temporal condition of the entire propositional activity was of a special type, another (overlapping with one of the "new" <-ne> contexts) where it appeared in prepositional phrases headed by directionally specific locational particles. Yet there is another characteristic of the <þan> determiner in *Lazamon* which is worth our attention since it seems to shed important light upon the interpretation we are to give to that rather unusual feature of our text —

the "spread" of <-re> attributive morphology shapes to noun phrase constructions containing lexical items etymologically classified as *non-feminine*.

Unhistorical <þan> definite determiners are extremely rare in contexts appropriate for circumstantial NON-TEMPORAL (locative, allative) arguments. Although they do, in fact, on a very few occasions occur in just such a context: <he gadere[de] in þan erþ mochel siþ-ferde> (*Otho* 5177); <þat yllond steond foliwiſ a-midde þan bor[h] of Paris> (*Otho* 11829); <In þan see ifunde vt-lawes> (*Otho* 644) — for a different explanation for such types, see § 5.8 below — it is nevertheless overwhelmingly the case that <-re> morphological shapes "resist" intrusion by <þan> in precisely this kind of environment. This can be well illustrated if we consider the total token distribution in Book One of attributives associated with the historically *feminine* item <burh> "city" in both locative and absolutive argument expressing contexts as set out in 5.4.a below on page 194. The three <þan> forms in the two manuscript versions are those which we have already cited above in locative arguments to non-specific directional predication, c.f. <hi wenden..into þan borwe> (*Otho* 4865). <-re> attributive morphology is clearly common with this lexical item in both texts and while it often reflects the locative status of arguments governed by source/goal specifying particles (<wenden to þare burh> (*Cal* 6204)) it plays a major role in signalling non-temporal circumstantial locative (allative) relationships.

Consider:

#### 5.4.b

- (1) þe cnaue wes iboren in þere burhe  
(*Cal* 148-9)
- (2) þe king i þere burh wonede  
(*Cal* 1024)
- (3) 7 hine bi-burien in Newe Troye þere burhze  
(*Cal* 1050)

as well as at *Cal* 5967; 6259 and 7760. The importance of this "exclusion" of <þan> shapes from such non-temporal circumstantial contexts will become clear in our next section.

## 5.4.a

	CAL	OTHO
<i>absolutive</i>		
<þone>/<-ne>	3	8
<þan>	0	1
<þa>	14	0
<þe>	5	9
<i>locative</i>		
<þan>	1	2
<þere>/<-re>	22	9
<þe>	1	1

But even at this point it is worth noting that (a) <þan> forms are rigidly excluded from particular extra propositional argument comment types and (b) if we ignore for the moment the morphology-less <þe> forms, it is clear — especially from the *Otho* data — that this lexical item appears to show in its attributive morphology an <-ne>/<-re> "paradigm" in non—"subject" contexts — innovative non-*feminine* attributive shapes are permitted intrusion into only well defined case relationship contexts and "resisted" in others.

## 5.5 &lt;PAN&gt; IN ABSOLUTIVE ARGUMENTS

We have now to turn to a peculiarity of the *Lazamon* data which might make us take an even more tentative stance concerning some of the conclusions we have so far reached. Both manuscript versions (although in Book Two the phenomenon is almost entirely confined to *Otho*) show <þan> forms in construction with nouns whose argument status to their predicates is an *ABSOLUTIVE* one. The token numbers are not, we should strongly stress very large, but we appear to be dealing with a phenomenon

directly contrary to our assertions above that <-ne> morphological shapes were coming to be the "preferred" surface signal for that particular case relationship. Consider the following:

## 5.5.a

- (1) he redde þen kæisere ⁊ al þan Romanisce here  
(*Cal* 4622)
- (2) Eneas..grette þen alde kinge  
(*Cal* 68)
- (3) heo wolden..þan kinge wið-stonden  
(*Cal* 711)
- (4) Hengest grop þan king  
(*Otho* 7620)
- (5) h[e..uþe] þan vuele craft  
(*Otho* 1419)
- (6) and ȝefue hire louerd þan beste of þis erþ  
(*Otho* 5693)
- (7) þe cheorles..þan king icnewen  
(*Otho* 6148)
- (8) Ingernes and Peridur neme þan king Elydur  
(*Otho* 3395)

all with historically *masculine* nouns, while with *feminines* we find only <⁊ menden to him heore sær ⁊ heore sorh-siðes/⁊ þan vnimete scome ⁊ þenne muche grome> (*Cal* 5541–2) and perhaps < wel heo closden heore ȝeten..and þan borh bi-wuste> (*Otho* 4868). Book Two likewise bears witness to this kind of usage although it is almost entirely confined to *Otho*: < he smot þan cniht> (*Otho* 11381); < me sloh þan eorl> (*Otho* 9553); < þan heremite he iseh come> (*Otho* 9384); < þan oþer he ȝaf in-to Winchestre> (*Otho* 9090) as well as at *Otho* 11667; 12997; 13004; 9981; 10110; 8520 and 13358. But before discussing what linguistic significance, if any, instances of this kind might be thought to have, we should also consider examples like the following:

## 5.5.b

- (1) to wreken .ire teone of þan kinge and  
þane cwene  
(*Otho* 1234)

- (2) sæhtrien me wið þene kæisere 7 wið þon  
Romanisce here  
(*Cal* 4377)
- (3) 7 spac wið þane kæisere 7 wið þan  
Romanisce here  
(*Cal* 5234)
- (4) þe fader weap a þane sone soster o þan broþer  
moder to þan dohter  
(*Otho* 12743-4)
- [*Cal* <þe uader weop a þene sune suster a  
þene broðer moder a þa dohter>]
- (5) þa rad forð a þan felde falsest alre kinge  
and Oswald rad a þene feld næfde he sper  
ne nænne sceld  
(*Cal* 15685-6)
- (6) 7 þan vnimete scome 7 þenne much grome  
þe Maxenz heom hæude idon  
(*Cal* 5542)
- (6) Dunewale in þan fihte was swiþe kene...  
Dunewale in þan fihte hadde gode cniþtes  
(*Otho* 2080-2)

Such instances, and note especially those with *feminine* nouns like <dohter>, <cwen> and <scamu> "shame", would at least superficially appear to suggest that <þane> and <þan> were "equivalents", alternants in ABSOLUTIVE arguments to predication such as "*to weep for*", "*to speak with*", "*to take vengeance upon*" among others.

These examples confront us with at least two possible types of explanation. The first, that the scribes were indiscriminately utilizing <þan> and <þane> spellings as orthographic variants and with no semantic contrast associated with them has, needless to say, severe consequences for the kind of model we have been putting forward throughout this monograph. If <þane> can randomly be substituted for <þan> and *vice versa* we shall at least have to revise our comments upon <-ne> attributive morphology in locative contexts: instances such as <hi ȝeuen þane beorn ȝeftes swiþe ȝode> (*Otho* 9613) could be interpreted as "normal" <þan> shapes in construction with non-*feminine* lexical items. Likewise, instances like <heo comen mid him to þane castle of Sparatin> (*Cal* 300) could merely be collated with those

examples we itemized immediately following 5.3.c.1/2, where <þan> attributes (albeit marking *absolutive*, caseless determiner forms) "regularly" appeared post-prepositionally with non-*feminine* nouns. Yet there are a number of factors which might lead us away from an "orthographic variant" type of hypothesis. The first lies in the parallel between the *Lazamon* and *Peterborough Chronicle B Text* and *Interpolations* usage with <-ne> accretions in locative arguments. The East Anglian <þone> forms cannot readily be interpreted as orthographic variants of <þam> or <þan> — certainly <þan> attributes are nowhere to be found in *absolutive* arguments in the *Chronicle* materials. Secondly, any suggestion that <þane> is an orthographic variant for <þan> does nothing to explain its use with etymologically *feminine* lexical items as in: <Saturnus heo ziuen Sætterdæi þene sunne heo ziuen Sonedæi> (*Cal* 6953) — a <þan> form in such a context is just as innovative as a <þane>. So too, in an instance like <auerelcne cnihte he zef zeoue brihte> (*Cal* 3841), any appeal to conflated orthographic "accusative/dative" morphological shapes is meaningless.

Again, were such a random orthographic substitution an active characteristic of the scribes' spelling habits then we might reasonably expect it to surface with a high statistical level of frequency. In fact, when we examine an item like <feoht> with a wide frequency of occurrence in both *Lazamon* texts and which is regularly used in allative circumstantial arguments with preposed particles, we find a theory proposing a random substitution of <þan>/<þane> attributives difficult to support. For instance, with this *neuter* item we find no less than twenty four occurrences in Book One alone of the phrase <in þan/þon/þeon fe(o)ht> — c.f. *Cal* 1085; 1087; 2080; 2797 and *Otho* 3733; 4788; 5221 and 7004 with only two <inne þane fehte> (*Cal* 109); <in þane fihte> (*Otho* 2080). Likewise in source/goal directional arguments post prepositionally, only <þan> attributive definite determiner shapes appear: <vt of þan fehte> (*Cal* 44) and <wende to þan fihte> (*Cal* 3788; *Cal/Otho* 4715; *Cal/Otho* 5309). If random scribal variation lay behind the <þan>/<þane> alternation we have witnessed above, then we might not unreasonably expect it to figure much more frequently than it in fact appears to do. Perhaps most telling of all in this context is the distribution of these forms with an extremely high

frequency item like <king>; in Book One there are no less than seventy instances between the two manuscript versions where <þone>/<þane> attributives are found to be in agreement with absolutive nominal arguments. There is no <þane>/<þan> syncretism at all, except in contexts of the type we have listed earlier in this chapter at §§ 5.2.b.3 and 5.2.b.4, i.e. where (a) we find <þone> as a marker of "case only" to the immediate right of a directional prepositional particle in "movement" predicate constructions:

## 5.5.c

- (1) *Pes swein an hizinge wende to his louerd  
to Leir þane king*  
(*Otho* 1797-8)  
(*Cal* <to Leir þon kinge>)
- (2) *He sende his sonde..to Leir þane king*  
(*Otho* 1562)

and (b) with those predication like "*promise*" which are characterized as triggering "inherently" goal directional arguments as in propositions like: <Hii bi-hehte Goffare þane king> (*Otho* 815), together with the non-ergative, absolutive subject underlying <king> in cases like: <leouest þone kinge of þan sustren> (*Cal* 1359).

