



32101 071984932

1460

THE
ORDER OF WORDS
IN
ANGLO-SAXON PROSE

DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

CHARLES ALPHONSO SMITH

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, New Series, Vol. I, No. 2]

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1898

3501

.863

3501

.863

Library of



Princeton University.

Presented by

Johns Hopkins Univ.



THE
ORDER OF WORDS
IN
ANGLO-SAXON PROSE

DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
CHARLES ALPHONSO SMITH

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, New Series, Vol. I, No. 2]

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1893

1
3

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

YRABVBU
YRABU
L.M. NOTICORR

TO
MY FATHER,
WHOSE SYMPATHY AND SCHOLARSHIP
HAVE BEEN AT ONCE
THE INSPIRATION AND THE GOAL
OF MY STUDENT YEARS,
THIS MONOGRAPH IS AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED.

3501
.863

THE ORDER OF WORDS IN ANGLO-SAXON PROSE.

I. INTRODUCTION.

(a) Few subjects connected with Anglo-Saxon prose have been so persistently slighted as that of the position of words and clauses. The grammars either omit it entirely or touch upon it only in the most vague and general terms. No monographs treating the whole subject in all its periods and aspects have yet appeared, Kube's dissertation¹ being the only attempt, so far as I know, to investigate the word-order of even a single monument of Anglo-Saxon literature. But this work, though valuable, is awkwardly arranged, and devotes too little proportionate space to the subject of dependent clauses, the element of Anglo-Saxon word-order which offers the greatest contrast to modern English and which is therefore the most interesting as well as the most important. Kube's results are further vitiated by his having selected a monument written at long intervals apart and therefore incapable, if treated as a single synchronous work, of exhibiting any successive changes in word-order, or the word-order of any fixed date.

A more suggestive study than Kube's is that of Ries.² The latter not only treats the relative positions of subject and predicate as exemplified in Old Saxon, but mingles much else that is of value to the student of word-order in general.

For the general student, however, the most suitable book is that of Weil.³ This work, whether one agrees with all the conclusions or not, is rightly called in the words of the translator, "a lucid and systematic introduction to the study of the whole question."

¹ *Die Wortstellung in der Sachsenchronik*, (Parker MS.), Jena, 1886.

² "Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Heliand," *Quellen und Forschungen*, xli.

³ *The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with the Modern* (translated from the French by Super, 1887).

350
.86

The extensive bibliography which Schultze¹ is able to give of previous investigations into the word-order of Old French shows that, in this language at least, scholars have not been slow to appreciate the importance of word-order in its general relations to syntax. Special prominence is also given to this subject in the last edition of Allen and Greenough's *Latin Grammar* (1891), Part II, Chapter VI. The first chapter of *Cæsar* is translated and an attempt made to illustrate the various shades of thought indicated by the position of words in the original. "This subject has only just begun to receive the consideration it deserves." (Preface.)

The aspect of Anglo-Saxon word-order most urgently calling for treatment is the rhetorical aspect. There are three norms in the word-order of every language:² (1) The syntactic, or grammatical, used as a "means of indicating grammatical relations;" (2) The rhetorical, used as a means of indicating the "relative weight and importance intended by the author;" (3) The euphonic. The last concerns poetry and may here be omitted, but Anglo-Saxon, a highly inflected language, could better employ position for rhetorical purposes than modern English; but what were the emphatic places in an Anglo-Saxon sentence? Were they the first (*pathetische Stellung*) and the last (*signifikante Stellung*)? Goodell admits the former for Greek but denies the latter. He declares that the tendency to emphasize by finalizing "prevails in French," is less potent in German, and that "possibly the tendency in English is due partly to the influence of French."

I shall not enter upon these rhetorical questions,³ but I wish to emphasize the fact that till statistical results have been sifted rhetorically they can not have their full value, for there is a rhetorical as well as a syntactic norm.

¹ "Die Wortstellung im altfranzösischen direkten Fragesatze," *Herrig's Archiv*, LXXI; cf., also, Thurneysen's "Stellung des Verbums im Altfranzösischen," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XVI.

² See Goodell's "Order of Words in Greek," *Trans. Am. Phil. Association*, XXI, 1890.

³ Cf., however, Ries, p. 2, for authorities on *Die Voranstellung des Wichtigen*.

(b) The results obtained in the following dissertation are based equally on a study of Alfred's *Orosius* and Ælfric's *Homilies*. The figures following the citations from the *Orosius* refer to page and line of Sweet's Edition for the Early English Text Society, 1883; those following the citations from the *Homilies* refer to volume and page of Thorpe's Edition for the Ælfric Society (2 vols.), 1844, 1846.

When the order of words is the same in both, illustrative sentences are given only from the *Orosius*. The *Homilies* are cited for differences, and for the illustration of principles not sufficiently exemplified in the *Orosius*.

By keeping the two sets of citations thus distinct, I have tried to bring out more clearly the growth of Anglo-Saxon word-order in the tenth century toward the norm of modern English.

In this discussion my effort is, as was Kube's, to find the syntactic norm. Although, for example, I give statistics for all possible positions of the dependent verb, whether influenced by rhetorical considerations or not, it is not to be inferred that occasional non-final dependent verbs in the *Orosius* show a tendency necessarily in conflict with the finals. In the following sentences, for example, Alfred, evidently for rhetorical reasons, places his dependent verbs immediately before the marvels that follow, so that nothing may check the full effect of his figures :

an cild geboren, þæt hæfde III fet and III handa and III eagan and III earan 220, 14.

for þon heo [an nædre] wæs hund twelftiges fota lang 174, 16.

Yet if these examples are to be counted at all in a statistical enumeration, made to find out what the position of the verb is in the majority of cases, i. e. what the syntactic (grammatical) norm is, they must stand in a seeming conflict with the usual norm in the *Orosius* which is that a dependent verb is final. Both of them, however, are perfectly normal. They are the exceptions that prove the rule, the difference being that they follow a rhetorical norm while the final verbs follow a syntactic norm.

Ælfric has a finer feeling for rhetorical effects than Alfred. Inversion, for example, in a dependent clause is rarely found

in Anglo-Saxon prose, yet Ælfric in the following sentence skillfully employs it as a means of preserving the preceding word-order and bringing out the contrast and balance between "arleasnysse" and "deað." He is speaking of Stephen's death:

Swiþor he besorgade þa heora synna þonne his agene wunda ; swiþor *heora arleasnysse*^(a) þonne *his sylfes deað*^(b); and rihtlice swiþor, forþan þe *heora arleasnysse*^(a) fyligde se eca deað, and þæt ece lif fyligde *his deape*^(b) I, 50.

In the two following sentences the pronominal objects (see p. 15 (2)) follow their verbs, so as to preserve the balance of the clause immediately preceding :

He [se deofol] and his gingran awyrdaþ^(a) manna lichaman^(b) digellice^(c) þurh^(d) deofles^(c) cræft^(f), and gehælaþ^(a) hi^(b) openlice^(e) on^(d) manna^(c) gesihþe^(f) I, 4.

He^(a) bæraþ^(b) þæt cild^(c), and þæt cild^(a) bæraþ^(b) hine^(c) I, 136.

Under the head of "Transposed Order" (see p. 30 (d)), I have summed up the chief occasions when transposition is not observed with its usual frequency, but have left untouched the changes brought about by rhetoric. The syntactic norm must be clearly established before a rhetorical norm can be thought of, for the latter is largely a simple inversion of the former. If it be established, for example, that the usual position of pronominal objects is before the verbs that govern them, it follows that any other position must by its very novelty arrest attention and make for emphasis, whatever Goodell may say of the logical or psychological aspects of the question.

