



Myers, Sara Mae (2009) *The evolution of the genitive noun phrase in early Middle English*. MPhil(R) thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/514/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

The Evolution of the Genitive Noun Phrase in Early Middle English
Sara Mae Myers
Thesis submitted for Master of Philosophy
University of Glasgow
Department of English Language
September 2008

© Sara Myers 2008

Abstract

This paper looks at the evolution of the genitive noun phrase in early Middle English texts. Through an examination of six texts, representing three different regions and their separate textual traditions, I explore the development of genitive noun phrases, both in form and function. Each text is examined independently; early Middle English writing shows great dialectal variation, and each dialect, often each scribe, has a unique genitive system. It is through these individual "micro-systems" that we can see the details of the development of the genitive noun phrase, details which show that the genitive noun phrase did not develop uniformly throughout the country, but that speakers had several options for re-interpreting or replacing the Old English genitive constructions.

I begin with the West Midlands, represented by *The Lambeth Homilies* and Layamon's *Brut*. It was in this region that the tradition of copying and studying Old English texts was maintained the longest, and here that the effects the Old English standard can still be seen even in the early thirteenth century. From here I move to the East Midlands, to *The Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations and *Vices and Virtues*. Unlike the other texts in this study, these two texts do not have a known source text; as such, they are invaluable for seeing how scribes wrote in their own native dialect. I finish with two texts from Kent, *The Kentish Sermons* and *The Ayenbite of Inwit*. These are translations of Old French texts, and as such are an excellent source for the possible influences of French upon the English genitive noun phrase.

Within these texts, some of the issues I examine include: the gradual restriction of the genitive singular inflection; the very varied plural genitive forms; the rise in *of*-phrases; the decline of modifier genitive functions, and with them modifier genitive forms; the influence of a source text; and the non-genitive replacements of former genitive constructions. While there are some features which are common to all texts (such as the use of *-es* as the genitive singular inflection), there are many which are peculiar to a single scribe (such as the use of the pronoun *his* rather than *-es* or *of*), and which show how complex language change can be. There is no single genitive path along which all speakers went.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	4
II.	West Midlands	11
	<i>The Lambeth Homilies</i>	12
	<i>Layamon's Brut</i>	21
III.	East Midlands	30
	<i>The Peterborough Chronicle</i> Continuations	31
	<i>Vices and Virtues</i>	40
IV.	Kent	46
	<i>The Kentish Sermons</i>	47
	<i>The Ayenbite of Inwit</i>	54
V.	Conclusion	60
	Appendix	64
	Bibliography	81

I. Introduction

This paper is an exploration of the development of the genitive noun phrase in early Middle English. My focus will be on what I call the micro-system: a localized, individual system. Given the diversity of written forms found in eME texts, such micro-systems may vary greatly between regions or even between texts. By focusing on the genitive system of texts individually, I hope to show not only the general patterns of the period, but also that the evolution of the genitive was not a uniform process, but one which could vary considerably between and within dialects.

To fully understand the genitive noun phrase, one must consider the changes in inflection of nouns and modifiers, singular and plural, as well as the rise of the genitive *of*-phrase; one must also take into account the occasional shift to non-genitive constructions. To this end I examine six texts, representing three regions and three textual traditions. All these texts come from the eME period, a time of transition between Old English (OE) and ME, a time of momentous changes in the language structure, vocabulary, and social position. An important factor to consider at this transitional period is language contact; how did OE and Old French (OF) affect the development of the ME genitive construction? The issue of translation is closely connected to language contact; how a scribe chooses to translate a foreign genitive is an important source of information on the how eME speakers thought about the genitive, in other languages as well as their own.

1.1 Why the Genitive?

Why research the evolution of the genitive noun phrase in Middle English? It has a fascinating internal history, which relates to the larger patterns of the decline of nominal inflectional morphology. Many of the OE genitive functions have a syntactic replacement or alternative, similar to the development of other cases. However, only the genitive has left a productive morpheme in ModE, 's. As it is the only case to survive, it is the only one to co-exist with its alternate construction, the periphrastic *of*-phrase. This combination of preservation and innovation makes the evolution of the genitive unique.

Another reason to examine the development of the genitive noun phrase is that this particular construction is often overlooked. Perhaps because the *-es* is fairly consistent, unlike dative singular *-e*, and of traceable origin, unlike *she*, it has been thought less interesting than these issues. While *of* is treated more extensively, there seems to be a too ready willingness to ascribe it simply to the influence of French and Latin *de*. Strang does observe that “rivalry between these two modes of expression [formal inflection and phrasal *of*] to this day leaves some areas of unclear usage” (Strang 1970: §153). The standard histories of English tend to devote more space to French effects upon the lexicon than grammatical change; *A History of the English Language* devotes twelve sections to French influence on vocabulary, and only one to all the developments of the noun (Baugh and Cable 1993: §113, §123-34).

It is perhaps too much to expect that an author attempting to give a comprehensive description of the entire history of English would devote much attention to a question that, with a little simplifying, seems so straightforward. In comparison, Mustanoja, choosing to narrow his focus, treats the subject of the genitive more fully. Like Strang, he notes that the new uses of the originally locative preposition *of* “differ little or not at all from many functions of the inflected genitive” (Mustanoja 1960: 74).

Mustanoja also notes that, while the development of Romance *de* parallels that of ME *of*, the same process can be observed in other Germanic languages, such as Swedish and German. (Nor is the French development the only option open to Romance languages; Modern Italian has two separate prepositions, *da* 'from' and *di* 'of'.) Mustanoja offers a fuller discussion of the development of the formal inflection, discussing endless genitive singulars, and the differing development of the plural in different dialects.

Although Mustanoja's *Middle English Syntax* is the most thorough discussion, it cannot be an exhaustive treatment if "attention can be paid only to such morphological features as have an obvious bearing upon contemporary syntactical usage" (Mustanoja 1960: 71). Although not explicit, Mustanoja's criteria seems to be shared by other writers. And so a detailed description of the evolution of both the inflected and periphrastic genitive in Early Middle English is still lacking, even though the thirteenth century was the time when these constructions underwent the most decisive changes.

1.2 Research Questions

In order to follow the development of the genitive noun phrase, the following questions need to be answered for each text:

- What are the forms of the inflectional endings?
- How are nouns and modifiers marked?
- What are the non-inflectional genitive constructions?
- What are the genitive functions?
- What is the role played by language contact?

In addition, for each text there may be sub-questions of these, such as possible differences between singular and plural, or the influence of a source text. Since the focus of this paper is on micro-systems, which are by definition very individual, each text will present its own (potentially) unique set of genitive issues. By answering the questions which are common to all texts, as well as any text-specific questions, it will be possible to describe the genitive system of each text. After doing this for every text, I hope to be able to discuss the processes involved in the evolution of the genitive NP throughout the eME period.

1.3 Definition of Terms

To discuss the development of the genitive noun phrase in early Middle English, it will be useful to define some of the key terms.

Genitive a case; "very broadly...the genitive modifies or limits a word (usually a noun) by associating it with something. ...the genitive case is like an adjective, limiting the reference of the word it is associated with" (Baker 2003: 37). In 'the king's' sword, 'king' modifies 'sword' - it specifies which particular sword is being referred to. (Mitchell's description of the OE genitive forms and functions appears in 1.7.)

Periphrasis "the use of separate WORDS instead of INFLECTIONS to express the same grammatical relationship" (Crystal 2003: 344). In ModE, 'the house **of** the dog' is a periphrastic genitive, while 'the dog's house' is an inflectional genitive.