If <þane>/<þan> alternation is to be understood as not merely orthographic, then how are we to account for <þan> definite determiners in construction with *absolutive* argument nouns? One very tentative solution might be to argue for the existence in the *Lazamon* data of two separate attributive paradigmatic outputs. One of these, and the one with which we are now familiar, would generalize the <-ne> accretion shape from an original function of marking "completive" absolutive arguments to those other environments where, in the presence of alternative signals for locational direction, "case empty" attributive forms were seen to be appropriate. The other would take as its "model" that determiner shape found increasingly intruding to the right of directionally specific locational particles with nouns of all historical genders — <þan>. That "case neutral" or "case empty" form could then be generalized to non-locative absolutive slots.

Although we must admit that it is difficult to constrain such a tentative proposal, we might nevertheless suggest that for *Lazamon's Brut* (although, if anything it is more characteristic of the *Otho* version) we can expect historically "accusative" and "dative" morphological shapes (especially those of the definite article) to be sensitive to their predication in the following fashion:

### 5.5.d

PREDICATE	PRE-POSED LOCATIVE PARTICLE	PARTICIPANT ATTRIBUTIVE MORPHOLOGY
(1) "take", "have" "break"	NULL	<-ne> <þan>
(2) "come", "go"	<to>, <of>, etc	<-ne> <þan>
(3) "give", "command"	NULL	<-ne>

where, observe, the "case neutral" <þan> type has not intruded into those arguments whose directional characteristics are inherent in the semantics of the predicates with which they are in construction.

### 5.6 UNHISTORICAL <-RE> MORPHOLOGICAL USAGE

It is when we turn to the second unusual (in terms of the earlier texts we have been studying) feature of nominal attributive morphology in *Lazamon's Brut* that we realize just how complex a picture of this aspect of the grammar of early Middle English this manuscript presents. With the exception of the small number of unhistorical gender <-re> agreements (mainly with items like <mægden>) which appeared in the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (see § 2.10), we have so far shown that speakers appear to

have assigned innovative semantic functions to those morphological shapes which were historically associated with *masculine* and to a lesser extent *neuter* gender contexts – shapes such as <–ne>, <–um> and <–n>. We argued in Chapter Two, in fact, that it was the case function ambiguity of <–re> accretions which worked against their selection as phonologically distinctive nominally preposed markers of (especially) locative case relationships. However, in view of what we have just claimed to be a characteristic of *Lazamon's Brut* (especially of the *Otho* version) namely the syncretism of <þane>/<þan> outputs in various types of case neutral environments, we might not be surprised were we to find that speakers utilized <–re> attributive forms to express some of the non-absolutive case relationship functions previously accorded to "dative" forms. But although we shall attempt to show that something like this did indeed occur, the picture is nevertheless a very complex one and certainly some of the data we shall examine will tend to support a model of *genuswechsel* or lexical gender re-assignment which we have thus far been at considerable pains to disparage. Consider, for instance, the token distribution of definite article and "demonstrative" <þis> forms as they appear in Book One of the *Brut* in both *Otho* and *Cal* versions in non—"subject" case shapes in construction with the historically *neuter* item <ric> "*kingdom*" :

## 5.6.a

	CAL	OTHO	CAL	OTHO
	definite article		demonstrative	
object				
	þat	þe	þæs	þes
	(1939 0000)	(2026 3493)	(1400 5307)	(1400 1939 2397)
	ȝeond þat		þas	þeos
	(2005 6393)		(2274 5877)	(2005 5877)
	þa		3159 1933	
	(6111)		2026 2307	
	ȝeond þas			
	(3493)			

---

locative

of þere	of þissere	of þisse
(4518)	(2698 3594)	(2698)
	to þissere	to þisse
	(5673 5595)	(5595)
	an þissere	of þis
	(5105 7280)	(5307)
	7573 7971)	in þisse
		(7573)

---

These data would seem to point incontrovertibly to some kind of *lexical reclassification* from the West Saxon *neuter* gender to a *feminine*, certainly for the grammar of the *Caligula* scribe. Hoffmann (1909) comes to this conclusion and cites the rationale for the reclassification as "Auf Vokalausgehende Substantiva werden Femin." on the basis of the item's <richē> orthographic representation (pp. 59–60). This kind of interpretation is given even more weight when we observe that in many of the instances cited above in 5.6.a, <richē> appears as the second element of a compound word whose first element is a *neuter* <cynn> form: <cumen to þissere kineriche> (*Cal* 5673; 5575). At the same time, this *feminine* reclassified item appears to provoke a "gender change" when it appears as the first element of what is normally in West Saxon treated as a *masculine* item <ricdom> "*kingdom*": <ac alle hii weren ifreuered sone for þare richedom of Rome> (*Otho* 2979). Consider again too the possible gender reclassification of an item entered as *masculine* in Bosworth–Toller (1882–98) – <(sæ)-strond> :

## 5.6.b

	<i>Caligula</i>	<i>Otho</i>
<i>object</i>		
	þas (2308)	þat (4606)
		þis (2308)
<i>locative</i>		
	vppen þare sæ- (3773)	v(p)pe þar see- (3773)
	bi þere sæ- (5630 6200)	to þare see- (7514)
	to þare sæ- (7514)	framward þare strand (4691)
		bi þare see- (6200)
	framward þan (4691)	from þan (3659)
	bi þan sæ- (5278)	bi þan see- (5278)

From a total of twelve locative environment instances, no less than *eight* show <-re> attributive morphological terminations, *seven* of these eight when the item is prefixed by <sæ->, a predominantly *feminine* classified item in both *Lazamon* versions (despite Bosworth-Toller's (1882–98) *mASCULINE/fEMININE* classification). Only on a single occasion in Book One do we find <sæ> in congruence with a non-*feminine* attributive shape <þon>: <bi Ruscicadan hii neome þe see. and bi þe contre of Assare./In þan see ifunde vt-lawes> (*Otho* 643–644). Yet our enthusiasm for the gender reclassification of an item like <strond> under the "influence" of the prefixed <sæ>, must be tempered by the fact that it is after all still to be found in construction with <þon> shapes even when prefixed by <sæ-> (*Otho/Cal* 5278) as well as from the fact that we can find a <þon> locative attribute in agreement with a compound like <sæ-rima> "coast" in

such close textual proximity with an overtly *feminine* <-re> shape with <sæ>:

### 5.6.c

þat wes icumen of þare sæ. a deor swiðe sellich  
frommard Irlonde. com hider liðen  
and bi þon sæ-rime. rasde to þon folke  
(*Cal* 3209-3211)

It is possible to demonstrate, we believe, that at least in some instances <-re> attributive suffixes in congruence with historically non-*feminine* lexical items are restricted to well defined case relationship contexts and are not, in fact, the product of gender class shifting. Let us consider, as a first instance, the occurrence of attributive forms with a locative shape in the *Caligula* manuscript with the etymologically *masculine* item <tur> "tower":

### 5.6.d

#### (a) non-*feminine* *attributives*

- (1) þ[e] fengen þa lond-gauel 7 mid þan feo  
sculden faren.  
æuer-alcne zere. to Oðres þeon ture  
(*Cal* 3884-5)
- (2) Swa heo wenden mid þon flode to þon tur  
of Oðres  
(*Cal* 3987)
- (3) vp heo hine duden heze an ufen-meste þan  
ture  
(*Cal* 3033)

#### (b) *feminine* attributive shapes

- (4) In are swiðe stronge tur heo duden  
þene king Elidur  
(*Cal* 3397)
- (5) moni zer and moni dæi þe king in þære  
ture læi  
(*Cal* 3398)
- (6) 7 nomen ut Elidur þer he læi in are tur  
(*Cal* 3410)

- (7) in þare tur stronge þe kæisere wunede longe  
 (Cal 3874)

the fact that (4)–(6) are in close discourse proximity suggests to some scholars (c.f. Pervaz (1958), pp 57–60) some kind of gender class "contamination" – although how the initial *<are>* trigger for such contamination comes to have an unetymological shape is left unexplained. Likewise, that (7) is preceded by *<He hehte wurchen ane tur>* a few lines earlier (Cal 3871) is given as the impetus for its new *feminine* shape yet, given the high frequency of morphology-less "strong" adjectival forms in both *Brut* versions, it would be dangerous to too readily accept *<ane>* as an unambiguously *feminine* form, cf: *< halden...in ane stronge castle>/< in one strongne castel>* (Cal/Otho 2340) where *<castel>* is usually treated as etymologically *masculine*. What all the items under 5.6.d (b) above appear to share, especially those at (5)–(7) is their *ALLATIVE* case relationship characteristic, notably their *circumstantial allative non-temporal argument status*.