(c) "Can the numerous translations of Latin works, especially the translations of Alfred, be regarded as faithful representations of the natural utterance of the translators? There seem to be strong reasons for answering this question in the affirmative, with certain limitations."¹ Wack² corroborates Sweet and adds: "Einfluss des Lateinischen auf die Sprache der Uebersetzung lässt sich weder im Wortschatz noch syntactischer Beziehung nachweisen." And again, "Wahrt Aelfred

¹ Sweet, *Introduction to Cura Pastoralis* (E. E. T. Soc.).

² *Ueber das Verhältnis von König Aelfreds Uebersetzung der Cura Pastoralis zum Original.* Greifswald, 1889.

also der Uebertragung durchweg die Freiheit und Herrschaft der germanischen Form."

Speaking of the *Orosius*, "the only translation of Aelfred's which from the similarity of its subject admits of a direct comparison," Sweet¹ says: "We find almost exactly the same language and style as in the contemporary historical pieces of the Chronicle."

Though the *Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan* exhibit marked variations from the general order of other portions of the *Orosius*, I see no reason for crediting the Latin with any noteworthy influence. Whatever the influence may have been, it must have been exerted in behalf of finalizing the verbs, both in dependent and independent sentences; but I find only one sentence in which this influence seems exerted—the first sentence in the book. The Latin is: *Majores nostri orbem totius terrae, Oceani limbo circumseptum, triquadrum statuere.* The Anglo-Saxon: Ure ieldran ealne þisne ymbhwyrft þisne middangeardes, cwæþ Orosius, swa swa Oceanus utan ymb- ligeþ, þone (man) garsecg hateð, on þreo todældon. 8, 1. Here "on þreo todældon," appearing at the end of a long independent sentence, corresponds exactly in position to "tri-quadrum statuere," and is the most violent transposition that I have noted.

It is, perhaps, needless to say that the influence of Latin is plainly seen in the blundering awkwardness of many passages in the *Orosius*.² Sentences illustrating this are necessarily long, and the subject does not fall within the province of this paper, but the sentence beginning 106, 7 and that beginning 212, 14 will give a general idea of the incompleteness and clumsiness to be found in Alfred's frequent and vain attempts to pit the looseness of Anglo-Saxon against the compactness of Latin. In 136, 32 the attempt is made to compress two Latin sentences into one, but in none of these is the word-order abnormal.

¹ Page 40 of *Introd. to Cura Pastoralis*.

² Cf. Schilling's dissertation: *König Ælfred's Angelsächsische Bearbeitung der Weltgeschichte des Orosius* (Halle, 1886), p. 9.

The question of Latin influence does not enter into the *Homilies* except where Ælfric occasionally quotes Scriptural Latin and adds immediately a literal translation. In such cases there is noticeable at times a tendency to conform the word-order as closely as possible to the Latin,¹ so as, apparently, to impress the hearer with the fact that he is listening now not, as heretofore, to an interpretation of inspired thought, but to the inspired thought itself, dressed as far as possible in its native garb. E. g. He [Lucas] cwæp, Postquam consummati sunt dies octo, etc. þæt is on ure gepeode, Æfter þan þe wæron gefyllede ehta dagas, etc. I, 90. Such inversion, as noted before, is rare. In the *Gospel of Luke* (II, 21) the order is, Æfter þam þe ehta dagas gefyllede wæron, and Ælfric himself observes this order in the following example, where the Latin order is exactly as before: Cum natus esset Iesus, etc. þa þa se Hælend acenned wæs, etc. I, 104. In the *Gospel of Matthew* the order is the same, though the words are different (Mat. II, 1).²

(d) Using the terms employed by Whitney in his *Compendious German Grammar*, I divide order, as related to subject and predicate into (1) Normal, (2) Inverted, and (3) Transposed. (1) Normal order = subject + verb. (2) Inverted = verb + subject. (3) Transposed = subject . . . + verb.

It is only when the last division is viewed in relation to other sentence members besides the subject and predicate, that the propriety of a special designation is seen; for subject and

¹ Ælfric, however, is almost entirely free from the examples of forced order so frequently occurring in the *Anglo-Saxon Gospels*. Cf. the following, taken from the Notes to Bright's *Gospel of St. Luke in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 109, 110:

Luke I, 27 (*Clementine Vulgate*): Ad virginem desponsatam viro, cui nomen erat Ioseph, de domo David, et nomen virginis Maria.

Anglo-Saxon Gospel: tō beweddudre fæmnan anum were, þæs nama wæs Iosēp, of Dāuīdes hūse; and þære fæmnan nama wæs Maria.

Ælfric, *Hom.* I, 194: tō þām mædene þe wæs Maria gehāten, and heo āsprang of Dāuīdes cynne, þæs mārān cyninges, and heo wæs beweddod þām rihtwisan Iosēpe. See also Notes III, 4, 5; XI, 11, 12.

² The "paving letters" in the *Rule of St. Benet* (E. E. T. Soc. No. 90) would throw invaluable light on this subject if we had the original instead of a much mutilated copy. It is at present, however, impossible to rearrange the Latin words in the original alphabetical order of the "paving letters."

predicate follow the order observed in (1), though the predicate comes last as related to its modifiers.

For the component parts of the compound tenses, I use "auxiliary" for the first member, "verb" for the second. Though not so exact as "personal verb" for the first, and "non-personal verb" for the second, or "Hilfsverbum" and "Hauptverbum," these terms have the merit of greater brevity,¹ and are equally self-defining.

By "dependent order" and "independent order," I mean the order in dependent sentences and independent sentences. When the term "verb" is used alone, it means a simple (non-compound) tense, which is always personal.

These respective orders will now be taken up in detail.

II. NORMAL ORDER.

Independent sentences.

Subject + verb + verb modifiers.

(a) By verb modifiers are meant accusative objects, dative objects, predicate nouns and adjectives, prepositional phrases, and adverbs. Of this order in general Ries remarks: "Die Voranstellung des Subjects ist im Indogermanischen, soweit die historische Kenntniss reicht, der Grundtypus der Wortfolge und ist—soweit mir bekannt—mit alleiniger Ausnahme des Keltischen, in allen Zweigen des Sprachstammes herrschend geblieben" (p. 9).

This sequence is employed in Anglo-Saxon for independent affirmative sentences.

(1) With simple tense:

þæt Estland is swyðe mycel 20, 14.²

¹This can hardly be claimed for Ries's substitution of "irregulär-gerade Folge" for "Inversion," p. 2, though in other respects the term is a happy one.

²Arabic figures in every case show that the *Orosius* is referred to. Roman and Arabic, for volume and page, indicate the *Homilies*.

and se nimð þone læstan dæl 21, 3.

He wæs of Sicilia þæm londe 54, 17.

(2) When the verb is a compound tense the auxiliary follows the order of the simple tense noted above, the second member following immediately, medially, or finally. When the adverbial designations are numerous, or of various kinds, the verb either immediately follows its auxiliary or takes a medial position among the adverbial designations. This is often a matter of rhetoric (of emphasis) and is the principle involved in the distinction between loose and periodic sentences. The language had not yet developed a norm and was thus more flexible in this respect than modern German. The final position of the second member, is, however, the most common if the modifiers are few.

In the following examples I shall quote inverted as well as normal sentences, for as far as the relative positions of auxiliary and verb are concerned, they are not to be distinguished.