Early Middle English (eME) Since English was constantly evolving, and different dialects underwent changes at different periods, the limits of eME cannot be

- sharply marked off at beginning and end, but must be flexible in order to accommodate the synchronic variation between dialects. My texts cover a period of approximately 200 years, from 1122-1340. This roughly corresponds to Laing's designation of the approximate period 1150-1300 (Laing 1993: 1).
- Dialect "A regionally or socially distinctive VARIETY of language, identified by a particular set of WORDS and GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES" (Crystal 2003: 136). "ME is, *par excellence*, the dialectal phase of English" (Strang 1970: §127); dialectal variation is a central concern in investigating any aspect of ME.
- Micro-system A localized, individual grammatical system, as represented by the usage of a single text/scribe. Middle English was a time of great grammatical change, but these changes did not occur overnight in a single, uniform shift. In shifting from the OE to eME, speakers created a variety of systems to fill their communicative needs. In the absence of a national standard, the written evidence from this period shows the great variety of coping strategies.
- Form "In its most general sense, it refers to the abstract PHONOLOGICAL and/or GRAMMATICAL characterization of language, as opposed to its MEANING" (Crystal 2003: 185). In OE, for example, the *-es* ending is a genitive *form*.
- Function "The relationship between a linguistic FORM and other parts of the linguistic pattern or SYSTEM in which it is used" (Crystal 2003: 191). 'Possession' is one of the *functions* for which the form *-es* could be used in OE.
- Language Contact "[L]anguage contact is the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time. ... non-trivial [-] at least some people use more than one language" (Thomason 2001: 1). In Medieval England this includes contact between the English dialects, with Norman French, and also with Francien, the central French dialect centered on Paris, as well as Latin.
- Translation "The action or process of turning from one language into another; also, the product of this; a version in a different language" (OED); this is 'interlingual translation'. The updating of OE into eME is 'intralingual translation', or the act of translating between two versions of the same language (Hatim and Munday 2004: 5).

As with the research questions, there may be some terms which only appear in the discussion of a particular text; if so, these will be addressed in the regional introductions or in the discussion of particular text.

1.4 Methodology

To answer the questions posed in 1.2, I analyze six texts: *The Lambeth Homilies*, La3amon's *Brut*, *The Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations, *Vices and Virtues*, *The Kentish Sermons*, *The Ayenbite of Inwit*. These texts not only reflect the dialectal diversity of Middle English, but also the variety of textual traditions, which are an important factor in understanding the texts and possible influences on how the scribe/author uses the genitive. *Lambeth* and La3amon represent the West Midlands, an area in which the Norman influence was less immediate than in other parts of the country; OE texts continued to be copied and studied into the thirteenth century. The Continuations and *Vices & Virtues* are eastern texts, and represent an area in which the development of English writing was perhaps the least influenced by outside languages.

The *Sermons* and *Ayenbite* are Kentish, from Canterbury, an area in which Norman influence came early, and both these texts are translations of Old French originals. As a control and as the basis for late West Saxon usage I use the British Library Royal 7 c. xii MS of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (ed. Godden).

Due to the constraints imposed by the scope of this paper, I do not use the entire text, but rather a selection of approximately 3000 words. While not exhaustive, selections of this length returned a sufficient number of examples of genitive noun phrases to make generalizations, and had the added advantage of providing roughly the same amount of data for texts which in their entirety vary greatly in total length. Each text must be analyzed individually, since the system of any given scribe may vary from that of any other scribe. In addition to not using entire texts, I do not use every example with a genitive form or with *of*; I do not use pronominal forms, as pronoun development has a very separate history to that of nouns and modifiers.

The initial step is simple: to read through the selections and detail every genitive noun phrase. These phrases were categorized by type (inflection or periphrasis), number (singular or plural), and function (possession, adverb, measure, etc.). Categories of function are more fluid than categories of type and number, with potential overlap between the different functions. I consider the questions posed in section 1.2, and also other genitive issues/constructions which pertain to the specific text under examination, for example the occasional examples of a compound noun replacing a former genitive NP. From this I should be able to reconstruct (to at least a limited extent) the micro-system of each text, with the forms and functions which each scribe had for the genitive NP. *of*-phrases offer a special challenge: not every phrase with *of* is a genitive, and it can often be difficult to make exact divisions between the OE use 'from' and the ME genitive.

For translations I also analyze the corresponding section of the original version, and compare the source genitive constructions with the way in which the Middle English scribe chooses to translate these. La3amon's translation style is not as "close" as some of the others; rather than compare the ME text to the OF original, I compare the two surviving manuscript versions. I follow a similar process with *The Peterborough Chronicle*, sometimes comparing the Continuations with a slightly earlier section, which was copied in the West Saxon dialect. In addition to comparing corresponding genitive NPs, it is equally (perhaps more) important to compare those cases in which one text has a genitive construction and the other does not.

1.5 Texts and Traditions

West Midlands Due in part to the long and active tenure of Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester, Norman influence in the Church came slower to this part of the country. (Since literary production was largely the province of clerics, the impact of the Conquest on the Church is particularly important.) The copying of OE manuscripts continued longer in this area than elsewhere, and direct influence of the West Saxon standard is most evident in texts from this region. I have chosen two thirteenth century texts, *The Lambeth Homilies* and Layamon's *Brut* (Otho and Caligula MSS). These texts show the continued influence of Old English in the early Middle English period; *Lambeth* is an updating of various late Old English homilies, and Layamon is famous for his attempt to "recreate" Old English. Innovations, reproductions, and mistakes all provide information

on how the genitive NP had changed since the time of Ælfric.

The East Midlands The history of the East Midlands after the Conquest is murky. There was considerable unrest, not so much because of organized rebellion as because the fens provided an ideal base for individual malcontents in times of political unrest. Fewer texts survive from this region than the other two. To represent the eastern dialects I use *The Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations and *Vices and Virtues*. These texts are original English compositions, without an exemplar from another source. While in content and format they may be influenced by other models, they are not versions of another text, but rather native compositions in the authors' own dialects.

Kent Kent has long been considered the most conservative of the ME dialects in terms of morphology. Kent's location, and the importance of Canterbury, made it a natural area of focus for the Norman invaders. Kent's location in the extreme southeast of England made it a convenient crossing point for invaders from France; the battle between William and Harold occurred on the border of modern Kent and East Sussex. In addition to its geographical convenience, Kent is also the location of Canterbury, whose archbishop was the highest ranking in England. As I mentioned above when discussing the West Midlands, the situation of the Church is particularly important for this discussion, and so it is of great importance that Canterbury experienced an early "invasion" of Continental clerics, who brought their own scribal traditions to the see. The two texts from this region, *The Kentish Sermons* and *The Aeynbite of Inwit*, are translations of Old French works, and are localized/localizable to Canterbury. Translations such as these are valuable for my topic, because how the scribe/author chooses to translate genitive constructions tells us much about how well he understood the genitive and how he would express it in English. They are also invaluable for seeing to what extent of OF *de* influenced ME *of*.

1.6 Language Contact and Translation

"After the Norman Conquest the way languages were used in England became extraordinarily complex, primarily because of the introduction of French as a spoken language and the decline of Old English as a written one" (Clanchy 1979: 151).

"The scribal traditions of three schools conflicted - English, French, and Latin...most disconcerting" (Pope 1952: §1205).

"After the Conquest, following Continental practice, Latin began to replace English as the standard language of government and of literature...during the first half of the thirteenth century French had become a literary language of high social status" (Laing 1993: 2).

Strange as it may sound, I have chosen to focus on this period in the history of English precisely because it is "extraordinarily complex" and "disconcerting". The co-existence of three scribal traditions means that the literate groups were coming into contact with multiple languages. Inevitably, due to the shifting social positions of the languages, works composed in one language would be translated into one (or both) of the other two which were in use. Translation is the written evidence of the contact between

languages, yet I believe it has been largely overlooked as a source of information about the changes which English underwent, and about the possible impact of other languages (OE and OF in this discussion). How a scribe chooses to translate a genitive NP in another language into his own eME dialect can tell us much about how that scribe understood and represented the genitive.

1.7 Old English Genitive

To understand where English is going in the eME period, it is necessary to know where it has been. I therefore include a brief overview of the OE genitive forms and functions.