Consider again those places where we find unetymological *<-re>* attributive forms in construction with the historically *neuter* *<tempel>*:

#### 5.6.e

- (1) In þere temple he lette beornen enne blase of  
 fure  
 (Cal 1428)
- (2) Per stoden in þere temple. ten þusend monnen  
 (Cal 4027)
- (3) wes Allec þe king. in are temple  
 (Cal 5342)
- (4) in are riche temple mid golde heo hine  
 bi-tunden  
 (Cal 2139)

(although we also find the singleton *<Brutus ferde in-to þere temple>* (Cal 590)). In the above cases there would seem to be little doubt that the "ungrammatical" *<-re>* shapes occur in congruence with items which provide a non-temporal, allative and especially circumstantial comment upon the main proposition. If this observation is indeed correct, can we find any evidence for the intrusion

of <-re> terminations into circumstantial, prepositional phrases which denote allative (non source/goal) arguments with non-*feminine* lexical items which are inherently *place specifying*? The item <stede> "place" occurs on many occasions in both *Brut* versions and in almost all instances where an allative circumstantial is involved, a <þon> definite determiner surfaces: <i þan stede he hine wolde slæn> (*Cal* 3175; 3177; 4105; 5880), and in general the item occurs only with non-*feminine* attributive shapes. However, on the single occasion where an unambiguously *feminine* attributive termination is to be found with <stede>, it is in just the kind of circumstantial allative, non-temporal context our model would predict: <and ȝif ihc hine mai ohwa fon. in þare stude he worþ fordon> (*Otho* 4105).

Perhaps some of the most convincing evidence in favour of our thesis that <þon> and <þare> attributive forms (regardless of the historical gender classification of their head nouns) can signal the specific case relationship status of arguments to particular predicates in propositions and provide comment on entire propositions, can be seen from their distribution, especially in the *Caligula* text with the item <leode> "country". Bosworth-Toller (1882–98) list this item as being both the *masculine* (especially when plural) and *feminine* gender class, and an examination of the "dative" case form provoking environments in *Lazamon* would tend at first glance to support such a view. The examples are worth citing at some length:

### 5.6.f

#### (a) with <þan>/<þone> attributes

- (1) þat he heom wolde leaden out of þane leoden  
(*Cal* 182)  
(<þat he ȝam wolde le.. vt of þan londe> (*Otho*))
- (2) ȝa orles weorne iwende..in-to þon leode  
(*Cal* 2863-5)
- (3) He bigon. to senden ȝeond al þan Romleoden  
(*Cal* 4598)
- (4) heo rideñ ȝeond þan leode  
(*Cal* 5844)

(b) with *<-re>* attributive terminations



Both the (a) and (b) sets of examples involve well-defined syntactic contexts for the prepositional phrases in which <leode> is to be found. Those under (a) show it as a locative argument to motion predictions like "lead", "go", "send" and "ride", an argument where there is a preposed direction specifying particle present. Such contexts, we argued above, regularly trigger in this text (as well as in those of an earlier date) <þan>/<þone> definite determiner outputs, regardless of the classical West Saxon gender class of the lexical items involved. Whether we are dealing in the (a) cases with some kind of "intrusion" of non-*feminine* attributive outputs into constructions where *feminine* terminations would historically be expected, is immaterial since the "surviving" <-re> attributive shapes (if that is indeed what they are) appear to be principally constrained to occur with this lexical item just when it appears in *allative circumstantial (non-temporal environments)*. Indeed, we might wish to suggest that especially for the *Caligula* scribe, this item was, in fact, "genderless" — the morphological terminations of the attributive words which appeared in congruence with it being predictable from the kind of model we have proposed above. Needless to say, the *Lazamon* data in Book One shows exceptions to the predictions of our model: <and draf me to þisse londe in-to þire leode> (*Cal* 2337) and <þer wes cumen liðende. into þere leode> (*Cal* 4809) although the last might be considered an allative locational argument to a predicate like "*arrived at*".

We might very tentatively suggest too that the two unambiguously *feminine* attributives found in Book One with the etymologically *masculine/neuter* < hilt > "sword hilt", rather than act as indicators of gender class shift for the lexical item itself, once more reflect the *allative* nature of its argument status *vis-à-vis* the sentential predicate: < þa brac þat sweord..riht bi þere hilte> (*Cal* 781); < æ ðere hilte wes igrauen> (*Cal* 3808). And in this context as well it is worth noting that the majority usage of <-re> terminations in attributes to the etymologically *neuter* < rice> cited in our examples at 5.6.a above, quite clearly also involves circumstantial allative (non-temporal) arguments:

### 5.6.g

- (1) her wes unimete fare a þissere folc riche  
(*Cal* 5105)
- (2) þenne scalt þu for-wurpen a þissere  
woruld-riche  
(*Cal* 7280)
- (3) Wha wolde wenan a þissere weorlde-riche  
(*Cal* 7573)
- (4) þa wes he awundred on þissere wurlde-riche  
(*Cal* 7971)

as well as in Book Two: < Wæilawæi wæilawæi a þissere worlde-riche/ muchel is þa sorze> (*Cal* 8941) and < for nis na wimmon treowere in þissere worlde-riche> (*Cal* 9402).

### 5.7 UNHISTORICAL <þAT> DETERMINER FORMS

Before turning to a discussion of the extent to which both texts of *Lazamon's Brut* provide evidence for the encroachment of "morphology-less" definite determiner and other attributive forms in specific case relationship contexts, let us briefly consider the extent to which <þat> forms (used both gender etymologically and otherwise) show parallel characteristics to the kinds of usage we described for them in earlier texts in our previous chapters. Recall from 5.1.a the single token count statistics for "subject" and "object" <þat> determiners with nouns of all three historical genders:

## 5.7.a

WEST SAXON GENDER							
	masculine		feminine		neuter		
	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>	<i>Cal</i>	<i>Otho</i>	
<i>subject</i>	7	2	4	0	66	25	
<i>object</i>	15	10	5	0	63	29	

Although the overall numbers of actual tokens is rather small, the types of contexts in which those "unhistorical" <þat> determiner types are to be found very much resemble those in the texts which have been the object of our study in earlier chapters. They fall into two main types. Firstly, as we might by now expect, <þat> is very regularly used to indicate inter NP identity in discourse: secondly, it also would appear to be used as a means of marking that class of lexical items uniquely associated with "universal" ("all") rather than specific "some"-type quantifiers.

## 5.7.b

## (a) &lt;þat&gt; as an anaphoric pronoun "substitute"

Consider the following examples from Books One and Two:

- (1) Seoð seide Cordoille...Ouer soh seiden þat  
zunge vifmon  
(*Cal* 1727-1732)
- (2) Ful soue zere mid þon kinge he wunedē þere  
þat king he hauede iquemed  
7 al-swa þere quene  
(*Cal* 1979-80)
- (3) Gurmund castles makede abuten Chirenchestre..  
him-seoluen he heol[d] þat ane. Isembard  
þat oðer  
(*Cal* 14578-80)

- (4) Þar was al þat fiht idon ac þe niht to rāþe  
 com  
 ȝef þat niht neore aslazen alle hii were.  
 (Otho 14155-56)

where the items <vifmon> "woman", <king> and <castel> are etymologically *masculine*, while <niht> "night" and <fierde> "army" are *feminine*. The instance under (2) is interesting as well for the observation that <ge-cweman> "to please" normally triggers a "dative", <þam> case form with its absolute object (as can be seen with the <þere> determiner with the absolute argument to <queme> in *Cal* 1980). This appears to point to a phenomenon which we have already noted in previous chapters, to the effect that, in its "anaphoric" function, <þat> can spread outwith its usual "object" context, although we shall see below that there is also some evidence for <ðon> and <ðære> shapes as surface markers of this diegetic function. In this context too, the example at *Cal* 1887-89 is interesting:

#### 5.7.d

Þeo wes al þise kine-lond an Morgan ȝ  
 Cunedagies heond..  
 fengen to þissen lond and mid fuhten  
 hit bi-wunnen.  
 Pa dælden þat broþeran al þis driht-liche lond

since, despite Brook and Leslie's otherwise unjustified commendation of <þat broþeran> to <þa broþeran>, it shows <þat> in a plural context marking referential identity between its head noun and the two proper names <Morgan> and <Cunedagius>.

Very similar to the above as well are the following where, although the item showing the unhistorical <þat> determiner has no phonetically identical, previously mentioned "equivalent" NP in the discourse stretch, it refers to a range of events or occurrences coming within its semantic field or scope which have immediately previously been described and discussed. In such instances shared speaker/hearer knowledge of the referent is certainly implicit from the general context. The lexical items typically involved in this type of construction are <fierd> "army"

(historically *feminine*), <hired> "company" (historically *masculine*), <foreward> "an agreement", <spæc> "speech" and <tidung> "news", all historically *feminine*:

## 5.7.e

- (1) ȝeærwe wes þat ferde 7 forð-war[d] ifusede  
(*Cal* 2486)
  - (2) Forð iwende þat hired swa þe king hæhte  
(*Cal* 3066)
  - (3) Þa answare[de] þat hired mid hægzere stefne  
(*Cal* 3859)
  - (4) Al duðen þat hird swa Uortiger demde  
(*Cal* 6496)
  - (5) for þa hæðene men weoren hæfst an hireden  
7 þæt Cristine hired for hæne wes i halden  
(*Cal* 7203-4)
  - (6) 7 al þat fo[r]ward wes ilest Þa fusden  
þa ferde  
(*Cal* 548)
  - (7) Belin king him ȝette. þat forward þat  
he ȝerde  
(*Cal* 2391)
  - (8) Þe king Vortigerne fræinede his cnihtes sone  
what weoren þat speche þe þat maide spiled  
(*Cal* 7143-4)
  - (9) Þa þuhte Elæuðerie þat tiðende swiðe murie  
(*Cal* 5060)
- (b) *<þat> as a marker of lexical items showing restricted set membership*

A very striking parallel between unhistorical <þat> determiner usage in *Lazamon's Brut* and that which we have already described both for the gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Peterborough B Text* and *Interpolations* is to be seen from those places where it is found in construction with lexical items which can informally be described as showing a *restricted set or class membership*. They are items which we would not normally expect to be subject to further specification by restrictive relative clause and which are associated with quantification marking appropriate to "all" and "every" rather than "a" or "each of" (although they are not necessarily *non-count*).