(a) Verb immediately following auxiliary :

Þonne sceolon beon gesamnode ealle ða menn ðe swyftoste hors habbað 20, 33. This triple verb is evidently bunched together so that "ðe" and its clause may immediately follow "menn;" but had there been no following clausal modifier of "menn," the order would more probably have been, Þonne sceolon ealle ða menn beon gesamnode. See p. 35 (4).

Seo hæfde gehaten heora gydenne Dianan þæt, etc. 108, 16.

he wolde abrecan Argus þa burg 158, 31.

nu we sindon cumen to þæm godan tidun 182, 14.

Æfter þæm wordum Pompeius wearð gefliemed mid eallum his folce 242, 12.

Antonius and Cleopatro hæfdon gegaderod sciphere on þæm Readan Sæ 246, 19.

(b) Verb medial :

Þæt tacen wearð on Romanum swiþe gesweotolad mid þæm miclan wolbryne 86, 23.

Ic hæbbe nu gesæd hiora ingewinn 88, 28.

and næron on hie hergende buton þrie dagas 92, 36.

He weary þeh swiþor beswicen for Alexandres searewe þonne
124, 18.

He wæs on ðæm dagum gemærsad ofer ealle oþere cyningas
154, 25.

He wæs eac on þæm dagum gleawast to wige 154, 32.

(c) Verb final :¹

and Gallie wæron ær siex monað binnan þære byrig hergende
and þa burg bærnende 94, 1.

and uneaðe mehte ær ænig þæm Gallium oðfeon oþþe
oðhydan 94, 10.

þa hie ne mehton from Galliscum fyre forbærnede weorþan
94, 14.

þa wæron ealle þa wif beforan Romana witan gelaðede
108, 31.

nu ic wille eac þæs maran Alexandres gemunende beon
110, 10.

and þær wæs his folc swa swiðe forslagen þæt etc. 244, 10.

(b) The position of datives (nouns and pronouns).

(1) The substantival dative, unless influenced by rhetorical considerations, stands between the verb and the direct object, as in modern English.

Ohthere sæde his hlaforde, Ælfræde cyninge, þæt, etc. 17, 1.
(This clausal object makes the above position necessary in this case).

Romane gesealdon Gaiuse Iuliuse seofon legan 238, 16.

Æfter þæm Romane witan Claudiuse þone hunger 260, 21.

he gesealde Ualente his breðer healf his rice 288, 11.

He gesealde Persum Nissibi þa burg 286, 26.

and betahte his twæm sunum þone onwald 294, 30.

In the following sentence, the two appositive modifiers force the indirect object after the direct :

he sealde his dohtor Alexandre þæm cyninge, his agnum mæge 118, 27.

¹ Earle notes a survival of this order in the legal diction of Modern English (*English Prose*, p. 87).

(2) The pronominal dative, however, comes between the subject and the verb.

He him þa gehet 114, 25 and 27.

and him bebead 114, 30.

Hie þa sume him getygðedon 118, 15.

He þa Alexander him anum deadum lytle mildheortnesse gedyde 128, 14.

and hi him þæt swiþe ondrædan 138, 5.

he him¹ þa to fultume com 140, 22.

and hi him gefylstan 162, 20.

and him þæt rice geagnedan 224, 20.

Romane him geþancodon 224, 32.

There are many sentences in which the pronominal dative is drawn after the verb through the influence of a following word or phrase upon which the dative is dependent rather than upon the verb :

and gesetton him to cyningum twegen Hasterbalas 210, 26.

and he wearð him swa grom 260, 22.

he geceas him to fultume Traianus þone mon 264, 18.

But when dependent solely on the idea contained in the verb, the pronominal dative comes between the subject and the verb. Only nine variations are to be found in the *Orosius* (17, 9; 20, 1; 20, 4; 178, 18; 258, 28; 274, 14; 284, 5; 292, 28; 296, 5), and in some of these it is impossible to tell whether the dative is a modifier of the idea contained in the verb, the verbal modifier, or in the union of the two. Of course the dative after a preposition is here excluded.

Ælfric is not so consistent in this respect as Alfred, his sequence being more modern. In a portion of the *Homilies* equal to the *Orosius*, there occur 86 pronominal datives, of which 64 precede the verb, 22 follow,—a ratio of about 3 to 1.

an Adam him eallum naman gesceop 1, 14.

God him worhte þa reaf of fellum 1, 18.

¹ Here "him" is governed by "to fultume" rather than by "com." Most sentences of this sort observe the following order: he þa com him to fultume. See below.

Drihten him andwyrde I, 126.

But,

We secgaþ eow Godes riht I, 56.

(c) The position of direct objects (nouns, clauses, and pronouns).

(1) Nouns and clauses follow the substantival dative if there be one;¹ if not, they follow the verb but precede all other verbal modifiers.

Philippus gelædde fird on Læcedemonie and on Thebane 118, 24.

Alexander hæfde gefeoht wið Porose þæm, etc. 132, 16.

þa brohton Romane þone triumphan angean Pomp. mid, etc. 234, 27.

and mon towearp þone weal niþer oþ þone grund 238, 12.

(2) The pronominal direct object precedes the verb.

he hine oferwann and ofsloh 30, 11.

hy genamon Ioseph, and hine gesealdon cipemonnum, and hi hine gesealdon in Egypta land 34, 2 (a fine illustration of all the preceding).

he hi þær onfenge, and hi þær afedde 36, 11.

and se cyning Hasterbal hiene selfne² acwealde 212, 7.

he þa hiene selfne forbærnde 52, 7.

feng Titus to Romana onwalde, and hine hæfde II gear 264, 1.

feng Lucius Antonius to rice, and hit hæfde XIII ger 268, 26. (This oft repeated clause, "and hit hæfde" or "and hine hæfde," representing various Latin equivalents in the *Orosius*, never varies its order.)

Only four variations from the usual order are found in the *Orosius* (82, 18; 226, 10; 284, 28; 294, 28).

Ælfric, in a portion of the *Homilies* equal to the *Orosius*, employs 108 pronominal accusatives, of which 88 precede the verb, 20 follow,—a ratio of about 4½ to 1.

¹ For examples, see p. 13 (1).

² The preference for this interposed position, both in the *Orosius* and the *Homilies*, is not shown so decidedly by these intensive forms, "him selfum" and "hiene selfne," as by the simple forms. Cf. exceptions under both heads.

and he hi lædde ofer sæ and he hi afedde I, 24.

and he hine lufode synderlice I, 58.

God on swefne hi gewarnode I, 78.

Ða tungel-witegan hine gemetton mid þære meder I, 116.

But,

Stacteus astrehte hine to Johannes fotswaþum I, 68.

(d) In imperative clauses with the subject unexpressed, pronominal objects, both dative and accusative, follow the verb.

Orosius (only one such construction): Gesecgað me nu Romane, cwæð Orosius, 194, 24.

Homilies: þes is min leofa Sunu gehyraþ him I, 104.

Syle us to-dæg urne dæghwamlican hlaf. And forgyf us ure gyltas Ac alys us fram yfele I, 258.

The reason why pronouns prefer the initial positions in a sentence is to be sought, I think, in the very nature of pronouns. They are substitutes not merely for nouns, but for nouns that have preceded them in the paragraph or sentence. All pronouns are, thus, essentially relative; and just as relative pronouns proper follow as closely as possible their antecedents, so personal pronouns, partaking of the relative nature, partake also of the relative sequence.