Forms (Mitchell 1968: Ch. 3)

	masculine	feminine	neuter	plural
strong nouns	<i>stanes</i>	<i>giefe</i>	<i>wordes</i>	<i>stana</i>
weak nouns	<i>naman</i>	<i>sunnan</i>	<i>eagan</i>	<i>namena</i>
strong adjective	<i>tiles</i>	<i>tilre</i>	<i>tilis</i>	<i>tilra</i>
weak adjective	<i>tilan</i>	<i>tilan</i>	<i>tilan</i>	<i>tilena, tilra</i>
demonstrative	<i>þæs</i>	<i>þære</i>	<i>þæs</i>	<i>þara</i>

This table covers the majority of possible genitive constructions; there are also minor nouns classes; while most of these are use the above endings, there are nouns, such as *fæder* 'father' which have no overt genitive marker. There is also the small class of *u*-stem nouns which have genitive singular in *-a*, which is identical to the plural form. If we include the unmarked option, there are eleven forms for the constituents of a genitive NP.

Functions

"Classifying and defining the various uses of the genitive offers many problems" (Mitchell 1985: §1264). The genitive can be used with nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and verbs. The most frequent uses are:

possessive This is the use for actual possession, but is often used in a more figurative sense (Baker 2003: 37, Mitchell 1985: §1269). A modern example is 'St. Patrick's Day', in which St. Patrick does not *possess* March 17, but there is a sense that the day *belongs* to him.

partitive "The whole collection of things to which a particular thing or subset of things belongs" (Baker 2003: 37). Modern examples are 'one of the apples', 'all of the children'.

descriptive This use "attributes a quality to a thing" (Baker 2003: 37), such as 'a watch of gold', 'fool's gold'.

measure This use combines elements of the partitive and descriptive, and is used to indicate the number of a unit of measure, such as 'three miles', 'one hundred men'.

In addition, the genitive can occur independently as an adverb.

It must be remembered that the boundaries between these categories can sometimes be fluid, with different interpretations possible for a given phrase, and some

overlap between different functions. It is this overlap which accounts for the “many problems” in defining genitive uses.

OE functional equivalents

Even in OE there were alternative constructions which could perform the same function as the inflected genitive. The one of greatest interest for this paper is the preposition *of*. In OE this meant 'from, out of, of', and is generally used with the dative case. "There is no doubt that the genitive and *of* + the dative overlapped in some functions, e.g. origin and material" (Mitchell 1985: §1203). This overlap becomes significant when attempting to decide whether a particular eME use represents innovation, French influence, or the “natural” development of an OE construction.

Other functional equivalents include: the declined possessive; **genitive forms of personal pronouns and demonstratives**; dative of possession; other nominal case forms; **prepositional phrases**; adverbs; **compound nouns**; compound adjectives (Mitchell 1985: §1344). The equivalents which are in bold are of particular importance for this paper.

II. The West Midlands

Introduction

As I mentioned in 1.5, it was in the West Midlands that the influence and traditions of OE were maintained the longest after the Conquest. Even in the fourteenth century, the *Gawain* poet appears to have been more influenced by OE poetry than the newer forms found in London. This preservation of "Englishness" is rightly attributed to the long tenure of Wulfstan as bishop of Worcester. At this time learning and the writing of manuscripts was the province of the Church, so the makeup of the Church is quite important when considering the texts. Despite his reputation as a simple saint, Wulfstan was a learned and competent cleric; one doubts that a simple man would have remained in office under the Conqueror's reforms. In addition to his personal high level of education, Wulfstan was devoted to his see, constantly travelling to all parts of it, preaching and overseeing the well-being of his flock (Barlow 1999: 29). The old traditions "found defenders in the monastic antiquarian reaction which maintained English ways in the face of the Norman conquerors. Those monastic houses like Worcester ... were most concerned to preserve a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon" (Clanchy 1979: 166). While there is no evidence of distinct anti-Norman feeling, there does seem to have been a sympathetic feeling for the old ways, perhaps as looking back to a more "golden age".

demonstrative A word "serving to point out or indicate the particular thing referred to" (OED). In OE, the forms of *se*, which are the ancestors of our modern definite article 'the', are more accurately described as a simple demonstrative, since they include the meanings of modern 'the' and 'that'.

common case "The unmarked form of a word" (Crystal 2003: 84); in ModE this can be used to describe all non-genitive singular nouns, which are not inflected according to their function.

The Lambeth Homilies

1. Introduction

1.1 The Text

The *Lambeth Homilies* is a collection of homilies preserved in MS Lambeth 487 (L), written on the border of Herefordshire and Shropshire in the early thirteenth century (Laing 1993: 111). According to Morris, whose edition I use, it is a compilation of homilies from eleventh century documents. For this essay I examine *In Die Pentecosten*, which is a Middle English adaptation of Ælfric's *In Die Sancto Pentecosten*, from the First Series of Catholic Homilies, as found in MS Royal C.xiii (R) (ed. Godden).

1.2 Ælfric

Ælfric first composed his *Catholic Homilies* while at Cerne Abbas. Originally for his personal use as a mass priest, he later issued them as a source of preaching material for general use by the clergy. That the homilies were popular is shown by the large number of manuscripts which survive. Godden lists 21 main manuscripts, two which contain little of Ælfric's work, and eleven fragmentary texts (Clemoes 1997: xvii). These range from Ælfric's own lifetime, the 990's (British Library MS Royal C.xii), to the beginning of the thirteenth century (British Library MS Cotton Vespasian A.xxii). The earliest, Royal C.xii, not only bears alterations in the author's own hand, but also in hands of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, indicating that Ælfric continued to be studied throughout the Old English period and into early Middle English.

I use the Royal MS as a control, a guideline for Classical West Saxon usage, as this manuscript is closest to the author's original. I use Ælfric's writing as my guide for West Saxon, and by extension OE, genitive usage. Ælfric is representative of the standard Late West Saxon dialect, but it is crucial to remember that other dialects may have had slightly different rules, especially with the rise of dialectal writing in the ME period. There is always a possibility that a departure from Ælfric's system does not represent an innovation in ME, but an inherited difference from an OE dialect.

A caveat: while the Royal MS is an excellent guide for Classical West Saxon usage, it is not the Lambeth scribe's exemplar; Lambeth's exemplar is unknown. It is always possible that divergences between these two versions are due to the interference of intervening manuscripts. The two versions are nonetheless quite similar, and if we bear in mind the possible effects of intervening versions, we can still use the R and L versions to follow the evolution of the genitive in early ME.

1.3 Old English in the Thirteenth Century and the Nature of the Lambeth Version

We know that OE manuscripts continued to be used in the early ME period, as scribes continued to correct or otherwise mark these manuscripts. The most famous such scribe is the tremulous hand of Worcester, whose early attempts to update OE works (before switching to Latin glosses) Franzen describes as "transliterating and, when necessary, translating the Old English into early Middle English" (Franzen 1991: 22). The Lambeth scribe seems to have adopted a similar approach, sometimes updating, sometimes replacing items. Both processes can be applied to the same word:

- (1) R *ealdan æ* L *alde la3e* 'old law'
- (2) R *moyses æ* L *moyses .e.* 'Moyses' law'

In (1) the scribe replaces the OE word, but in (2) he merely updates the form. Such

examples show the nature of the Lambeth scribe's work; he was following his original fairly closely, but with an eye to writing a text which would be readable to ME speakers. In a brief discussion of the *Lambeth Homilies*, Franzen states these were intended for preaching, and were updated by scribes who may have been unfamiliar with the OE language and script (Franzen 1991: 111). Such possible unfamiliarity must be remembered when considering *Lambeth's* adherence to and departures from the original OE text.