Perhaps the most striking parallel is with the usage at (1106/12–14) and (1110/15–18) in the *Peterborough Chronicle* where we found items like <suðwest> and <norðwest> — items with specific geographic and locational reference, not usually open to further quantificational specification — in congruence with <þet> determiners; recall <Se steorra ætwyde innon þet suðwest>. Compare the following *Lazamon* instances:

## 5.7.f

- (1) Bi-zende France i þet west þu scalt finden  
a wunsum lond  
*(Cal/Otho 618)*
- (2) Cunedagius bi þare Humber. hauede al  
þe[t] west  
Morgan hauede norð 7 est  
*(Cal/Otho 1890)*
- (3) Locrines mær eode suð 7 east forð Albanac  
hefde al þat norð  
*(Cal/Otho 1067)*

Here too we might include those few cases involving *temporal* circumstantial comments to the main proposition where unhistorical <þat> forms appear to be intruding into environments (representing both "single point" and "extended" temporal duration) we have earlier seen characterized by <þane>/<þan> determiner morphology — recall <(bi)-wakede al þane niht> (*Cal* 4690); <he aras to þan mid nihte> (*Cal* 3781):

## 5.7.g

- (1) a þet þat þustere niht to-dælde heore muciele  
fiht  
*(Cal 4888)*
- (2) Þer weore al þat fiht i-don al þat niht  
to raðe com  
*(Cal 14155)*
- (3) 7 þe keisere 7 his iueren al þat winter [heo]  
wu[ne]den here  
*(Cal 4473)*

- (4) 7 Vaspasiæn and his iueren al þat winter  
wunedene here

(*Cal/Otho* 4930)

and in a plural context: <In þan see ifunde vt-lawes þe strongest þe weren in þilke daies> (*Otho* 644), where <niht> is historically *feminine*, and <winter> and <daie> historically *masculine*. The occurrence of the <al> quantifier with the last two <winter> instances might help to explain their ability to attract <þat> shapes, given that just such a quantifier is associated with *restricted lexical class* sets. Such a "whole set" membership relationship may also go at least some way to account for the occurrence of the "neuter" definite determiner with the historically *masculine* <dæl> "part", <clærscip> "clerkhood", the historically *neuter* <wæl> "slaughter" together with the historically *feminine* <leode> "people" in examples like the following:

#### 5.7.h

- (1) þa makede heo ane læge and læide ȝeon  
þat leode  
(*Cal* 3143)
- (2) and he lette al þat wel weorpen þer an innen  
(*Cal/Otho* 3204)
- (3) þa setten heo biscopes þan folken to dihten  
þer-ouer ærchebiscopes þat clærscipe to  
rihten  
(*Cal* 5088)
- (4) and heo scal habbe þat beste del of mine  
drih-lichen lon[d]  
(*Cal/Otho* 1474)
- (5) þin is þat beste deal þu ært mi dohter  
[deore]  
(*Cal/Otho* 1496)
- (6) he hehte echne riche man..neme þat halfendele  
(*Otho* 3535-36)

5.8 <PON> AND <-RE> SHAPES AS DISCOURSE TRACKING DEVICES

We have several times now expressed our consciousness of the danger of assuming too readily that every single "unhistorical" gender or case marking nominal attributive is susceptible to systematic explanation. Indeed we have noted that some of our interpretations as to how speakers may have "picked up" and re-assigned new syntactic/semantic significance to attributive morphological forms whose allotment to lexical items on the basis of their gender classification was in the process of being "corrupted", could be considered too "sensitive" or idiosyncratic. Such thoughts we must bear in mind when in this section we come to examine three rather unexpectedly unhistorical nominal attributive shape occurrences. However, the instances are interesting and are worth quoting with some of their surrounding discourse — consider the attributive markers with the historically *masculine* items <wifman> "*woman*" and <man> :

5.8.1

- (1) Pa swicfullle Rouenne eode to are tunne..  
 Pa heo isæh hire time heo fulde hir scale  
 of wine.  
 7 at-foren al þan dringe heo eode to þan  
 kinge  
 7 þus hailede him on þe swic-fulle wimman.  
 Lauerd king wæs hail Uor þe ich am swiðe uæin  
 Hercne nu muchel swikedom of þere luðere  
 wimmon.
- (Cal 7462-7470)
- (2) Pes Damus on his deie ane chiuese him ichæs  
 he hauede bi þare wimman enne swiðe wandliche  
 sune
- (Cal 3168-9)
- (3) Moche was þe gode þing þat couþe Luces  
 þe king.  
 nes no man onder lufte þat couþe betere  
 craftes.  
 Porph þissere gode man onderfeng þis lond  
 Cristendom
- (Otho 5038-40)

Hoffman ((1909) § 5, page 62) attributes, as we might expect, the determiner shapes in the first two examples to the influence of "Das natürliche Geschlecht", but he also appears to do so too for an example like <for þane mædene> at (*Cal* 2499), while presumably he would wish to include the <þorh þissere man> instance in (1) above within this framework as well. Yet we might wonder why such a system would stop at representing human-ness, and not go on to systematically connote male from female humans. Only three unhistorical <-re> attributive types as those listed at 5.8.1 are to be found in the entire length of both *Lazamon* texts, so we ought not to place too much emphasis on their significance. Yet such cases do remind us of the equally unusual instances we found in the late Old English gloss to the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:

### 5.8.2

7 gie hremas þ mægden ne is dead ah sleped  
 ET PLORATIS PUELLA NON EST MORTUA SED DORMIT.

genom	ðone fæder	7	moder	ðæra mædne
ADSUMIT	PATREM	ET	MATREM	PUELLAE
(Mk v/39-42)				

(see 2.10.b and 2.13.k above). We very tentatively suggested in that instance that the <ðæra> attributive shape acted like a <þ> determiner in a "possessive" context – i.e. it served to mark the sequential expression in the discourse of two semantically co-referential lexical items. It has, of course, been one of the central proposals of this monograph that the availability of several different surface determiner and adjectival attributive shapes encouraged speakers (in the face of a weakening tendency to reflect inherent lexical gender class) to assign to them the function of identifying semantic and syntactic relationships which they either historically marked only indirectly or not at all. <ðæra> shapes in an instance like 5.8.2 were, we proposed, manifestations of <þat> in non "subject"/"object" contexts and performed a like function of identifying the second of two EQUI NPs in a discourse. Our *Lazamon* examples quite clearly display an NP<sub>i</sub>≡>NP<sub>j</sub> although obviously phonological identity is not present – c.f. the *Lindisfarne Gospel* examples cited at

2.6.3.b through 2.6.3.j – and we might suggest, albeit with reservation, that the function of the <-re> attributive morphology in the 5.8.1 cases was to reflect the shared speaker/hearer knowledge status of the second mentioned N in the discourse context.

That <ðon> could likewise perform such a role for historically *feminine* nouns (although only, apparently, for *Otho*) might also be a possibility in the light of examples like the following:

### 5.8.3

- (1) bi Ruscicadan hii neome þe see and bi þe  
contre of Assare  
*In þan see ifunde vt-lawes þe strongest þe  
weren in þilke daies*  
(*Otho* 643-4)
- (2) Brutus and his kempes hii driue in-to þan  
castle  
and *in þan ilke fore hii fu[1]de of hire  
veres*  
(*Otho* 839-40)
- (3) bed weren i-scrud and bet weren ived  
Hengestes sweines þane Vortiger his cnihtes  
(*þa wes Vortigernes hired for hehne ihalden*)  
Bruttes weren sori for þan ilke sihte  
(*Otho* 6978-6981)

In this context too consider the difficult passage, crucially involving a variable set of nominal attributive terminations with the lexical item <wille> "a well", from (*Otho* 9854–9862) and (*Otho* 9871 – 9885) at 5.8.4 below. Bosworth-Toller ((1882); page 1228) cite two shapes for the "well" item: <wille:es> *masculine* and <wille:an> *feminine* – see too Hoffman ((1909), page 65; Cross (1969)). The "possessive" <welles> shape (9876) might lead us to propose a *masculine* gender classification on this kind of basis, but a strict "strong/weak" nominal morphological distinction is difficult to justify for either text of the *Brut*, although, if anything, "A (*Cal*) is characterized by a predilection for the *n*-declension, B (*Otho*) has a decided tendency towards the *s*-declension" (Bøgholm (1944), page 38).