As to whether an adverb should precede a prepositional phrase, or vice-versa,—it is purely a matter of relative emphasis. As in modern English, there was, and could be, no syntactic norm.

III. INVERTED ORDER.

Independent sentences.

Verb + subject.

(a) When a word, phrase, or clause, other than the subject or a coördinate conjunction, begins the sentence, provided it be a modifier of the verb, the verb may be drawn after it, and the subject made to follow.

Inversion presents itself under two entirely distinct aspects :
 (1) As a means of more closely uniting the inverted sentence with the preceding (by such words as “þa,” “þonne,” etc.);
 (2) As a means of relative stress (as e.g. when the direct object begins the sentence). The one conduces to compactness and continuousness; the other, to emphasis and effectiveness.

Inversion is by no means consistently employed in Anglo-Saxon prose; hence I have avoided stating the principle in a dogmatic way. Generally speaking, it may be said that the *Orosius*, on account of its narrative nature, employs inversion for the first mentioned purpose oftener than the *Homilies*; while the *Homilies*, on account of their expository nature, furnish more examples of inversion for purposes of rhetorical stress.

Kube finds the same dearth of inversion in the *Chronicle*, “her” when initial being followed by the normal more frequently than by the inverted order. The same may be said of “æfter þæm”¹ in the *Orosius*. Kube thinks that the frequent repetition of “her” had weakened its inverting power. “Es wurde ihm [dem verfasser] gleichsam zu einer einleitenden formel, nach der er seinen satz baute, wie er jeden anderen ohne diese formel gebaut haben wurde” p. 8. “Æfter þæm,” however, is not of frequent occurrence in the *Orosius*, while “þa” and “þonne” are; yet inversion after “Æfter þæm” is as rare as it is frequent after “þa” and “þonne.” It must be remembered that the essence of inversion is the closeness of interdependence between verb and initial word. Consistent inversion would assume that this union is constant and indissoluble, so that to move a verbal modifier to the beginning of the sentence must necessarily move the verb with it. But this cannot be true where constructions are as yet unfettered by traditional forms. The relation between verb and verbal modifier is not constant, but varies in degree even with the same words. Rhetoric, again, has kept the language from crystallizing into hard and merely mechanical forms of construction.

¹ Æfter þæm þe” is, of course, an entirely different construction, and introduces only dependent clauses.

In the following sentences, for example,
 Maximianus he sende on Affricam 280, 2.

Constantius he sende on Gallie 280, 3.

Galerius he sende on Perse 280, 8.

one feels the superior distinctness with which these names are contrasted, not only by their being placed first but equally by their not drawing (though they are direct objects) the verb with them. The reader naturally pauses briefly after each name; but had the verb immediately followed, *i. e.* had inversion taken place ("Max. sende he," etc.), there would have been no room for a pause. In these cases, therefore, rhetoric has disturbed what must still be called the usual norm.

(b) The chief cases of inversion are,

(1) By a word :

þa for Iulius to Rome 240, 15.

þær hæfdon Romane sige, and þær wæs Gallia ofslagen
 232, 11.

Sipþan for Iulius on Thesaliam 240, 29.

Ne wene ic, cwæð Orosius 92, 18.

Uneaðe mæg mon gesecgan 128, 20.

þonne is þis land 19, 16.

(2) By a phrase :

For hwi besprecað nu men 54, 33.

Eac buton þæm yfele nahton hie naþer, etc. 92, 33.

Æfter his fielle wearð þara casera mægð offeallen 262, 5.

(3) By a clause :

Ær ðæm ðe Romeburh getimbred wære, ricsode
 Ambictio 36, 4.

Ic wat geare, cwæð Orosius, 42, 1.

Ær þæm þe Romeburg getimbred wære wæs þætte
 Pel. and Ath. winnende wæron 56, 6. (The inverted
 subject is here the whole clause introduced by "þætte").

Inversion caused by an initial dependent clause is not frequent in Anglo-Saxon; for most dependent clauses, when they precede independent ones, have some correlative word to introduce the latter (þa þa, þonne þonne) :

þonne he þa oferswiðed hæfde . . . þonne dyde he, etc., 112, 23.

Here the inversion in "dyde he" is caused by the second "þonne," not by the preceding clause. Such clauses were weaker in inverting power than either single words or phrases. The fact that it contained a separate subject and predicate gave the initial clause a certain independence, an isolation, a power to stand alone, and thus widened the breach between it and the verb of the succeeding clause which it limited. No better proof of this could be given than the tendency to sum up and reinforce the weakened effect of the preceding clause by some correlative or connective word. The interdependence of the two clauses was not strongly felt. Rask¹ correctly states the principle as follows:

"In general, however, as in English, the consequent proposition is not distinguished by any sign, not even by the order of the words, the subject being also here placed before the verb." "But when the particle of time, þa or þonne, is repeated before a consequent proposition, the subject usually follows the verb, as in German and Danish."

Erdmann,² discussing a principal clause (Nachsatz) preceded by a dependent (Vordersatz), says: "Im Nhd. scheint die Voranstellung des Verbums im Nachsatze überall herrschende Regel geworden zu sein; nur nach concessiven Vordersätzen unterbleibt sie oft, indem diese trotz ihrer Satzform für sich als selbständige Ausrufe gefasst werden und der Nachsatz dann (oft mit rhetorischer Pause) ganz ohne Rücksicht auf sie seine eigene Wortstellung bewahrt." What is here said of concessive clauses is true largely of all Anglo-Saxon dependent clauses in their effect upon succeeding clauses.

Æfter þæm þe Philippus hæfde Ath. and Thes. him under-
ðieded, he befeat, etc., 112, 8.

and raþe þæs þe hie togædere coman, Romane hæfdon sige,
160, 3.

¹*Ang. Sax. Gram.* (translated by Thorpe, 1830), Fourth Part, pp. 118, 119.

²*Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax*, § 207.

Ac raþe þæs þe Hannibal to his fultume com, he geffiemde ealle þa consulas 190, 5.

In the *Voyages of Othhere and Wulfstan*, there are three initial dependent clauses without a succeeding correlative, and none of them causes inversion (18, 15; 21, 12; 21, 15).

(c) There are no instances in the *Orosius* of inversion to express condition, concession, or interrogation, and only two instances of inversion to express command or permission (100, 27; 182, 16).

The *Homilies*, however, show that the genius of the language allowed inversion for all the above purposes.

(1) Condition :

Eaþe mihte þes cwyde beon læwedum mannum bediglod, nære seo gastlice getacning I, 94.

(2) Concession :

Beon þa mædenn snotere, beon hi stunte, eallie hi moton slapan on þæm, etc. II, 566.

(3) Interrogation :

Eom ic hit, Drihten? II, 244.

and gesawe þu Abraham? II, 236.

Petrus, lufast þu me? II, 290.

ne ondrætst þu þe God? II, 256. (The negative invariably precedes in such sentences).

(4) Command :

The Lord's Prayer furnishes many examples (I, 258): Gebiddaþ eow, Sy þin nama gehalgod, Cume þin rice, Sy þin wylla, etc.

Ne ete ge of þam lambe II, 264.

(As before, the negative must precede).

ne beo ge bitere II, 322.

Ne bere ge mid eow pusan II, 532.

Ne gecyrre ge nænne mann II, 534.

There are a few cases in which the subject precedes :

Ic wylle; and þu beo geclænsod I, 122

þæt soþe Leoht . . . onlihte ure mod II, 294.

þu soþlice cyþ þine gesihþe II, 342.