An important issue regarding both the tremulous and Lambeth scribes' re-working of OE texts is the nature of their contact with the older form of the language. Using a somewhat broad definition of language contact from section 1.3, the updating of OE texts into ME does qualify as a contact situation. The real question is to what extent such situations are learned contacts; that is, did the contact between OE and ME "come about solely through education" (Thomason 2001: 20)? Of the tremulous scribe, Franzen concludes that the contact was learned, and "that he went through a clear and methodical learning process in the course of his glossing" (Franzen 1991: 2). A similar contact situation probably existed for the Lambeth scribe, who likely learned his OE through study. There is an important stylistic difference between these two scribes: the tremulous scribe was glossing, whereas the Lambeth scribe was translating/transliterating to produce a continuous text.

2. Nouns

2.1 Singular Nouns

The following table summarizes the scribe's genitive singular endings.

Table 1

-es	82	-an	2
-∅	3	-en	2

The overwhelming preference is for *-es*, derived from the OE strong masculine declension, which is used for the most common functions of OE genitive: possession, measure, partitive, description, object of a verb (not however adverbial), and with any noun, personal, animate, inanimate. The reasons for the emergence of *-es* as the preferred ending are several: the collapse of grammatical gender, the distinctive phonological form of the ending, and the high frequency of strong masculine (and neuter) nouns. These causes combine to make *-es* the most likely candidate for genitive singular endings (Wardale 1949: §95). The other endings found are restricted to possessive uses, and are only found with three nouns:

Table 2

-∅	<i>feder, culfre</i>	'father', 'dove'
-an	<i>wite3an</i> (2x)	'prophet'
-en	<i>culfren</i> (2x)	'dove'

feder is a remnant of the endingless genitive of the OE -r stems (See Introduction 1.7). *culfre* and *wite3an* are discussed in greater depth below. The scribe's use of genitive singular endings shows not just the early preference for the *-es* form, but how quickly this became the dominant, and possibly only, genitive singular ending. Given that he was updating an OE text, it seems likely that his exemplar is the source of the minority forms, and that in his dialect *-es* was the only productive ending.

2.2 Plural Nouns

The scribe's plural genitive system is more complicated than the singular.

Table 3

-a	9	-as	1
-e	1	-an	8
		-en	1

The endings in the first column are derived from OE strong masculine *-a*. The example with *-e*, *egipte londe* 'Egyptians' land', will be discussed further below, but this ending looks to be a ME updating of *-a* (See Franzen 1991: 20). The endings in the second column represent new ME forms, in which the common case is used for all plural functions; like the minority singular endings these are confined to the possessive function, while the *-a* forms can also be used for other functions, such as genitive of measure. Unlike the minority singular endings, which are archaic remnants of the OE system, this group of common case genitives represents innovation. Again unlike the minority singular forms, the innovatory plural endings are not a minority, but as a group are as frequent as the OE-derived endings. As any discussion of ME dialects will mention, in some areas the *-n* plural derived from the weak declension in OE underwent a period of increase (Baugh and Cable 1993: 156). This appears to have been the case with the Lambeth scribe. The choice between the two available endings is not random, but seems to be determined by factors which involve the entire genitive noun phrase, and so will be discussed after an examination of the scribe's modifier system.

2.2.1 Apostles and Other Animate Nouns

A peculiar feature of the genitive plural is that this is the only category in which the n-plural is extended to new, animate nouns. (Excluding the dative plural, where n-forms are the normal development of OE *-um*.) This is most easily seen from the forms of 'apostles.' The form *apostlan* 'apostles' is only found in the genitive. This is true of other animate nouns, such as *monnan* 'men's'. Both words also appear with the historically correct *-a* ending. Why would the scribe allow animate nouns to have n-plurals in the genitive but nowhere else? He may have made a particular connection between the concepts of "genitive" and "animacy".

The animacy of a noun also plays a role in ModE genitive use; Quirk notes that in present usage the choice between inflected and periphrastic genitive is often determined by where the noun ranks on what he terms the "gender scale"; animate, personal nouns are at the top and inanimate nouns at the bottom (Quirk 1973: 96). In a similar way, the scribe may have been making choices based on the relative animacy of the nouns. But as mentioned above, the demonstrative also seems to play a significant role in the choice of ending.

2.3 The Genitive of Measure

The genitive of measure occurs with units of time and nouns which refer to humans. There are seven examples common to both L and R.

Table 4

identical word and inflection	4	L <i>fifti daga</i>	R <i>fiftig daga</i>	'50 days'
different word, same inflection	1	L <i>fif þusend manna</i>	R <i>fif þusend wera</i>	'5000 men'
same word, different inflection	2	L <i>fowerti da3es</i>	R <i>feowertig daga</i>	'40 days'

There is also an L example not found in R: *twa hun manna* '200 men'; this may be interference from the manuscript(s) which came between L and R, as may be the substitution of *manna* for older *wera*.

How well did the L scribe understand the genitive of measure? Seven examples is not enough data to draw firm conclusions, but it seems plausible that this particular use was not an active part of the scribe's grammar. The two examples which are not genitive may be a shift from "genitive of measure" to "accusative of time", a construction which can also be found in R:

- (3) R *we wurpiað þæs gastes tocyme mid lofsangum seofon dagas*
L *we wurðiað þes hal3en gastes to-cume mid loft-songe seofen da3es*
'we praised the holy ghost's coming with hymns for seven days'

The following seems to indicate the L is extending this accusative of time (although this may be another case in which it would perhaps be more accurate to speak of the common case rather than accusative):

- (4) R *he wæs mid gode feowertig daga*
L *he wes mid gode fowerti da3es*
'he was with God for forty days'

As a more marginal use, the genitive of measure would be more susceptible to loss than the possessive. There is also the fact that genitives of measure tend to be plural, and throughout the inflectional system, the plural lost case before the singular. (I have not found any offered explanation for why this happens.)

There is also a possible semantic component to the instability of the genitive of measure. The mere presence of a number could overshadow any need for a noun which was specifically marked for number (as in Modern Welsh, where a noun following a number has the singular form). The famous example of archaic preserved genitive of measure, American English phrases such as 'three foot tall', 'ten mile long', co-exist with common case plurals such as 'three feet tall', 'ten miles long'. Such variation is common between speakers and even within the speech of an individual. For a time measurement the preference is for the singular form: 'three month long trip'. Speakers do not feel the need for a specifically plural form, nor do they interpret these as genitive constructions.

2.4 Syntax

The Lambeth scribe does not post-position genitive phrases. There are a few isolated examples, but these are confined to more marginal, restricted functions, such as after a number or when the genitive noun is functioning as the object of a verb, as in *fondian godes* 'to test God'. For the possessive function, the genitive always precedes its head noun. This is in contrast to the Royal MS, in which a possessive genitive can follow its head noun, as in *ælcum huse þæs egyptiscan folces* 'to each house of the Egyptian people'. The sole example of a possessive genitive being post-positioned in the Lambeth MS is *þes wite3an cwide ioheles* 'the prophet's speech Joel's'. However, this is also the only instance of a noun phrase with more than one genitive noun; *ioheles* may be somewhat appositive in the scribe's use.

3. Modifiers

Table 5 summarizes the scribe's system of marking modifiers in genitive noun phrases.

Table 5

	<u>demonstrative</u>	<u>adjective</u>
singular	<i>þes</i>	-∅, -n, -es
plural	<i>þere, þera, þes</i>	-e, -n, -re

3.1 The demonstrative

The scribe is consistent in his use of forms for the genitive demonstrative. In the singular he never departs from the *þes* form, and in the plural there is only one anomalous form, *þes*. This form however is used with the plural noun *apostlas* which is itself somewhat irregular. Given the consistency of his use, it seems possible that the scribe may still have had genitive articles as part of his living language; if not, he had a good knowledge of their use and meaning, as he always replaces OE singular feminine *þære* with *þes*. While the plural forms could conceivably be a straight transliteration of the OE *þæra* into a Middle English form, when considered in context of the entire noun phrase, I think there is strong evidence that the scribe had complete control of the genitive article.