## 5.8.4

heorne to þare wille þat was bi þare halle  
 and sette þare one ohte sweyn for to witye  
 hine for þe reyn  
 For þe king ne may on worle dringke none senche  
 bote cold welles water þat him his icweme

.....  
 þeos speche forþ-rihtes i-horde þes cnihtes  
 to harme hii weren lihte and hout eode bi nihte  
 to þan ilke wille þare hii harmes wrohte  
 Vt hii drowe sone six ampullas  
 mid hatter ifulled and caste hit in þan wille

.....  
 Hii come to þare welle and hire bolles fulde  
 aȝein hi gonre wende to Vther þan kinge

.....  
 and saide to Vther Nou we beoþ icome her  
 and we habbeþ ibroht þat þou her bede  
 cold welles water brouket mid winne  
 Vp a-ros þe seake king and sat on his bedde  
 of þam watere he drong and sone gan swete

.....  
 Po wende to þan wille cnihtes swiþe snelle  
 and þane wel dutte mid stones and mid erþe

Anyway, it would seem rather unusual to find both declensional types used so distinctively within such a short temporal span on the same MS pages (fol. 91<sup>va</sup>; fol. 91<sup>vb</sup>). In fact, the model for attributive morphological shape assignment we have been proposing above would argue in favour of a *feminine* lexical gender classification for < wille>, with "unetymological" < þan> forms following a locational particle in construction with "motion" predicates: < caste hit in þan wille>. Likewise, the < þane welle> shape at 9886 accords well with our prediction that <-ne> attributive termination shapes are to be found in construction with those predicates which demand an *absolutive* case relationship argument as participant. Yet we might just argue too that since the discourse appears to be divided into two "episodes" involving two sets of individuals visiting the well in question, on each occasion when the well is introduced as a topic in that discourse section, it is found in congruence with an "historical"

<bare> determiner shape (9855; 9871) and then in contexts where our model would predict a <þan> form. Only on subsequent mentions of the well in these discourse episodes do we come across a <þan> (indeed, on one occasion a <þan ilke>) attributive form. Such a shape is used, we might tentatively argue, as a "dative" case form equivalent to <þat> and marking the second of two identical NPs in discourse.

### 5.9 "MORPHOLOGY-LESS" FORMS: <þE> AND ITS ORTHOGRAPHIC VARIANTS

The following table reflects the token count distribution of <þe> definite determiners (including its occasional orthographic variants <þæ> and <þeo>) in Book One of the Brook and Leslie *Brut* (1978) for the "subject", "object" and "locative" case environments:

#### 5.9.1

WEST SAXON GENDER						
	masculine		feminine		neuter	
	CAL	OTHO	CAL	OTHO	CAL	OTHO
<i>subject</i>	51	56	18	44	6	25
<i>object</i>	6	14	16	35	1	6
<i>locative</i>	3	4	1	6	1	0

Neither text of the *Brut* shows any significant tendency to realize "morphology-less" shapes in locative type contexts, which should not surprise us given our observations throughout this chapter on the innovative use of <þon> and <-ne> attributive morphology in such an environment. However, it is clear from 5.9.1 that (a) <þe> definite determiner shapes are becoming the norm in "subject" case form slots while, especially in *Otho*, we witness the zero morphology output in competition with <-ne> *absolutive* case relationship arguments with lexical

items of all etymological gender classifications – typically:

### 5.9.2

- (1) and þe luþere Rowenne drang þane bolle...  
þe bolle geo sette to hire chin  
(*Otho* 7478-81)
- (2) (Loweman) nom þe Englisse boc  
(*Otho* 17)
- (3) he makede þane kalender þe dihteð þane  
moneð 7 þe zer  
(*Cal* 3599)

where <bolla>, <boc> and <zer> are historically *masculine*, *feminine* and *neuter* respectively. The *Caligula* text also shows an interesting intrusion of <þa> shapes into "subject" taking serial positions, although it is in the vast majority of occasions confined to those items which are historically of the *feminine* gender, consider:

### 5.9.3

- (1) muchel wes þa blisse þat heo makeden  
(*Cal* 3792)
- (2) in þere burhe þa brude dead iwearð  
(*Cal* 149)
- (3) þa burh was swiðe wel idon  
(*Cal* 1016)
- (4) Heuede Lauine þa quene kinebearn on wombe  
þa quen þer-etter sone ænne sune hefde to  
froure  
(*Cal* 101-2)

but its occasional use with historically *masculine* and *neuter* items might persuade us to treat it as in general phonetically equivalent to the <þe> version so prevalent in "subject" environments: <þet wes þa eæraste mon> (*Cal* 2121); <ne beo þa dai na swa long> (*Cal* 665); <þat þa  
sweord wes i-cleoped inne Rome Crocia Mors> (*Cal* 3809).

## 5.10 VICES AND VIRTUES

Rather intriguingly sub-titled as "A Soul's Confession of its Sins with Reason's Description of its Virtues", the British Museum *Stowe 34 Vices and Virtues* is one of the earliest Middle English Dialogue pieces "in prose, the manuscript of which is dated about 1200–1225 by the MED but may have been composed between 1175–1225" (Hartung (1972), pp. 866–867 and p. 702). The text, which is probably of Essex or Middlesex origin (Jordan (1932) p. 10; Dickens and Wilson (1954) p. 204) is of considerable interest for the student of early Middle English in almost every branch of its grammar (Philippson (1911)), while it is of especial importance for us since it appears to bear witness to a very different kind of "solution" to the problem of attributive morphology evolution than anything which we have come across so far. While we shall refrain from providing the reader with an exhaustive account of all aspects of the nominal attributive morphology of the text, we shall nevertheless hope to show that the "consequence" for that morphology of the weakening of the process whereby speakers assigned individual lexical items to a specific grammatical gender class was a rather special one and one which appears to have been realized in different ways for different kinds of attributive words in noun phrases.

Let us begin by displaying at 5.10.a the occurrences of tokens of the *definite determiner* in the text for "object" and "locative" case form types only, mapped against the historical gender classification in West Saxon of the lexical items with which they are found in construction. For reasons which will shortly become clear we shall, for the moment, omit reference to "morphology-free" <ðe> occurrences. This table makes a remarkable contrast with those at 5.1.a and 4.5.a above. In the first place there is little of what we might by now expect of the <–ne> termination intrusion into *absolutive* contexts with nouns of every gender classification. Even the single instance where such an intrusion does appear to manifest itself – <Hu mai ic on ðane world wunigen 7 naht heo ne luuizen> (41/12) [references are by page and line to Holthausen's (1888) edition] has every sign of representing "scribal

## 5.10.a

WEST SAXON GENDER			
	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<i>object</i>			
<ðane>/<ðen>	38	1	0
<ða>/<ðo>	15	5	6
<ðat>	0	1	21
<i>locative</i>			
<ðan>	14	0	5
<ðare>	4	60	4

error", since in no other place in the entire text do we find unequivocal *masculine* determiners with this lexical item, but as a matter of course find it commonly in construction with historical <ðare> shapes: <Ðu ðe wunest on ðære woreld> a few lines later at (41/14–15), as well as <ðu wilt on ðare world wunigen> (81/7–8; 109/16); <to habben lean..on ðare oðre woreld> (35/7); <aiðer on ðessere woreld 7 ec on ðare oðre> (35/12), as well as at (29/34; 33/9; 39/32; 41/32–33; 149/4–5).

The second striking characteristic of the data in 5.10.a is the apparent complete absence of any intrusion by locative *masculine/ neuter* terminations onto definite determiners in congruence with historically *feminine* lexical items. Rather, the <–re> accretion seems to be successfully holding its own as a case form and even appears to be intrusive into historically *masculine* and *neuter* environments. Something like this we had, of course, seen in our *Lazamon* data (c.f. 5.1.a) especially in the *Caligula* version, but we shall go on to show that the *Vices and Virtues* instances are less amenable to explanation in terms of an innovative case *relationship* expressing function and that they are probably best

accounted for by another kind of criterion altogether. But it is when we come to compare the token distribution of "full" attributive morphological distribution in *Vices and Virtues* as displayed in 5.10.a above with the realization in the text of "morphology-free" <ðe> definite determiner shapes, that the full significance of the apparent "strength" of <-re> terminations becomes apparent. Consider the following:

## 5.10.b

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<hr/>			
<ðe> forms			
<i>subject</i>	79	8	2
<i>object</i>	11	20	4
<i>locative</i>	26	3	15

Interestingly there appears no longer to be any phonologically distinct *feminine* definite determiner shape for that range of semantic functions performed by the subject case form. Clearly the "morphology-free" <ðe> form is intruding strongly into *absolutive* contexts which in the other texts we have examined was characteristically the innovative domain for <ðone> shapes for nouns of all genders:

## 5.10.c

- (1) underfoh ðe michele wurðscipe (113/30)
- (2) ne sien ðe rihte weige (127/8)
- (3) azeanes ðe hali write (75/7)
- (4) forliesen ðe swete luue of Criste (41/10)
- (5) Hie benemð ðe manne (13/13)
- (6) godd ðe fader..ȝifð ðe mihte  
al ðis te donne (37/3-4)

- (7) ic wolde ðe wrecchede saule..acwellan  
 (9/15-19)

and see also (19/12; 127/18; 41/11; 45/12; 103/30; 7/20) and many other places. At the same time, <ðe> has transparently come to be the dominant determiner form in locative contexts where historically <ðan>/<ðam> forms surfaced with items which were etymologically *masculine* and *neuter*:

#### 5.10.d

- (1) arist up to ðe roue (95/5)
- (2) cumen to ðe liuende lande (45/2)
- (3) cumeð forð in to ðe eche liue (9/3)
- (4) he nam..of sainte Marie ðe hali  
maiden (25/23-24)
- (5) he giede ut of ðe rihte weize (83/10-11)
- (6) He mai cumen..in to ðe bredale  
tofore ðe bredgume (95/32-33)
- (7) ðo derewurðe sondes ðe comen fro ðe kynge  
(43/14-15)

as well as at (147/15; 147/25; 37/21; 61/31; 141/22; 25/14; 55/24; 61/8-9; 95/4) and many other places.