In the following sentence, the two orders are combined :

Ælc sawul sy underþeod healicum anwealdum ; þæt is, Beo
ælc man underþeod mihtigran men þonne he sylf sy. II, 362.

The occasional occurrence of inversion in dependent clauses
will be treated under the proper head. See p. 36.

IV. TRANSPOSED ORDER.¹

Dependent sentences.

(1) *Subject verb.*

(2) *Subject verb + auxiliary.*

(a) Before taking up dependent sentences in detail, I wish
to give the commonly accepted view in regard to the modern-
izing influence of French upon Anglo-Saxon transposition.
This is best stated as well as exemplified by Fiedler and Sachs.
The following is quoted from a paragraph headed, "Einfluss
des Französischen auf die Wortstellung im Englischen:"²
"Wichtiger als alle die genannten Veränderungen, welche das
Französische im Englischen hervorgebracht hat, ist die Ver-
änderung der Wortstellung. Um nicht weitläufig zu werden,
beschränken wir uns, dieselbe an Beispielen klar zu machen.

Gif weofodþen be boca tæcinge his agen lif rihtlice *fadige*.

Si un prêtre *règle* sa vie sur les prescriptions des livres.

þa Darius geseah, þat he *oferwunnen* beon wolde.

Lorsque Darius vit, qu'il *serait* vaincu."

(I omit as unnecessary the German and English equivalents
given by Fiedler and Sachs, as well as their numerous other
examples.)

¹ Various explanations of Transposition have been offered, but the question
is still unsettled. Cf. Wunderlich, *Der deutsche Satzbau*, 91 seq; Wacker-
nagel, *Indogermanische Forschungen* I, 333 seq; Erdmann, *Grundzüge der
deutschen Syntax*, § 216, 3.

² *Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, I, § 27.

Meiklejohn gives the same view (*English Language*, Part III, cap. III, § 11).

The lessons which they draw from such citations may be easily inferred; but is the claim a true one, that the resemblance between French and English order is due to the influence of Norman French? The following results, it seems to me, settle this question in the negative:

A.

If the verb be a simple tense, the following scheme represents all possible relative positions, whether with or without a direct object:

(1) *Verb final.*

a { verb (with or without object):
 { þe þæs yfeles ordfruma wæs 40, 16.

(2) *Verb non-final.*

b { object + verb:
 { for þon þe he monege anwealdas . . . geode on þæm east-
 londum, 150, 16.
 c { verb + object:
 { þæt þunor toslog heora hiehstan godes hus Iofeses 160, 18.
 d { verb (no object):
 { þæt he bude on þæm lande 17, 2.

B.

If the verb be a compound tense, the following scheme represents all possible relative positions of its two members and the direct object:

(1) *Verb final.*

a { object + aux. + verb:
 { þa he hiene hæfde gelædd 286, 17.
 b { aux. + object + verb:
 { for þon þe hie hæfdon gewinn up ahæfen 278, 22.

- c { aux. + verb (no object):
 { þæt hie sceoldon . . . besincan 160, 29.

(2) *Aux. final.*

- d { object + verb + aux. :
 { hu he hiene beswican mehte 52, 4.
 e { verb + object + aux. :
 { Does not occur in *Or.* or *Hom.*
 f { verb + aux. (no object):
 { hwær . . . hweol on gongende wæron 38, 34.

(3) *Aux. + verb non-final.*

- g { object + aux. + verb :
 { þæt he . . . gewinn mehte habban wið hiene 240, 8.
 h { aux. + object + verb :
 { ac sona swa G. hæfde . . . fultum . . . gelædd angean
 { Marius 230, 2.
 i { aux. + verb + object :
 { for þon þe elpendes hyd wile drincan wætan 230, 26.
 j { aux. + verb . . . (no object):
 { ær he ut wolde faran to gefeohte 232, 4.

(4) *Verb + aux. non-final.*

- k { object + verb + aux. . . . :
 { þeh þe hie hit . . . cyþan ne dorsten for þara senatum ege
 { 232, 27.
 l { verb + object + aux. . . . :
 { Does not occur in *Or.* or *Hom.*
 m { verb + aux. + object :
 { gif hie gemunan willað . . . unclænnessa 64, 14.
 n { verb + aux. . . . (no object):
 { raþe þæs þe . . . þæt spell cuð wearð Cartainiensium 170, 4.

I have noted according to these schemes 500 dependent clauses from the *Orosius*, none being omitted unless it con-

tained simply a subject and predicate (as, "æ'r hio gefeolle" 252, 7) and thus had the final position forced upon its verb. Of these 500, 314 have simple tenses, of which (see scheme A.),

259	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
9	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
14	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
32	"	"	"	<i>d</i>

Of the 500, 186 have compound tenses, of which (see scheme B.),

4	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
20	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
27	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
31	"	"	"	<i>d</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>e</i>
80	"	"	"	<i>f</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>g</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>h</i>
3	"	"	"	<i>i</i>
8	"	"	"	<i>j</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>k</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>l</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>m</i>
9	"	"	"	<i>n</i>

These results show that if the verb be a simple tense, Alfred prefers to place it at the end, 82% being found in this position. If a compound tense, the auxiliary follows the verb proper and occupies the extreme end position, 59% (viz. classes *d* and *f*) following this order.

But these figures show more. An examination of scheme A shows that while 259 verbs (class *a*) are transposed, 46 (classes *c* and *d*) follow normal order (the order of independent sentences); while 9 show a mingling of the two norms.

In scheme B, 111 clauses (classes *d* and *f*) show complete transposition, 47 (classes *b* and *e*) assume normal order, while 28 show again a mingling of the two orders.

Thus there is already a movement in Early West-Saxon to abandon transposition in dependent sentences and to assume normal order instead. By the Mid. Eng. period, transposition had disappeared entirely,¹ dependent sentences being leveled under the order of independent. "In der ältesten englischen Prosa aus der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts ist die Konstruktion bereits vorzugweise französisch" (Fiedler and Sachs, § 29). This is true, but the point I here emphasize is that, while the influence of French powerfully aided the movement against transposition, it did not create the movement, but only fostered it. The following statistics from the Homilies prove that in a century after Alfred's day and more than half a century before the Norman Conquest, normal order had already practically triumphed over transposition. Of 314 simple tenses taken, as in the *Orosius* by pages from the *Homilies*,

155	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
20	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
67	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
72	"	"	"	<i>d</i>

Of Ælfric's 186 compound tenses,

3	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
21	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
48	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
15	"	"	"	<i>d</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>e</i>

¹The following line (No. 7827, Harl. MS., Cant. Tales) is cited by Prof. Child in his *Observations on the Lang. of Chaucer and Gower*, "Peculiar Order:"

"Of all this thing, which that I of have sayd." So rare a survival, however, does not at all disprove my statement.

38	follow	order	of	<i>f</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>g</i>
4	"	"	"	<i>h</i>
17	"	"	"	<i>i</i>
33	"	"	"	<i>j</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>k</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>l</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>m</i>
5	"	"	"	<i>n.</i>

Here, while there are no majorities, 155 simple tenses (class *a*) are transposed, 139 (classes *c* and *d*) follow normal order, while 20 show a mingling.

Of the compound tenses, 69 (classes *b* and *e*) assume normal order, 53 (classes *d* and *f*) show complete transposition, while 64 show a mingling of the two.