A note on terms: it is difficult to decide exactly which term is best applied to a word such as *þes*. In OE *se* and its forms are better described as a simple demonstrative, which in the development of ModE is now the definite article *the*. However, in the transitional period of early ME it is often difficult to decide which term is more appropriate. Since the functional distinction between demonstrative and article does not affect the development of the genitive forms, I use the term demonstrative in this discussion given the strong OE influence (in the other texts I use the term article).

3.2 The Adjective

The adjective forms are not connected to the idea of "genitive", but rather reflect the scribe's marking of adjectives for all cases based on strong/weak, singular/plural distinctions; in effect the Lambeth adjectives have not only lost case marking but any concept of "case". Only one of the twelve examples has an *-es* ending, *elches monnes* 'each man's'. Singular adjectives used with the demonstrative tend to have weak *-n*, while those without a demonstrative present are usually unmarked. This demonstrative-adjective relationship is a tendency, not a predictable pattern, as can be seen from the five occurrences of 'the holy ghost's':

þes halie gastes
þes hali3an gastes
þes hal3e gastes
þes hal3en gastes
þes hal3an gastes

Each example has the demonstrative, yet two have *-∅* while three have *-n*, and no two forms are exactly alike. I believe that, in the context of the marked demonstrative and noun, there was no functionally-driven need for a distinct adjectival marker; the phonological collapse of the adjectival endings was not checked by any functional need for those endings.

Unfortunately there are only three examples of an adjective appearing in a genitive plural noun phrase, so it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions from such limited data. The fact that each example has a different form may indicate the relative weakness of *any* ending. As in the singular, there is only one example with a

distinctively genitive form, *alre sunnen* 'of all sins'. This is but the first of many such examples in which 'all' maintains marking longer than any other adjective, and will appear in the system of several other texts.

4. Demonstratives, Nominal Inflection, and Number

The scribe's genitive singular nominal marker is *-es*, which occurs in 94% of the examples. The genitive plural ending is less clear-cut, with *-a* forms and *-n* forms occurring nine times each (I exclude the single anomalous *-as* form.) The need for a distinct genitive marker is closely connected to the use of the demonstrative. It is far more common for a singular noun to appear without the demonstrative than the plural. (possessive genitives only)

Table 6

	<u>singular</u>	<u>plural</u>
with demonstrative	20	10
without demonstrative	59	7

Many nouns, particularly personal ones, never occur with the demonstrative: **þes godes*, **þes cristes*. Intuitively this seems reasonable: a demonstrative serves to specify a noun; personal nouns, especially names, are already specific. (Neither Ælfric nor his later copyists would have needed to specify *which* god they referred to.) Since the demonstrative is so often not present, and adjective marking is not sufficient indication of the function of a noun, the singular genitive noun must be explicitly marked as such.

The demonstrative is more frequent with plural nouns, although at present I can neither offer nor find an explanation for why this should be so. For the plural, where it was more common to have the demonstrative present, there was less need for a specifically genitive marker. The presence or absence of the demonstrative does seem to have a connection to the choice of ending. (The following table only considers possessive constructions, as this is the only function for which both forms are found.)

Table 7

	<u>-a</u>	<u>-n</u>
with demonstrative	1	8
without demonstrative	4	1

Based on these numbers, it seems that *-a* is the marked ending, while *-n* tends to occur as an unmarked, or common case, form used in conjunction with the demonstrative. This shows one possible way in which the common plural could have come to be used in place of the genitive form: unmarked noun forms are used in conjunction with marked modifiers, and so meaning is not lost. In addition to the forms with demonstratives, there is also one example of the *-n* form used with a marked genitive plural adjective: *alre sunnen for3ifenesse* 'forgiveness of all sins'. This would seem to be further support for the theory that a marked modifier was capable of carrying the functional load, rather than the noun. This is similar to the relationship between demonstratives and weak adjectives in OE, where the presence of a distinctive marked demonstrative removed the need for a distinct marked strong adjective (Mitchell 1968: §62).

As I mentioned in 3.1, the connections between demonstrative and nominal inflection in the noun phrase indicate that the scribe had control of the genitive demonstrative system as well as the genitive endings. It is not clear to what extent this is the system of his own living language, and to what extent he was influenced by his older

exemplar. There does seem to be a consistent connection between the use of marked genitive nouns and the presence of a demonstrative; if Franzen is correct in believing that this material was used in preaching, then perhaps the scribe's usage reflects the usage current in his dialect.

5. Doves and Prophets: The Weak Genitive

An apparent anomaly of the Lambeth scribe is his treatment of *culfre* 'dove.' The word occurs three times:

- (5) *on ane culfre onlicnesse* 'in a dove's likeness'
- (6) *On culfre onlicnesse* 'in dove's likeness'
- (7) *on culfren heowe* 'in dove's form'

Why is the scribe varying the form? It may be a scribal error, perhaps not. It is possible that the first two examples are not even genitives, but rather compounds, and better translated as 'in dove-likeness' rather than with the possessive 'dove's'. The OE weak form of *culfran* would not have been clearly genitive, since the scribe's genitive singular form is *-es*, and he may have interpreted it as a non-genitive form, particularly in the absence of any demonstrative. I do not think that the different forms can be ascribed to any semantic property of the head nouns, *onlicnesse* and *heowe*; these also appear as head nouns with the genitive modifier *fures* 'fire's,' but the form of *fures* is unambiguously genitive and less likely to cause confusion. Another possible compound was mentioned in 2.2: *egipte londe*. While this may well be the scribe's transliterated ME form of the *egypta lande*, there is also the possibility that this may have been read as 'Egypt-land' (in much the same way as the name of the nation *Engla-lond*, "land of the Angles, Angle-land', was a semi-compound (Mitchell 1985: §1311)).

There are also counter-examples, in which the Lambeth phrase is in a genitive NP, whereas the Royal form is a compound noun.

- (8) L *godspelles bodunge* R *godspelbodunge*
- (9) L *on þas pistles redinge* R *on ðissere pistolrædinge*

Taken together, these five examples indicate there was some semantic overlap between the genitive noun phrase and a compound. A comparable ModE example would be 'dog house' vs. 'dog's house'; I do not claim that either form is derived from the other, but wish only to show the overlap between the two constructions.

The Lambeth scribe uses only one other historically weak noun in the genitive - *wite3an* 'prophet.' However, unlike *culfre*, *wite3an* appears with the demonstrative. So for the scribe, the presence of the demonstrative would clearly indicate that *wite3an* was a genitive noun, information which he did not have when writing about the dove. It has already been stated but bears repeating that the connection between demonstrative and nominal inflection was most likely an integral part of the scribe's own patterns; in this case the presence of a demonstrative whose form and function he knew "outweighed" the nominal form he may not have.

6. Lambeth Genitives not in Royal

There are nine genitive noun phrases in the Lambeth version which are not found in the Royal version; it is possible that these phrases were present in the Lambeth scribe's exemplar. Whether these NPs represent new material introduced in L, or were updated from his unknown exemplar, they are in line with the claims made earlier about the L

scribe's genitive patterns.

Table 8

singular, personal, possession:	5
singular, inanimate, description:	2
plural, possession:	1
plural, measure:	1

Every singular noun has the *-es* ending. Of the seven singular examples, there is only one with the demonstrative:

(10) *þes deofles bern* 'the devil's child'

Neither plural example has a demonstrative. For the genitive of measure *twa hun manna* 'two hundred men', the form in *-a* is expected, as this is the only form found in non-possessive contexts. However, the other plural example *mennen saule*, takes the common case *-n* which can appear in possessive contexts. These nine NPs tend to follow the patterns discussed above: the genitive singular ending is *-es*; singular nouns more often lack a demonstrative in the NP; a genitive plural without a demonstrative in the NP tends to have the *-a* ending; the *-n* genitive can only appear in possessive contexts. Again, it seems that the scribe's own dialect had an active genitive singular, and that the genitive plural ending was dying out, for nouns and possibly articles.