However, perhaps the most interesting feature to emerge from a comparison of 5.10.a and 5.10.b is that *intrusion of morphology-less <ðe> is constrained not to occur in locative contexts just with those lexical items which are etymologically of the feminine gender*. While we do come across a few instances like:

#### 5.10.e

- (1) wændende to ðe woreld (71/23)
- (2) holie watere ðe giede ut of ðe riht side  
(83/2-3)
- (3) werpen me in ðe uttreste þiesternesse  
(17/27-28)

where <woruld>, <sidu> and <þiesternesse> have a *feminine* West Saxon gender assignment, by far and away

the "normal" case form expression with nouns of this gender class in such a case environment is <ðare>:

### 5.10.f

- (1) hie bieð idriuen ut of þare hierte  
(131/6)
- (2) gað to ðare rihte lafdi (53/34)
- (3) brinkgð mid him to ðere fordringede hierte  
(83/1)
- (4) ær ðanne ðu fare of ðare woreld (103/21)
- (5) him dede cumen fram ðare rode (113/1)
- (6) ðe waren ifast[n]ed on ðare hali rode  
(103/1)
- (7) Se ðe doð his hand to ðere sull (71/21)

as well as at (43/1; 7/28; 21/8; 63/4; 39/10; 95/27–28; 103/31).

How are we to interpret such a distribution? One solution might lie in suggesting that the direction of attributive morphological change in *Vices and Virtues* lay towards the setting up of a *two-paradigm* nominal system. On the one hand it seems clear that there were whole sets of nouns which were coming to be in construction with definite determiner <ðe> shapes in all case relationship contexts (although, as we shall see below, not all lexical items reacted in the same way to this <ðe> invasion). Yet simultaneously there was another set of nouns principally, but not entirely, it would seem of the historically *feminine* gender class, which systematically resisted <ðe> intrusion in that set of case contexts we have loosely designated *locative*. That is, there appears to have been a set of nouns which triggered a distinctive (<-re>) termination in attributive words but only in those sentential arguments assigned a locative type case form; otherwise morphology free <ðe> forms were utilized throughout their paradigm. For this set of lexical items <-re> was still a powerful case form, one capable of withstanding <ðe> and, as we shall see, general morphologically empty attributive word intrusion. This tendency is well illustrated in an example like <Ne mai zie iðolien none unclannesse on godes temple, ne beneðen

on *ði likame*, ne abuuen on *ðire saule* (123/27–28), where the historically *masculine* <lichoma> "body" is found in construction with the morphology-less <*ði*>, while the historically *feminine* <*sawol*> – sharing an identical argument case relationship to the sentential predicate <*iðolien*> "endure" – is in congruence with an <–re> distinguished attribute. The distribution in our text of attributive words with an item like <*weorold*> (historically *feminine*) is interesting in this respect as well. While in "subject" and non—"subject" *absolutive* case relationships <*ðe*> determiner shapes freely intrude:

## 5.10.g

- (1) *fordan betere is an god saule ðan all  
ðe woreld*  
(37/22)
- (2) *Sume oðre forlæteþ ðe world*  
(5/32–33)

spatial allative circumstantial <world> arguments to predicates stubbornly resist <*ðe*> replacement and are everywhere to be found with <*ðare*>/<*ðære*>/<*ðessere*> attributive shapes:

## 5.10.h

- (1) *Alle ðo menn ðe swinkeð on ðessere  
swinkfulle world*  
(33/9)
- (2) *hwat hafst ðu swa lange idon on ðare woreld*  
(17/18–19)
- (3) *to habban lean..on ðare oðre woreld*  
(35/7)
- (4) *niðer on ðessere woreld 7 ec on ðare oðre*  
(35/12)

and also at (39/9–10; 39/32; 41/14–15; 41/48; 41/32–33).

Yet there are still a number of questions which we should like to ask. Our data in 5.10.a shows (as will others we shall shortly review) that <–re> forms themselves were spreading, in "*locative*" environments, to a

use with nouns which were historically non-*feminine*. In the light of our earlier discussion of a similar phenomenon in *Lazamon's Brut* (c.f. § 5.6 above), we might ask whether such forms were being assigned some especial case *relationship* identifying role rather than merely being viewed, as we suggested above, as that "dative" case form typical of a particular nominal paradigm. The data relating to this question are complex and perhaps the best we shall be able to do is to suggest a negative case relationship for innovative <-re> forms. Perhaps the best method of approaching such a problem is by looking to see whether <ðan> (non-*feminine*) definite determiners perform specific argument identifying roles where intrusion by other shapes (notably <ðe> and <ðare>) is resisted. In fact, <ðan> determiner forms are only to be found in two kinds of case relationship functions, functions which they regularly marked in the majority of earlier texts we have so far examined. These are:

### 5.10.i

#### (a) circumstantial temporal locative allatives

- (1) On ðan ilche daize ðe ðe tebrecst  
(89/18)
- (2) at ten ænde ofte beswiken  
(25/3-4; 19/31)
- (3) te..wunien..in ðan gastliche ofne  
(73/28-29)

#### (b) locative source/goal participant arguments

- (1) ðe cumþ of ðan geþanke  
(19/2-3)
- (2) ðu scalt fram ðan ende buzen  
(65/13)
- (3) (go) to ðan eche liue..in to ðan  
eche fiere  
(25/29-30)
- (4) bringe to ðan eche lif  
(33/21)
- (5) a mann cumþ tan oðer  
(101/2)

- (6) hie falleð mid ða blinde in to ðan pette  
(109/19)

and also at (53/4; 41/8) while we can only find a single instance in the entire manuscript such that <*swa cumeð forð in to ðe eche liue*> (9/3). But although <*ðan*> forms resist <*ðe*> intrusion in such argument environments, we must bear in mind that in this text they themselves do not intrude into construction with *feminine* lexical items in such contexts – <*ðare*> appears to be "too strong" a morphological marker to be ousted by <*ðan*>. It is therefore interesting to record the fact that although we do find gender unetymological <*ðare*> case forms, they do not appear – with the exception of a single lexical item – in those environments which are characteristic of the <*ðan*> determiner. Consider the following unhistorical <*ðare*> occurrences where, whatever the case relationships they represent may be, they are certainly not circumstantial temporal locative allative or locational source/goal:

#### 5.10.j

- (1) swa soðlice berð ðis ilche trew ðat wastme  
ðe manige want to liue, 7 ec sume to deaðe,  
for ðare misbileaue 7 for ðare unwurscipe  
(53/6-8)
- (2) 7 ðe wrihte his timber to keruen after  
ðare mone  
(27/26)
- (3) 7 for ðare euele ȝewune ne ðin[c]ð hit  
hem no misdade  
(149/5-6)
- (4) Durh ða trowe 7 his wastme werð al mankenn  
idem to deaðe; þurh ðe trowe of ðe lieue  
halie rode 7 ðurh ðare iblescede wastme  
ðe ðar on heng  
(119/1-3)

although we can but speculate over the motivation, if any, behind the <*ða*>/<*ðe*>/<*ðare*> contrast in the last example in what look like identical argument case contexts.

The exception to this negatively constraining environment for unhistorical <ðare> selection is the item <rice> (etymologically *neuter*; "kingdom") which triggers <ðare> definite determiners in situations like <ne mai cumen into ðare riche> (115/3) and <þe bringð to ðare riche> (129/11). This item in fact shows only unambiguous *feminine* determiner and other attributive shapes throughout *Vices and Virtues* and so we may have to conclude that it has been reclassified as *feminine* in gender.

This pattern of definite determiner behaviour seems to be paralleled by that of the <ðis> attributive shape and its variants. There seems to be a case for arguing that <ðese> and <ðis> configurations are treated as morphology-free forms in contexts where we might historically expect *absolutive* and/or *locative* specific surface shapes. Compare the following instances of the "demonstrative" adjective in construction with the item <tempel> (historically *neuter*), where <ðessen> might be interpreted as some kind of phonological development of a <ðissum> locative (non-*feminine*) shape:

### 5.10.k

- (1) Of ðese hali temple ðe rihte beleave  
is grundwall (93/27-28)
- (2) duren wel bilokin of ðis holi temple (99/23-24)
- (3) Ðies hali mihte is all wrihte of  
ðessen eadi temple (95/9)

The overall distribution of <ðis> tokens in all case form and function contexts shows, however, that once more <-re> is treated as a strong morphological marker, resisting <ðese>/<ðis> penetration, even itself on occasion invading the case form for demonstratives in construction with historically *masculine* lexical items; see 5.10.1 below. Of <ðissum> locative case forms there is no trace and a mere three <ðessen> shapes survive. Indeed, these kind of data would suggest a <ðes/ðies> *subject*, <ðe(s)se> *object*, and <ðessere> *locative* paradigm for all lexical items in congruence with this

grammatical category regardless of historical gender class.

Our text is interesting too for the information it provides relating to the relative "sensitivity" of both individual lexical items and grammatical categories to the kind of process we have been outlining above.

### 5.10.1

---

#### WEST SAXON GENDER

---

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
--	------------------	-----------------	---------------

---

*subject*

<i>&lt;ðies&gt;</i>	9	18	2
<i>&lt;ðes&gt;/&lt;tes&gt;</i>	5	0	0
<i>&lt;ðis&gt;</i>	4	2	2

---

*object*

<i>&lt;ðese&gt;</i>	7	27	14
<i>&lt;ðas&gt;</i>	0	2	0
<i>&lt;ðesse&gt;</i>	0	5	0
<i>&lt;ðis&gt;</i>	3	0	9

---

*locative*

<i>&lt;ðessere&gt;</i>	6	35	0
<i>&lt;ðese&gt;</i>	4	0	3
<i>&lt;ðesen&gt;</i>	0	0	2

---

For instance, not all non-*feminine* items appear equally ready to accept *<ðe>* intrusion in absolute and locative type contexts. Some, like *<deað>* resolutely "hold out" against *<ðe>* intrusion in *absolute* arguments: *<He forgaf hire ðane deað>* (111/30); *<7 ec ðane forcūþeste deað 7 ðane laðlicheste ðe hie beðenchen mihten>* (51/13–14), while "permitting" *<ðe>* shapes in post locational particle (*?allative*) arguments such as : *<ðe was hersum..to ðe deaðe>* (9/3; 119/6–7; 33/29; 51/8–9) and *<hie brohton Criste to ðe deaðe>* (105/17; 109/8). Likewise with *<gast>* we find: *<fuste on me ðane gast of strengþe>* (83/22–23); *<hafst ge sænt ðane froure gost>*

(83/33) as against <bute of ðe halige gast ane> (89/20–21; 131/2) and <bie nu gladd..in ðe hali goste> (91/23), while an extremely high frequency item like <king> shows no <ðone>/<ðan> definite determiner congruences throughout the length of the entire dialogue.