(*b*) Before taking up dependent clauses separately, I wish to note the occasional occurrence of transposition in independent clauses. In the *Orosius* this is found most frequently in the so-called progressive forms of the verb, and in such cases the auxiliary follows the verb proper and occupies the extreme end position, thus exhibiting both marks of complete transposition.

and hi þa x gear ymbe þa burg sittende wæron and feoh-
tende 50, 12.

þa folc him betweonum ful x winter þa gewin wraciende
wæron 50, 20.

ac Romane mid hiora cristnam . . . þowiende wæron 64, 10.

Hie þær þa winnende wæron 66, 21.

Hio mid þæm . . . farende wæs 76, 27.

Sona æfter þæm heora þeowas wið þa hlafordas winnende
wæron 86, 29.

Though these progressive verbs employ transposition most consistently, it is not confined to them. When not due to rhetorical causes, an explanation of transposition in independent sentences may often be found in the law of analogy.

(1) The analogy of dependent sentences; (2) The analogy of independent sentences with pronominal datives or accusatives.

(1) and genamon^a anne earmne mon him to consule, þær he on his æcere eode^b, and his sulh on handa hæfde^c, and siþþan to Fulcisci þæm londe ferdon^d, and hie ut forleton^e 88, 7.

In this example, *d* is the verb of an independent clause, yet this verb follows two dependent final verbs (*b* and *c*) and is by analogy, I think, drawn into a final position. The verb *e* is also final and independent, but could not take position before "hie" (its direct object) without violating a sequence which, as before shown, is most consistently observed by Alfred.

Ne wene ic þæt ic hie on þisse bec geendian mæge; ac ic opere anginnan sceal 94, 16.

I do not think that "wene" extends its influence to the second predicate, but rather that the latter is drawn into the dependent (transposed) order by the magnetism of "geendian mæge."

The following is a fine illustrative sentence: he þa wende on þa ane þe him þa getriewe wæron, and heora burg gefor, and þæt folc mid ealle fordyde, and heora hergas towearp, swa he ealle dyde þe he awer mette 112, 36. (Cf. also 160, 30).

(2) By recurring to the citations given in the treatment of pronominal datives and accusatives, pp. 14, 15, and noting how frequently these pre-posed pronouns draw other words with them, one sees that a norm already existed in Alfred's prose for finalizing the verb even in independent sentences. One more citation will suffice:

Hie for þæm hie gebulgon, and þa burg forleton, and mid callum heora fultume Romane sohton 92, 10.

Here "gebulgon," which occupies its usual position, has set the fashion for the two following verbs.

Many similar cases could be given, though I by no means limit the influence of these pronouns to sentences in which they occur in juxtaposition to independent sentences.

(c) The two schemes for dependent sentences given under A. and B. include a count of all classes,—temporal, local, rela-

tive, comparative, clauses of degree, causal, conditional, final and result clauses, concessive, indirect affirmative, indirect interrogative, and indirect imperative. I note no difference in any of these clauses as regards relative frequency or infrequency of transposition, except the three last named, which I reserve for special treatment later on.

As the difference between Alfred's word-order in dependent clauses and that of Ælfric has already been discussed, the following treatment is based wholly on the *Orosius*. In each case the list of introductory particles is exhaustive. As the word-order in the *Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan* is more like that of Ælfric than of Alfred, I shall for each class of clauses give the order peculiar to this portion of the *Orosius*.¹

(1) Temporal clauses: þa, ær, þonne, hwilum . . . þæt, þa hwile þe, oþ, þy . . . þe, siþþan, ær þæm þe, sona swa, gemong þæm þe, mid þæm þe, raþe þæs þe.

No hard and fast line can be drawn between temporal and relative clauses. They are often one and the same (cf. the frequent "þe's" in temporal introductory words), but I regard the clause as temporal whenever the adverbial idea seems more prominent than the adjectival. (It hardly need be said that "þa" and "þonne" often mean "then" not "when," that "þær" often means "there" not "where," and so for other introductory words. In such cases they have nothing to do with dependent clauses, and have already been treated under Inverted Order.)

oþ hie binnan þære byrig up eodon 90, 30.

Gemong þæm þe Pirrus wið Romane winnende wæs 160, 6.
(Cf. also 158, 16; 56, 17; 214, 16.)

The most frequently occurring temporal clause in the *Orosius* is "Ær þæm þe Romeburh getimbred wære" with the number of years. Almost every chapter of every book begins with it or its later substitute "Æfter þæm þe R. getimbred

¹ March (*Gram. of the Ang.-Sax. Lang.*) has based his discussion of Arrangement (p. 214) chiefly on this portion of the *Orosius* and Alfred's prefaces.

wæs." These clauses occur 91 times, and only twice is the order of auxiliary and verb reversed, "wæs getimbred" occurring in 270, 5 and 278, 6.

In *O. and W.* (*Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan*) the tendency is to finalize, but 4 of the 5 compound temporal clauses have aux. + verb instead of verb + aux.

(2) Local clauses: þær, hwær.

hwær þara wigwæгна hweol on gongende wæron 38, 34.

þær nan mon ær ne siþþan mid firde gefaran ne dorste, buton Al. 150, 19 (172, 19; 214, 5).

There is but one example in *O. and W.*: þær hit smalost wære 18, 32.

(3) Relative clauses: þe.

Unless "se, seo, þæt" was clearly relative, I have excluded the clause. The position of the verb in the *Orosius* is the best criterion; but to use this criterion when the position of the verb is the thing sought would, of course, be illogical. When coupled with "þe" it is relative, and often when preceded by a preposition, which "þe" never admits in the *Orosius* (Cf. 164, 23; 174, 9). Nor have I included cases of supposed omitted relatives, for in such cases it is as easy to suppose an omitted demonstrative as an omitted relative (Cf. 96, 10; 170, 31).

þe hy mæst bi libbaþ 30, 10.

þe þæs cristendomes wiþerflitan sint 84, 26 (98, 18; 194, 29).

Of the 16 relative clauses in *O. and W.*, 5 have independent order.

(4) Comparative clauses: þonne.

for þan þe he brycþ swiþor on þone supdæl þonne he do on bone norþdæl 24, 26 (a good example of order influenced by balance).

þonne hio ær wære 40, 25 (210, 24; 220, 16; 222, 1; 224, 33).

There is but one comparative clause in *O. and W.*: þonne ænig man ofer seon mæge 19, 19.

(5) Clauses of degree and manner: swa.

swa hit ær wæs 40, 1.

swa hi mon syþþan het Persi 40, 34.

It is only when "swa" is doubled, "swa . . . swa" or "swa swa," that the clause is properly one of degree rather than manner. E. g. in the following and in all those from *O. and W.*:

gesecgan swa monigfeald yfel swa on þæm þrim gearum gewurdon 128, 20.

Of the 6 in *O. and W.*, 5 follow normal order.

(6) Causal clauses: for þæm, for þæm þe, for þon, for þon þe, þæt (21, 15), nu.

for þon hy hyre nane bysene ær ne cuþan 30, 23.

nu ic longe spell habbe to secgenne 94, 16. (164, 21; 250, 31).

Of the 6 causal clauses in *O. and W.*, 5 have normal order.

(7) Conditional clauses: gyf, gif, buton, swelce, gelicost þæm þe.

buton hie on heora wifa hrif gewiton 54, 4.

swelce hie of oþerre worolde come 92, 31.

(170, 11; 214, 24; 286, 15).

The 2 in *O. and W.* (19, 13; 21, 12) are more transposed than normal.

(8) Final and Result clauses: þæt, to þon þæt.

þæt he eal þæt land mid sweflenum fyre forbærnde 32, 9.