7. "of X"

The Lambeth scribe has eight examples of constructions which use "of X" rather than the inflected genitive form found in the Royal MS.

Table 9

<u>Lambeth of-phrase</u>	<u>Royal inflected genitive</u>	<u>translation (from L)</u>
<i>lomb of ane 3eres</i>	<i>lamb anes geares</i>	lamb of one year
<i>huse of þam egyptissen folce</i>	<i>huse þæs egyptiscan folces</i>	house of the Egyptian folk
<i>sum of heore ehte</i>	<i>sumne dæl heora landes worþes</i>	some of their wealth
<i>ewilcum of þan wurhtan</i>	<i>ælcum þæra wyrhtena</i>	each of the workers
<i>irecdnesse of misliche spechen</i>	<i>gerecednyse mislicra spræca</i>	knowledge of various languages
<i>þon eie of þon heðene</i>	<i>for oðan iudeiscas folces</i>	the fear of the heathens
<i>aferede of nane licamliche pinunge</i>	<i>forsawon ealla lichamliche pinunga</i>	afraid of no bodily torment
<i>3efan of þam hal3an gaste</i>	<i>gifum þæs halgan gastes</i>	gifts of the holy ghost

The scribe uses *of* for singular and plural, and for several functions, making it appear, in this text, that there was no particular environment which favored the use of this new construction. In OE, the preposition *of* had the meaning 'from', a meaning which can still be seen in some of the above examples, particularly *3efan of þam hal3an gaste*. (The overlap between *of* and the genitive inflection has already been mentioned in Introduction 1.7.) As the preposition *of* was used to indicate origin in Old English, it seems plausible that this use may have been the original source of the variation between the prepositional phrase and the inflectional marker, especially as prepositions become more frequent during the transition to Middle English. The form *of* + noun was already known in OE; ME speakers merely extended its functions (although "merely" is perhaps not strong enough for the remarkable rise in the use of *of*).

8. Summary

What then is the Lambeth scribe's genitive NP system? The genitive singular

nominal ending is *-es*, and can be used with all nouns and for a variety of functions. However in the plural we can see the beginning of the preference for the common plural form. This development is in turn connected to the scribe's demonstrative genitive form, which by its presence can remove the need for a marked nominal form. The genitive adjective appear to has been lost, while there are early signs of increased periphrastic genitives. The scribe's language also shows a syntactic shift, where a possessive noun must precede its head.

La3amon's *Brut*

1. Introduction

1.1 The Text

Layamon's *Brut*, an epic poem recounting the history of the British, survives in two manuscripts: British Library MS Cotton Caligula A ix and British Library MS Cotton Otho C xiii. The Caligula MS (C) dates from the last quarter of the thirteenth century and is written in the language of northern Worcestershire, while Otho (O) dates from slightly earlier, the third quarter of the thirteenth century, and comes from the west Somerset area (Laing 1993: 70,79). I examine three selections: l. 9263-475, and two shorter sections, l. 5118-214 and l. 14180-279 from Brook and Leslie's printed edition (my reason for using multiple selections is explained in the following section). Since the entire poem is nearly 17,000 lines, my selections represent only a fraction of the whole; as such, my conclusions are based on limited evidence, and so there is a risk that my data and conclusions may not be truly representative of the scribe's use.

1.2 Background and Debate

In his introduction the author provides a good deal of information about the background of his text. He not only gives us his name, Layamon, but also his occupation and location - a priest in the village of Areley Kings in Worcestershire. From references to different events, such as the reference in the C text to 'Eleanor who was the high king Henry's queen', and also paleographical examination of the MSS, it is possible to narrow down the date of composition. There has been considerable debate regarding this, but the general consensus appears to be 25 years either side of the year 1200. Layamon also provides a list of three sources, including the C MS reference to the book by 'a French clerk, called Wace'. This refers to Layamon's main source, the Old French *Roman de Brut*, composed by Wace in 1155, which was itself based on Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, completed in 1138 (Allen 1992: xivv). While there is general agreement on the pre-eminence of Wace, as with the exact date of composition there is still much discussion about possible other literary sources, oral traditions, and cultural influences. (For a complete overview of the different theories regarding both date and sources, see Le Saux 1989.) Part of this debate is fuelled by the fact that "despite an almost perfect agreement in content, the *Brut* has a different internal structure to the *Roman de Brut*" (Le Saux 1989: 229). Unlike the other translations in this study, the *Brut* is the only non-religious text, and no doubt the author felt more at liberty to improvise. The fact that the two ME versions do not match with regard to these biographical details is further cause for debate.

Another topic of discussion is the number of scribes for the C MS. There is less debate on this subject (or at least fewer debated answers). Current opinion varies between one or two scribes. Allen and Le Saux support the two scribes view; Laing and McIntosh one scribe. Allen (Allen 1992: xx) refers to two scribes who traded stints, and that the second finished the poem (approximately nine-tenths is attributed to this second scribe); Le Saux refers to the interchanging and therefore coeval hands (Le Saux 1989: 1). Laing believes that the evidence for more than one scribe is due to variations in quality of pen and neatness, while McIntosh considers that there is no evidence of a change in language to support the suggested change of scribe (Laing 1993: 70). All accounts agree that there was only one Otho scribe. It was to consider whether the

genitive NPs of the entire poem may have been influenced by different scribes, or even by the changing styles of a single man over a considerable time, that I have used multiple selections; however my short extracts have not been sufficient to make a conclusive argument for multiple scribes. Therefore I refer only to one scribe.

1.3 Why use Layamon?

There are several factors which make Layamon's *Brut* useful for this study. It is for Layamon's place in time and space that I use this text. It is late twelfth/early thirteenth century, the transitional phase from OE to eME. Layamon's location in Worcestershire is also useful for comparison with my other WMid text, *The Lambeth Homilies*, a text from the neighboring county of Herefordshire. Even the seemingly far-removed Southwestern O text is of a similar dialect; "[t]he language of the counties of Gloucester, Hereford, and Worcester shows such marked points of resemblance with its neighbour South-West" (Wardale 1949: §9) that comparisons can reasonably be made. In this area there was an "archaic" tradition, and the intentionally archaic nature of Layamon's language has often been remarked upon. This deliberate connection to the OE tradition is an important tradition of the eME period.

The other reason for choosing Layamon is the existence of two versions. These are separated by some distance, from the heart of the WMid to the southwestern edge of English. They are somewhat closer in time, the C text being perhaps 25 years later than the O. Comparing these two versions can offer insight into the development of ME, especially as the O scribe has modernized his version. There is also the possibility that any OE "mistakes" can tell us how Layamon *thought* the older language was used.

2. Nouns

2.1 Singular Nouns

In both versions, there is only one genitive singular ending, *-es*. This is most commonly employed for two functions, possessive and adverbial, with occasional descriptive uses. In possessive uses, the inflection is mostly found with proper nouns and nouns which refer to humans, but can sometimes be found with inanimate nouns.

Table 1

5135	(C) <i>his hiredes grið</i> 'his army's peace'	(O) <i>his grið</i> 'his peace'
5199	(C) <i>Sæueres dæðe</i> 'Severus's death'	(O) line missing
9274	(C) <i>þas da3es lihte</i> 'the day's light'	(O) <i>þes dai3es lihte</i> 'this day's light'
9317	(C) <i>Lundene tun</i> 'London town'	(O) <i>Londenestoun</i> 'London's town'
9476	(C) <i>þas castles 3æte</i> 'the castle's gate'	(O) <i>þan castel-3eate</i> 'the castle-gate'

The examples from l. 9274 and 9476 both have inanimate inflected nouns; however the possessive sense is very strong in both of these examples, which could override any "inanimate" rule.