There might be some evidence to suggest too that there is likewise a discrepancy in the tendency to admit morphology-free attributive shapes more readily with "possessive pronouns" like <min>/<þin> than with definite determiners or even demonstrative pronouns. The following token count appears to suggest that morphology-less <þ/min>/<þ/mine> forms achieve a greater penetration into absolute and locative contexts than do other attributive words:

### 5.10.m

#### WEST SAXON GENDER

	<i>masculine</i>	<i>feminine</i>	<i>neuter</i>
<i>absolute</i>			
<þ/mine>	22	6	0
<þinne>	1	0	0
<min/þin>	6	2	2
<i>locative</i>			
<m/þine>	5	6	3
<min/þin>	1	2	0
<ð/mire>	0	12	0

a phenomenon we had noted to be characteristic of both the late Northumbrian glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Durham Ritual* — see the examples at 3.4.f above.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.M. (1968) "Ergative and Nominative in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 4, 1-32
- (1971) *The Grammar of Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- (1975) "On Serialization in English Syntax". *Ludwigsburg Studies in Language and Linguistics* 1.
- (1977) *On Case Grammar*. London: Croom Helm
- (1979) *On Explaining Universals of Word Order: A Problem of More Syntax*. Linguistic Agency, University of Trier 33. Trier
- and C.J. Ewen (1980) "Introduction: a sketch of dependency phonology", in J.M. Anderson and C.J. Ewen (eds.), *Studies in Dependency Phonology*. *Ludwigsburg Studies in Language and Linguistics* 4.
- and C. Jones (1974) "Three Theses Concerning Phonological Representations". *Journal of Linguistics* 10, 1-26
- Ausbüttel, A. (1904) "Das persönliche Geschlecht unpersönlicher Substantiva, einschliesslich der Tiernamen, im Mittelenglischen seit dem Aussterben des grammatischen Geschlechts". *Studien zur englischen Philologie* 19, Halle
- Baron, N.S. (1971) "A Re-analysis of English Grammatical Gender". *Lingua* 27, 113-140
- Bauch, H (1912) *Die Kongruenz in der angelsächsischen Poesie*. Diss. Kiel
- Baxter, A.R.W. (1985) *Competing Factors in Morphological Change*. Utrecht. Drukkerij
- Bean, M.C. (1983) *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Croom Helm
- Belfour, A.O. (1909) *Twelfth Century Homilies in MS Bodley 343*. Early English Text Society. O.S. 137. London
- Blakeley, L (1947) "Accusative-Dative Syncretism in the Lindisfarne Gospels". *English and Germanic Studies* 1, 6-31
- Bøgholm, N. (1944) *The Lagamon Texts: a Linguistical Investigation*. Copenhagen: Munksgard

- Böhm, R. (1982) *Topics in Localist Case Grammar, with especial reference to English and German*. Dissertation. New University of Ulster
- Bosworth-Toller (1882) *An Anglo Saxon Dictionary based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth. Edited and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Britten, G.C. and A.S.C. Ross (1960) "Aldrediana X: manifesta". *Anglia* 78, 129-168
- Brook, G.L. and R.F. Leslie (1963;1978) *Lazamon's Brut*. Early English Text Society vols. 277 and 250, Oxford
- Bruce, L. (1979) *A Grammar of Alamblik*. Australian National University dissertation
- Callaway, M. (1918) *Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press
- Carpenter, H.C.A. (1910) *Die Deklination in der nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift*. Bonn
- Clark, C. (1957) "Gender in the Peterborough Chronicle", *English Studies* 38, 109-115  
---- (1970) *The Peterborough Chronicle, 1070-1154*. Oxford
- Classen, H. (1919) "On the origin of Natural Gender in Middle English". *Modern Language Review* 14, 97-103
- Cook, A.S. (1894) *A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels (Lindisfarne Gospels or Durham Book)*. Halle
- Cross, J. (1969) *The Metrical Epilogue to the Pastoral Care*. Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, vol 5, ed. E.V.K. Dobbie. New York. Columbia University Press
- Dekeyser, X. (1972) "The Diachrony of Gender Systems in English and Dutch", in J. Fisiak (ed.) *Historical Morphology*. The Hague: Mouton
- Dickens, B and R.M. Wilson (1954) *Early Middle English Texts*. London: Bowes and Bowes

- ó Dochartaigh, C. (1980) "Aspects of Celtic Lenition", in J.M. Anderson and C.J. Ewen (eds.) *Studies in Dependency Phonology. Ludwigsburg Studies in Language and Linguistics* 4, 103-138
- Dorian, N. (1977) "The Problem of the Semi Speaker in Language Death", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 12, 23-32
- (1981) *Language Death: the life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Ervin, S. (1962) "The Connotations of Gender", *Word* 18, 249-261
- Fillmore, C.J. (1968) "The Case for Case", in E. Bach and R.T. Harms *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Flasdieck, H.M. (1930) "Zur Geschichte der femininen -ō- Flexion im Westgermanischen", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 48, 53-66
- von Fleischhacker, R. (1888) "On the Old English Nouns of More than One Gender", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 21, 235-254
- Fodor, I. (1959) "The Origin of Grammatical Gender", *Lingua* 8, 1-41; 186-214
- Foley, E.H. (1903) *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St. Matthew. Part 1. Phonology*. New York
- Foley, W.A. and R.D. van Valin (1984) *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gazdar, G., E. Klein and G.K. Pullum (1983) *Order, Concord and Constituency*. Dordrecht: Foris
- Gibbens, V.E. (1955) "Shifts in Gender and Meaning of Nouns Designating the Sexes", *American Speech* 30, 296-298
- Givón, T. (1970) "The Resolution of Gender Conflicts in Bantu Conjunction: when syntax and semantics clash", *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society*, 250-261
- von Glahn, N. (1918) *Zur Geschichte der grammatischen Geschlechts im Mittelenglischen*. *Anglia Forschungen* 53, Heidelberg

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1967-68) "Notes on Transitivity and Theme", *Journal of Linguistics* 3 and 4, 37-81; 179-216
- Hartung, A.E. (1972) *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500*, London
- Heltveit, T. (1958) "Attribute and Anaphora in the Gender System of English", *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvitenskap* 18, 357-369
- Hoffmann, P. (1909) *Das grammatische Genus in Layamon's Brut*. Halle
- Holthausen, F. (1888) *Vices and Virtues*, Early English Text Society, 89, London
- Ibrahim, M.H. (1973) *Grammatical Gender, Its Origin and Development*. Paris: La-Haye
- Jackendoff, R.S. and P. Culicover (1971) "A Re-consideration of Dative Movement", *Foundations of Language* 7, 397-412
- Jones, C. (1964) *Grammatical Gender in late Old English and early Middle English*. Dissertation. Glasgow
- (1967a) "The Functional Motivation of Linguistic Change: a Study in the Development of the Grammatical Category of Gender in the late Old English Period", *English Studies* 48, 97-111
- (1967b) "The Grammatical Category of Gender in early Middle English", *English Studies* 48, 289-305
- (1971) "Some Features of Determiner Usage in the Old English Glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Durham Ritual*", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 75, 198-219
- Jordan, R. (1974) *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, translated and revised by E.J. Cook, The Hague
- Kellum, M.D. (1906) *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St. Luke*. New York
- Ker, N.R. (1957) *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford
- Kolbe, T. (1912) *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien*, Bonn

- Kurath, H. and S.H. Kuhn (1963) (eds.)  
*Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor:  
University of Michigan Press
- Kuryłowicz, J. (1964) *The Inflectional Categories  
of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter
- Lafont, R. (1970) "Genre et nombre en  
indo-européen", *Rev. Langages Rom.* 79, 89-148
- de la Grasserie, (1904) "De l'expression de l'idée  
de sexualité dans le langage", *Revue Philos.  
de la France et de l'étranger* 58, 225-246
- Landwedr, N. (1911) *Das Grammaticische Geschlecht  
in der Ancrene Riwle*. Dissertation. Heidelberg
- Liebermann, F. (1874) *Das Rituale Dunelmense*,  
Archiv für das Studium der neuren Sprache  
und Litteraturen 140, 122-123. Halle
- Lightfoot, D.W. (1981) "Explaining Syntactic  
Change", in Hornstein, N.R. and D.W. Lightfoot  
(eds.) *Explanation in Linguistics*, London:  
Longman
- Lindelöf, U. (1890) *Die Sprache des Rituals  
von Durham*, Helsingfors
- (1901) *Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des  
Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, Bonn
- (1927) *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, Durham:  
Surtees Society
- von Lindheim, B. (1969) "Die weiblichen  
Genussfixe im Altenglischen, Korrektur und  
Nachträge", *Anglia* 87, 64-65
- Lohmann, J. (1932) *Genus und Sexus*. Göttingen
- Lommel, H. (1924) "Neutrum und sächliches  
Geschlecht", in *Festschrift für J. Wackernagel*,  
168-180. Göttingen
- Madden, F. (1847) *Lazamon's Brut*. London
- Martin, R. (1971) "La Catégorie de l'animé et de  
l'inanimé en grammaire française", *Trav. de  
Ling. et Litt* 9, 253-65
- Meringer, R. (1887) "Beiträge zur Geschichte der  
indogermanischen Deklination", *Zeitschrift für  
vergl. Sprachf.* 28, 217-239
- Mitchell, B. (1986) *Old English Syntax*. Oxford:  
Clarendon Press
- Mitchell, B. and F.C. Robinson (1982) *A Guide to  
Old English*, Oxford: Blackwell