þæt he his modor slege on his bræþer gewrecan mehte, 150, 34. (240, 19; 294, 24).

Only one result clause occurs in *O. and W.* (21, 17); the verb is final, but aux. precedes verb proper, thus producing a mingling of the two norms.

(9) Concessive clauses: þeah, þeah þe, þeh, þeh þe, þa.

þa hio hit þurhteon ne mihte 30, 22.

þeah hit wind oþþe sæs flod mid sonde oferdrifen, 38, 36. (120, 17; 232, 27; 256, 6).

O. and W.: þeah man asette twegen fætels full ealaf oþþe wæteres 21, 15.

(d) The three dependent clauses which I have called indirect affirmative, indirect interrogative, and indirect impera-

tive,—following respectively verbs of saying, asking, and commanding,—differ from all other dependent clauses in having been once independent themselves. They fall therefore under the head of *oratio obliqua*, and are substantives while all other dependent clauses are adverbs or adjectives. This substantival trio shows a frequent tendency to return, in regard to position of words, to its original independence, and thus to dispose its words according to *oratio recta* rather than to the demands of *oratio obliqua*. Of the 500 clauses counted from the *Orosius*, 90 consist of substantival clauses introduced by “*þæt*.” Of these, 44 have compound tenses, 46 simple. Of the simple tenses (see p. 22),

21	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
2	“	“	“	<i>b</i>
9	“	“	“	<i>c</i>
14	“	“	“	<i>d</i>

Of the compound (see p. 22 seq.),

2	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
11	“	“	“	<i>b</i>
17	“	“	“	<i>c</i>
7	“	“	“	<i>d</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>e</i>
3	“	“	“	<i>f</i>
1	“	“	“	<i>g</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>h</i>
1	“	“	“	<i>i</i>
2	“	“	“	<i>j</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>k</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>l</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>m</i>
0	“	“	“	<i>n</i>

Thus it is seen that a minority of these “*þæt*” clauses fall in the predominating classes of dependent clauses, viz., *a* for

simple tenses, *d* and *f* for compound; while the majority are found in those classes which, with more or less faithfulness, follow the normal instead of the transposed order.

As was to be expected, the tendency in oratio obliqua clauses to revert to the normal order is far more marked in the *Homilies* than in the *Orosius*. Of the 500 clauses counted from the *Homilies*, 96 consist of substantival "þæt" clauses. Of these, 50 have simple tenses, 46 compound. Of the simple tenses,

13	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
7	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
15	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
15	"	"	"	<i>d</i>

Of the compound,

0	follow	order	of	<i>a</i>
8	"	"	"	<i>b</i>
7	"	"	"	<i>c</i>
2	"	"	"	<i>d</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>e</i>
7	"	"	"	<i>f</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>g</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>h</i>
9	"	"	"	<i>i</i>
11	"	"	"	<i>j</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>k</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>l</i>
0	"	"	"	<i>m</i>
1	"	"	"	<i>n</i>

The existence, then, of this group of substantival clauses, but especially the indirect affirmative clauses, which even in Alfred's time resisted transposition and reverted to their original normal order, was, I believe, an important though hitherto overlooked factor in the ultimate disappearance of transposi-

tion and the triumph of the normal order in all dependent clauses. The frequency of these "þæt" clauses is attested by the figures just given, 90 in the *Orosius*, 96 in the *Homilies*. No other dependent clause approaches this ratio.

Briefly stated, then, the leading difference between the word order in Anglo-Saxon and that in Middle English or Modern English is found in the frequent transposition occurring in Anglo-Saxon dependent clauses. But this transposition had already, even in the period of Early West-Saxon, begun to show signs of decay, and, in the Late West-Saxon period, was fast disappearing. This was due, I think, chiefly to the following three causes: (1) The greater simplicity of the normal order; (2) The norm set by independent clauses and the consequent levelling of dependent clauses under this norm; (3) The norm set by indirect affirmative clauses, which gradually spread to other dependent clauses.

The introduction of Norman French only consummated these influences.

Ries, p. 66 (see p. 5), finds that in the *Héliand* indirect affirmative clauses take the normal order, provided the introductory word be omitted; and Erdmann, p. 194 (see p. 19), remarks that, "Im Mhd. und Nhd. haben solche sätze stets die einfache Wortstellung nach Typus 1: ich weiss, er lohnt es ihm." This corroborates the view that I have been urging, yet, in many cases at least, the clause ought not to be considered dependent when "þæt" is omitted, the omission serving rather as an evidence that the thraldom of the verb of saying has ceased to be felt. The author has taken the narrative into his own hands. In the *Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan*, for example, if "sæde" be as exacting as the Latin "dixit," one would have to consider no clause independent except the few that have this very "sæde" for their predicate. This is clearly not the case. When I speak, therefore, of "þæt" clauses, I mean those clauses preceded by "þæt" expressed, not understood.

(1) Substantival "þæt" clauses:

3

þæt hi gesawon mannes blod agoten 30, 8.

þæt wæs þæt forme þæt hyra wæter wurdon to blode 36, 25.

The preceding sentence is the first of the ten plagues. Throughout them all the normal order is preserved.

þæt hit wæs Godes stihung 252, 29.

þæt hio wære mid gimstanum gefrætwed 252, 27.

þæt hie woldon þa onwaldas forlætan 280, 20.

þæt he hine mehte lædan þurh þæt westen 286, 16. (For transposed order, see 128, 5; 174, 24; 244, 17.)

Of the 15 "þæt" clauses in *O. and W.*, but one transposes:

þæt he ealra Norþmonna norþmest bude 17, 1.

(2) Indirect interrogative clauses:

hu, for hwy, hwy, hwær, hwele, hweper:

to gesecgenne hu monege gewin siþþan wæron betuh M. and C. and S. 52, 8.

on hu micelre dysignesne men nu sindon on þeosan cristen-dome 136, 17.

for hwy hie noldon geþencan ealle þa brocu 224, 27. (For transposed order see 164, 28; 202, 33; 260, 6.)

There are but 3 such sentences in *O. and W.*, all with simple final verbs.

(3) Indirect imperative clauses: þæt:

He biddende wæs þæt hie and Lac. mosten wið Persum sumne ende gewyrca 82, 22.

bædan þæt him mon sealde ænne cucne mon 102, 28.

onbudon þæt he come mid feawum monnum to Rome 240, 2.

bebead þæt hie simle gegripen þæs liegendan feos 260, 31. (For transposition see 82, 21; 98, 14; 164, 27; 176, 2; 178, 18.)

No imperative clauses occur in *O. and W.*

The last two classes of sentences, (2) and (3), do not follow the normal order as consistently as do indirect affirmative clauses. It is to be remembered that these two classes had not the same original order in *oratio recta* that the affirmative clause had. *E. g.* "He cwæð þæt he bude on," etc., was

originally "Ic bue on" = normal order. But "Lucinius bebead þæt nan cristen mon ne come on," etc., was originally "Ne come nan cristen mon on," etc. = inverted order. So also the interrogative clause was originally inverted. All had their verbs, therefore, near or at the beginning of the sentence and thus are fortified, as it were, against transposition; but the original affirmative norm proved most potent, for it had both subject and predicate already in the normal order, while the two latter classes had to re-invert before assuming the normal order.

(4) A fourth cause that operates against transposition is the tendency to bring modifying and modified words as closely together as possible. This can occur only when the second dependent clause modifies some word in the first other than the predicate. The disturbance is thus limited practically to relative and comparative clauses.