Both scribes show an innovation in the constructions with personal possessive nouns: ellipsis. According to Mitchell, the elliptical genitive is not found in OE (Mitchell 1985: §1287), yet there are three such genitive in my selections:

- (1) 5211 (O) *Gesanes* 'Gesane's [mother]'
- (2) 9449 (C) *þas eorles* 'the earl's [appearance]'

(3) 9449 (O) *þe eorles* ‘the earl’s [appearance]’

Of the 22 possessive genitives which occur in one or both texts, eight have the same form, ten different forms, and four are differences due to omission or rewriting. Even if we only look at those examples which are found in both, there are still more mismatches than matches. The most common reason for these mismatches is the O scribe’s variant possessive construction, typified by *Basian his moder* ‘Basian his mother’. There are six such constructions in the O selections, including one which is peculiar to the O text. The origin of this construction is unclear. Was there phonological confusion between *-es* and *his*? The O scribe seems to have regarded the two constructions as equal; both are used with the name *Arthur*: *Arthures hiredmen* ‘Arthur’s followers’, *Arthu(r) his borde* ‘Arthur his table’. With the weakening of nominal inflectional endings, is it possible that some dialects opted instead to use the unambiguous possessive pronoun? It would be interesting to see whether there are any instances of a similar construction with other possessive pronouns in the rest of the text; if so, this would be a strong argument against the phonological confusion argument, and could be proof of a very interesting, if local, innovation.

There is a precedent for such a construction in OE, particularly with foreign names. Mustanoja claims the “primary reason for the use of the possessive pronoun in these cases may be a desire to indicate the inflectional case (genitive) in conjunction with a more or less undeclinable foreign proper name” (Mustanoja 1960: 160). He also says that constructions with *her* are much rarer than with *his*, while the plural pronoun does not occur at all (Mustanoja 1960: 160-1). This was not a common construction in eME, except in two southwestern texts, the O version of Layamon and the *Polychronicon*. So this seems to be a local development, a possible alternative to the inflection *-es*. (It later became much more widespread, highlighting the importance of the micro-system to a complete understanding of language change.)

Relating to phonological confusion with respect to the genitive singular ending, the name Severus shows that even at this period there is confusion about how to mark, in the written language and possibly the spoken language as well, words which ended in *-s* in the singular.

Table 2

5137 (C) *Seuarus hired* ‘Severus’s army’ (O) *Seuarus heap* ‘Severus’s band’
5199 (C) *Sæueres dæðe* ‘Severus’s death’
5204 (C) *Sæuarusses lic* ‘Severus’s body’ (O) *Seuare* ‘Severus’

The examples from l. 5137 appear to have no marking on the name. l. 5199 seems to have altered the form to be more in line with the regular genitive ending. No doubt the presence of Latin (and possibly French) names which ended in *-s* presented a special problem in adapting other texts to English forms. In l. 5204 the C scribe has gone for perhaps the clearest form, NAME + *-es*, while the O scribe eliminates the genitive altogether and opts for the name alone (perhaps an objective form from Latin). In the Uther section (l. 9261-476) there is another name which ends in *-s*: *Gorlois*. The C scribe has an inflected genitive in this case, *Gorloises wiue* ‘Gorlois’s wife’, while in the two examples in the O text the scribe uses his variant singular possessive construction,

Gorloys his wifue 'Gorlois his wife'. It seems there was considerable uncertainty about how to represent these names in the genitive singular.

2.2 Adverbial Genitive

Both scribes employ adverbial genitives, such as l. 5144 (C) *flu3en forð-rihtes* (O) *flowen forþ-rihtes* 'they fled at once'. As with the possessive genitives, there are cases in which one scribe uses the *-es* and the other does not; however, as each text has internal inconsistencies, it is impossible to say that one scribe is more or less "modern" or "archaic". Rather it appears that both scribes are beginning to consider this feature old-fashioned. Two particularly interesting examples come from l. 14208 and 14210, all of which mean 'by night':

(4) (C) *bi nihte* (O) *bi niht*

(5) (C) *bi nihte* (O) *bi niht(e)*

Neither scribe uses an adverbial genitive, although there adverbial time expressions in which both scribes use the genitive *-es* ending, as in l. 5165, 5170:

(6) (C) *dæies 7 nihtes* (O) *dai 7 nihtes* 'by day and night'

(7) (C) *ne dæies ne nihtes* (O) *daies no nihtes* 'neither by day nor night'

Used with a preposition, it seems that the nouns cease to be independent adverbs, and become part of an adverbial prepositional phrase. Given the frequent association that existed between prepositions (which did not indicate motion) and the OE dative case (Mitchell 1985: §1177), it is not surprising that a writer who is trying to preserve an older form would use the old dative form in this context. Far more important than the form of the noun is the question of how "*bi* + noun" came to be substituted for the adverbial genitive. Perhaps the OE adverbial genitive has lost its "genitiveness", and is simply an adverb for eME speakers.

2.3 Other Inflected Singular Genitives

Other uses of the genitive singular inflection are few, and most occurrences are the genitive of description. This occurs in the C text in phrases such as *nanes cunnes monnen* 'men of no kind'. The O scribe does not follow C's pattern, and has uninflected (and slightly different) *none manne* 'no man'. This is in keeping both with the O scribe's more "modern" version, which has lost certain forms and functions that the C scribe preserves, and also with his different system of plural endings, discussed below. (The genitive of description with 'kind' is further discussed in *Vices and Virtues* 2.5.)

2.4 Plural Nouns

2.4.1 Forms

The two scribes use the following endings for genitive plural nouns:

Table 3

<u>Caligula</u>		<u>Otho</u>	
<i>-en</i>	7	<i>-e</i>	4
<i>-ene</i>	6		
<i>-e</i>	7		

As the table shows, the O scribe does not use *-ene*, *-en* at all; where C has one of these endings, O either substitutes his own *-e*, as in C *wifene apelest* 'noblest of women'

O *treowest alre wifue* 'truest of all wives', or replaces the genitive entirely: C *gumenene lauer[d]* 'lord of men' O *eorl of Cornwale* 'earl of Cornwall'. It seems that the O scribe no longer used these endings, and substituted expressions which he considered more comprehensible. In fact, it is possible that the O scribe does not have a genitive plural; in some cases, such as *treowest alre wifue*, another possible translation would be 'truest wife of all', in which case it is only the adjective which is plural.

The C scribe's endings are an interesting phenomenon in their own right. Strictly speaking, *-en* is not a genitive plural, but rather the common plural; these forms are not formally marked for case. So his *genitive* plural ending is *-e*. The *-ene* endings then are a combination of the two endings, common plural *-en* and genitive plural *-e*. (There is one example, *maidene*, which at first appears to be an *-ene* example; however the *-en-* in this case is part of the stem, and so the only inflection is *-e*.) In effect, nouns with *-ene* are marked twice for number and once for case.

Another possible interpretation of the *-ene* ending is that it is derived from the OE weak ending *-ena*. The C scribe does use the weak *-n* plural form, so it is possible that he also used a weak genitive plural ending. Such an explanation is perhaps simpler than the double-marking explanation offered above. However, if *-ene* derived from the OE weak ending, the C scribe two marked genitive forms, in addition to the common plural; whichever explanation we use, the C text still shows considerable variety in genitive plural endings.

2.4.2 Functions

By far the most common use of the genitive plural is the superlative-partitive construction. This construction has the meaning "X-est of Ys." It is in this construction that we find most of the (marked) genitive plurals. In these examples the case marking seems optional, and was perhaps determined by the rhyme the scribe was trying to make: unmarked *forcupest kingen* 'wickedest of kings', marked *wraþest kinge* 'angriest of kings'. Although some examples do contain a marked modifier (always *alre*), I think that the construction itself made it plain what was meant. By nature, a superlative adjective is somewhat partitive: it selects the X-est out of the available group of Y's. That is, syntax and semantic content seem to have taken over the role of the inflection.