- Moore, S. (1921) "Grammatical and Natural Gender in Middle English", *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 36, 79-103
- Mōri, T. (1979) "Grammatical Gender in Old English", *Thought Currents in English Literature* 52, 35-50
- Morsbach, L. (1913) *Grammatisches und psychologisches Geschlecht im Englischen.* Berlin
- Mustanoja, T.F. (1960) *A Middle English Syntax,* vol. 1. Helsinki
- Pervaz, D. (1958) *The Survival of Grammatical Gender in Lazamon's Brut, the Southern Legendary and Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle.* Dissertation. Edinburgh
- Philippsen, M. (1911) "Das grammatische Geschlecht in den "Vices and Virtues", in *Die Deklination in den "Vices and Virtues".* Halle
- Plank, F. (1978) (ed.) *Ergativity: Toward a Theory of Grammatical Relations.* London: Academic Press
- Platt, J. (1883) "Zur Kenntnis der ags. Geschlechter", *Anglia* 23, 171-175
- Postal, P. (1966) "On so-called 'Pronouns' in English" in F.P. Dineen (ed.) *Monograph Series in Language and Linguistics* 19, Georgetown University Press.
- Quirk, R., G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1984) *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman
- Roberts J.A. (1970) "Traces of Unhistorical Gender Congruence in a late Old English Manuscript" *English Studies* 51, 30-37
- (1978) "Towards an Old English Thesaurus", *Poetica.*
- Ropers, K. (1918) *Zur Syntax und Stilistik des Pronominalgebrauchs bei Ælfric.* Kiel: Schmidt und Klaunig.
- Ross, A.S.C. (1936) "Sex and Gender in the Lindisfarne Gospels", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 35, 321-330

- (1937) "Studies in the Accidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*": *Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs* 2. Kendal: Titus Wilson
- E. Stanley and T.J. Brown (1956) "Some Observations on the Gloss and the Glossator", in R.L.S. Bruce Mitford, A.S.C. Ross and E. Stanley (eds.) *The Anglo Saxon Gloss: Codex Lindisfarnensis*. Urs Graf. Geneva
- van Royen, G. (1929) "Die nominalen Klassifikations-Systeme in den Sprachen der Erde", *Anthropos* 4, Vienna
- Samuels, M.L. (1972) *Linguistic Evolution*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press
- Skeat, W.W. (1871-1887) *The Four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions*, Cambridge
- Stevenson, J. (1840) *Rituale Ecclessiae Dunelmensis*. Surtees Society vol, 10. Durham
- Stratmann, F.A. (1958) *A Middle English Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press
- Squires, A. (1971) "Collation of the Anglo-Saxon Gloss to the *Durham Ritual*", *Notes and Queries* 18, 362-366
- Traugott, E.C. (1972) *A History of English Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Venneman, T. (1974) "Topics, Subjects and Word Order: from SXV to SVX via TVX" in J.M. Anderson and C. Jones (eds.) *Historical Linguistics*, volume 1, Amsterdam: North Holland
- Vincent, N. (1976) "Perceptual Factors and Word Order Change in Latin", in M.B. Harris (ed.) *Romance Syntax: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*. London: Longman
- Wagner, K.H. (1969) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Old English Language*. Heidelberg: Groos
- Wardale, E.E. (1955) *An Old English Grammar*. London: Methuen
- Waring, G. (1886) *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels*, Part IV. Surtees Society, vol. 48. Durham

- Wells, J.E. (1926) *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400*. New Haven.  
Yale University Press
- Wełna, J. (1980) "On Gender Change in Linguistic Borrowing", in J. Fisiak (ed.) *Historical Morphology*. The Hague: Mouton
- Whitelock, D. (with D.C. Douglas and S.I. Tucker) (1954) *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London
- Wienold, G. (1967) *Genus und Semantik*. Meisenheim am Glan
- Wyss, S. (1982) *Le système du genre en viele anglais jusqu'à la conquête*. Lille: Atelier
- Yamakawa, K. (1980) "The Adverbial Accusative of Duration and its Prepositional Equivalent. Part 1. Old and Middle English", *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences* 21, 1-39

## SUBJECT INDEX

- ablative case 88, 90, 104, 156, 186-87  
absolutive case 83, 94ff, 99, 112, 121ff, 132-133, 143ff, 153ff  
completive 153ff  
in <þe> 99ff  
in locative contexts 132-133, 148ff, 181ff, 175-176  
adlative case 88, 104  
Alamblak 2-3, 10, 82  
Ældred 102, 112  
allative case 88, 90-91, 99, 104, 113-115  
anaphora 10  
animates 2-10  
**Bantu** 2-3  
**Bedeutungsanalogie** 13-14  
**Begriffassoziation** 13-14  
**case**  
  absolutive 94ff  
  circumstantial 85, 87, 158, 163ff, 188-189, 193ff  
  dative 117-118  
  forms 83, 104, 112, 117  
  in West Saxon 82-83, 83-85  
  locative 86ff, 117  
  neutral 121, 146  
  relationships 18-19, 43, 81ff  
  repetition 85-88, 178  
**circumstantial**  
  see *case*  
**dative movement** 152  
**directionality**  
  source/goal 83, 88, 90, 93, 187  
  intrinsic 151ff, 165-166, 170  
  source only 187  
**discourse marking**  
  new information 65, 67ff  
  morphology 23, 44-47, 52, 74-76, 109ff, 213  
**East Midland** 129  
**empty determiner**  
  96, 99ff  
**ergative case** 83, 93, 145, 152, 156, 160  
**EQUI NP** 45ff, 107ff, 136ff, 167-168, 208, 214-215  
**Essex** 269  
**feminine gender**  
  discourse marking 71, and sex 2-10  
  unhistorical 70ff  
**Formelle Gründe** 12  
**Gaelic** 18-19  
**gender**  
  change 1-2, 10-14, 85-86, 172-173  
  declension 2-3, 120  
  morphology 25-26  
  physical shape 2-3  
  sex 4-12, 33ff, 73, 214  
**West Saxon** 14-16  
  see *masculine, feminine, neuter*

- genuswechsel 11-15,  
172, 177, 200ff, 227
- glosses 20-21, 102  
Latin influence 22  
literal 29-30  
natural discourse 42  
goal only 53
- humanness 6-10
- inalienable possession  
60-62, 66, 111, 142
- indirect object 152ff
- inflections 4-5, 12
- intrinsic orientation  
151ff, 181ff
- Latin influence 23, 27ff,  
71, 118-119, 125-126
- lenition 18-19
- lexical items  
restricted set 44, 49ff,  
111-112, 210ff
- localist 82, 112
- locative case 83-84, 86ff,  
146  
-ne morphology 98  
source/goal 88, 90, 114-  
115, 127-128, 151, 161
- locational reference  
57ff, 137-138
- Lower Sepic 2
- male sex 6-8
- mammals 8-9
- masculine gender 2-10
- masculinization 135
- Middlesex 219
- morphology  
attributive 15-17  
case relationships  
70, 84-86, 104,  
112ff, 143, 175
- reinterpretation  
16-17
- residue 16-17
- sex indicating  
5-6, 9-10, 23
- morphology-less  
105, 113, 125ff,  
131, 144, 156ff,  
175-176, 217ff, 226ff
- neuter gender  
discourse relationship  
43ff, 67ff, 109ff  
sex 7ff  
unhistorical 27ff, 35ff
- neutralization 36ff,  
39ff, 105, 135
- non-count 53, 210
- noun phrase  
co-reference 45ff, 136  
single member class  
49ff, 140ff,  
209-210
- participants - see case
- partitives 90, 98, 186
- personification 14, 25
- possessive 74, 104, 118-19  
case forms 98-99, 112,  
161-162
- proper nouns 140
- reclassification  
11-14, 205ff
- re  
discourse marker  
73, 93, 214, 220
- unhistorical 116ff, 166,  
176, 193ff, 214ff

- referential identity** 45ff, 107ff, 208,  
see *EQUI NP*
- Reimassoziation** 14
- relative pronoun** 108
- Rushworth** 21, 57
- semantic influence** 13–14
- serialization** 143, 152
- sex and gender** 38ff, 73
- source** 156
- speaker/hearer knowledge** 44–47, 49, 78–79, 109ff, 134ff, 141–142, 210ff
- subject as <bone>** 169ff
- subject selection** hierarchy 146, 152, 159
- temporal constructions** 87–89, 113–114, 189–191, 211
- Toricelli** 2
- þ(æt)**
- discourse marking 43ff, 105ff, 124, 134
- locatives 57–58, 142–43, as PRO 48, 60ff, 208–9
- as quantifier 55, 211–12
- unhistorical 27ff, 35, 207ff
- uniqueness 49ff
- þan** 176, 187ff, 193
- as absolute 194ff
- word order** 143
- Ymes** 3–2, 82
- zero morphology**  
see *morphology-less*