Relative clauses :

for þon þe se cyning ne gemunde þara monigra teonena þe hiora ægþer gedyde 52, 21.

Here "gemunde," the predicate of the first dependent clause, could not take its usual order in the *Orosius* without separating "teonena" and "þe," modified and modifying words (cf. also 112, 24; 196, 18; 258, 27; 296, 23).

Comparative clauses :

and for ðon þe sio sunne þær gæð near on setl þonne on oðrum lande 24, 17. Here, for the same reason as above, "gæþ" could not come between "setl" and "þonne" without separating two intimately connected ideas (cf. 52, 1; 192, 28; 192, 33).

(5) Another dependent clause which violates the usual final position of the verb in the *Orosius* is the relative clause having as its predicate some form of "hatan." The complementary noun ends the sentence "þe man hæst Euxinus" being the norm and not "þe man Eux. hæst." In the first 28 pages of the *Orosius*, the geographical portion, in which this clause most frequently occurs, there are 58 instances of "þe" with

“hatan,” and in 44 of these the normal order is used instead of the transposed. Cf. also the invariable “þe oþre noman hatte” with the noun added. E. g. “þe oþre noman hatte Curtius” 102, 30.

In a portion of the *Homilies* equal to the *Orosius*, the relative clause with “hatan” occurs 32 times; 30 of these follow the Alfredian type and thus resist transposition.

(6) Instead of the transposed or normal order, inversion is sometimes found in dependent clauses and is produced by the same causes that produce it elsewhere; viz., by some sentence member, other than the subject, following the introductory particle. It is not of frequent occurrence in the *Orosius* or the *Homilies*.

þonne þær biþ man deað 20, 20.

þæt þær com haġol 38, 8.

oþ þara Persea wæs unġemetlic wæl ġeslæġen 80, 25.

þætte on anre dune neah Romebyrig tohlað seo eorþe, and wæs byrnende fyr up of þære eorþan 160, 23.

(7) When there are many verbal modifiers, or when the idea contained in the verb is distributed (as by “ge . . . ge,” “ne . . . ne”), the verb prefers a medial position and often immediately follows the subject.

ġif hie ġemunan willað hiora ieldrena unclænnessa, and heora wolġewinna, and hiora moniġfealdan unsibbe, and hiora unmilt sunġe þe hie, etc. 64, 14.

The predicate might have been placed after the first or second of these objects, but could hardly have occupied a final position. The relative clause (see p. 35) is also a disturbing element in the above sentence.

buton þæm þe mon oft herġeade æġþer ġe on hie selfe ġe on heora land æt ham 90, 25.

swa . . . þæt hie naþer næfdon siþþan ne heora namon ne heora anweald 98, 7. (Cf. also 98, 22; 184, 2; 190, 7; 240, 28; for this principle as well as the disturbing influence of a relative clause, see 38, 9; 82, 18.)

These seven cases, then, are the leading instances in which both Alfred and Ælfric most consistently reject the transposed order in dependent sentences. Most of them are general causes, applicable to all Anglo-Saxon prose, and thus constitute links in the chain of influences which more and more circumscribed the sphere of the transposed order and extended that of the normal, or more natural and logical, order.

(e) In the *Orosius*, pronominal datives and accusatives precede the subject of the dependent clause as frequently as they follow it, there being no prevailing norm.

Pronouns precede subject :

oþ him Pilatus onbead 254, 23.

þæt hiene monige for god hæfde 254, 24.

oþ him þa biscepas sædon 114, 3.

oþ þæt him on se miccla firenlust on innan aweox 32, 8.

þeah hit wind oþþe sæs flod mid sonde oferdrifen 38, 36.

swa hit Gaius geþoht hæfde 258, 19.

Pronouns follow subject :

þæt ic hie . . . geendian mæge 94, 17.

þe þa Finnas him gyldaþ 18, 16.

þe he him onwinnende wæs 30, 5.

oþ hie him þær eard genamon 44, 27.

þætte þa earman wifmen hie swa tintredon 48, 13.

þeh þe hie hit openlice cyþan ne dorsten 232, 27.

In the *Homilies*, these datives and accusatives follow the subject more often than they precede it. Here, as in every case, the *Homilies* mark an advance toward a freer and more natural order, in this case the order found in independent sentences. Out of 72 datives, 52 come between the subject and the verb, 20 precede the subject. Out of 98 accusatives, not one precedes its subject.

A peculiarity of the *Orosius*, not shared by the *Homilies*, is the invariable position of the indefinite "mon" after pronominal datives and accusatives.

þæt hie mon oferswiþan mehte 160, 4.

hwæper hiene mon . . . gefieman mehte 192, 15.

Ac þa hit mon to him brohte 242, 18.

þæt him mon sealde ænne cucne mon 102, 28.

þe him mon gebed 94, 27.

þæt him mon geswicen hæfde 52, 6.

for þæm þe him mon . . . forwiernde 78, 9.

Cf. these with "þæt mon þa þeowas freode," in which the object is not a pronoun but a noun.

INDEX.

I. INTRODUCTION.	PAGE.
(a) Previous investigations.....	5
(b) Purpose of paper.....	7
(c) Influence of Latin.....	8
(d) Definition of terms.....	10
II. NORMAL ORDER.	
(a) Simple and Compound tenses.....	11
(b) Datives { (1) Substantival.....	13
(2) Pronominal.....	14
(c) Accusatives { (1) Substantival.....	15
(2) Pronominal.....	15
(d) Pronominal objects in imperative clauses.....	16
III. INVERSION.	
(a) In general.....	16
(b) { By a word.....	18
By a phrase.....	18
By a clause.....	18
(c) To express:	
(1) Condition.....	20
(2) Concession.....	20
(3) Interrogation.....	20
(4) Command.....	20
IV. TRANSPOSITION.	
(a) Counter influence of French.....	21
(b) Transposition in independent clauses.....	26
(c) Dependent clauses separately treated.....	27
(d) Disturbing influences in transposition.....	30

ORDER OF WORDS IN ANGLO-SAXON.

39

	PAGE.
(1) Indirect affirmative clauses.	
(2) Indirect interrogative clauses. }	33
(3) Indirect imperative clauses. }	
(4) Relative and comparative clauses.....	35
(5) Relative clauses with "hatan".....	35
(6) Inversion in dependent clauses.....	36
(7) Multiplicity of verbal modifiers.....	36
(e) Pronominal datives and accusatives.....	37

LIFE.

I was born in Greensboro, N. C., May 28, 1864. After attending several private schools and the Greensboro Graded School, I entered Davidson College, N. C., in September of 1880, from which institution I received the degree of A. B. in 1884, receiving also the Society medal and the Bingham medal for special work in English. After pursuing, under the direction of Dr. W. S. Currell, the prescribed A. M. course in English, I received that degree from my alma mater in 1887. At that time I was Principal of the Selma Academy, Johnston Co., N. C.; this position I resigned in 1889 to pursue graduate courses in English, History, and German at the Johns Hopkins University, where I have since remained. In 1890 I was here appointed Assistant in English, and during the following two years have conducted the undergraduate (P. H. E.) classes in English Composition and Rhetoric.

To all of my instructors, and especially to Dr. Bright, to whom this paper owes its inception, I take pleasure in expressing a grateful sense of appreciation and indebtedness, not only for helpful guidance in study, but equally for the kindly sympathy and unfailing courtesy that have marked their relations to me.

CHARLES ALPHONSO SMITH.

May 26, 1893.



32101 071984932