The two scribes do not use the same system. The C scribe seems more familiar with this construction, with the O tending to replace endings or the entire expression. Most interesting are two examples:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| (8) | C <i>monnen alre læþest</i> | O <i>man alre loþest</i> |
| (9) | C <i>kingen alre kenest</i> | O <i>king alre kennest</i> |

It would appear that the O is re-interpreting the plural forms of C as singular. If the O scribe no longer used a genitive plural ending, nor the *-n* plural, then perhaps he re-interpreted examples like the above in the only way which fit his own patterns.

The other uses of the genitive plural are far less frequent; I find only six possible examples, all confined to the C text. The following table gives example of the uses and forms.

Table 4

<u>line</u>	<u>Caligula</u>	<u>Otho</u>	<u>translation</u>	<u>function</u>
5196	<i>feole his Romwæren</i>	<i>moche of hi[s] folke</i>	many of his Romans	partitive
9286	<i>eoldrene istreon</i>	<i>hilderne streone</i>	acquisition of ancestors	possessive
9380	<i>feole wintre</i>	<i>fale wyntres</i>	many years	measure

As with the superlative-partitive, only the C scribe preserves the genitive plural functions regularly. The O scribe's forms appear to represent more contemporary usage; his use of common plural *wyntres* is especially interesting. Many texts, from various regions and periods, preserve at least the form, if not the function, of the genitive plural *wintre*, as the C scribe does (This form is even found in the *Sermons*, which otherwise always uses periphrasis for plural nouns, *Kentish Sermons* 5.1). O's clearly non-genitive form indicates that even when the genitive plural form was preserved, it is likely that no "genitiveness" was associated with this form, but rather that it was a fixed expression. O's construction is also a very early instance of the genitive of measure being re-interpreted as a simple plural.

3. Modifiers

3.1 Articles

The C scribe may have been attempting to preserve a genitive singular article, but so inconsistently that one doubts whether the genitive article was functioning in his dialect. The O scribe seems to have lost this form of the article.

Table 5

9274	(C) <i>þas da3es lihte</i>	(O) <i>þes dai3es lihte</i>	the/this day's light
9425	(C) <i>uerde þas kinges</i>	(O) <i>folkes þeos kinges</i>	army/folk of the/this king
9432	(C) <i>þes kinges ferde</i>	(O) <i>þis kinges ferde</i>	the/this king's army
9449	(C) <i>þas eorles</i>	(O) <i>þe eorles</i>	the earl's
9460	(C) <i>þeos eorles stiward</i>	(O) <i>þis [eorl]es steward</i>	the/this earl's steward
9476	(C) <i>þas castles 3æte</i>	(O) <i>þan castel-3eate</i>	the castle's gate/castle-gate
14268	(C) <i>Cadores sune þe eorles</i>	(O) <i>Cador his sone eorl</i>	Cador's son the earl's

In many cases it is impossible to say whether the demonstrative is the definite article or the demonstrative 'this' (Millar 2000: 245-6). Again, the O scribe is less conservative, and uses forms, such as *þis*, which are almost certainly the demonstrative rather than the article.

There are no genitive plural articles.

3.2 Adjectives

There are examples of genitive adjectives for both singular and plural; however its use is greatly limited, depending on the number and the scribe.

The six examples of a genitive singular adjective are confined to the C text. There are no lexical constraints; however adjectives only appear in the minor functions, never in the majority possessive phrases. This is probably more a semantic/stylistic feature than grammatical. Possessive genitives tend to be used with personal nouns, especially proper nouns, which are less likely to have an adjective modifier; it is possible to say something like "the great Arthur's", but not likely at this period. The O scribe has no adjectival genitive; compare l. 9333 (C) *ælches weies* (O) *in (e)che weyes* 'in each way'.

Both scribes have a plural genitive adjective: *alre* 'all'. This is the only genitive plural adjective, and its use is confined to the partitive-superlative construction discussed in 2.4.2. Indeed, from the evidence it appears compulsory in this environment in the O text. *all* seems to have had a longer inflectional life than most other adjectives in all eME dialects, although I have no explanation for why this should be so.

4. *of*

There is a combined total of 78 phrases containing *of* in the two texts, 43 in C and 35 in O. Despite the famously “archaic” nature of Layamon, these *of*-phrases seem to be right on the point of transition from OE to ME usage, suggesting that the forms in the text reflect contemporary usage.

of has a wide range of functions/meanings; the most frequent are:

‘about, concerning’

‘from’ (origin)

descriptive genitive

partitive

of-phrases in these contexts account for 61 of the total occurrences; the most frequent, *of* expressing origin, is the most common meaning in either text, and has a combined total of 22 examples, more than one-fourth of the total *of*-phrases. This use not only shows an area of shared overlap with OE genitive inflection, but also a similarity to OF *de*. The genitive inflection could be used to indicate origin, an idea which is not far from the meaning of the OE preposition *of* ‘from’; one’s *origin* is where one is *from*. Such semantic overlap no doubt opened the door for the functional expansion of the periphrastic genitive, the *of*-phrase, into the area previously occupied by the formal inflection. A similar semantic overlap between the genitive and *de* existed in OF, for the same reasons; in French the periphrastic construction eventually ousted the inflection. Indeed, all four of the most common periphrastic genitive functions have parallels with the use of OF *de*.

Both the majority uses listed above and the infrequent minority uses have OE origins, with one exception: the descriptive genitive *of*-phrases. This is the third most frequent usage of the genitive *of*-phrase, and so cannot be considered an anomaly. What is the origin of this structure? Is this an extension of the functions of *of*, an expansion motivated by the increased use of OE *of*-phrases which had already shared some of the semantic space occupied by the genitive inflection? It is possible that the increased use of *of* in areas it had always shared with the inflection blurred the distinction between the two constructions, and speakers began to associate *of* with the genitive. The periphrastic genitive of description also has parallels in OF, which had a similar function for *de*; while the *Brut* itself shows limited OF influence, such similarities could certainly encourage the later expansion of *of*.

There is one example which may be considered a possessive *of* construction:

(10) (C) *strengðe of Tintaieol* (O) *strengþe of Tyntagel* ‘strength of Tintagel’

While certainly not a common use, this is an early hint of a future development. However, at this early stage there does not seem to be any settled form. A similar phrase occurs in (C) *Lundene tun* ‘London town’ (O) *Londenestoun* ‘London’s town’. For a similar phrase there seem to be three possible options: inflection, *of*, and the topic of the following section, compound.

5. A Third Option

The different versions of l. 9476 illustrate a rarely mentioned alternative to the OE genitive inflection: compounds

(11) C *þas castles 3æte* 'the castle's gate' O *þan castel-3eat* 'the castle-gate'

Here the O scribe is replacing an inflected genitive with a non-genitive structure, a compound noun.

This is an innovation, but how radical? Compounding was a feature of Old English, and is still productive in Modern German. It is also unlikely to be due to OF influence, as many two-noun compounds are expressed in the form NOUN *de* NOUN. Even in the C text we can find examples of the compound: l. 9308 *þat castel3at* 'that castle gate'. Perhaps the most important thing about these examples is to remind us that speakers were not limited to a choice between *-es* and *of*, OE and OF- there was nothing to prevent them coming up with a new ME form to express the same function. This is still true of ModE, in which all three forms are produced:

the castle's gate
the gate of the castle
the castle gate

Perhaps that favorite example of a preserved feminine genitive singular, *chirche dore*, is a similar formation; not a genitive, but a compound: 'church door' rather than 'church's door'. Mustanoja gives two possible answers for the question, suggesting that the *chirche* may be an *s*-less genitive or the attributive use of the nominative (Mustanoja 1960: 72). However, since *castle* would not have been a candidate for the *s*-less genitive, I think this must be a compound.

6. Summary

Despite Layamon's famously "archaic" language, there are several innovative features, especially in the O version. The genitive singular nominal ending is *-es*, and is generally confined to possessive and adverbial uses. The O scribe also has remnants of the genitive plural, but it is the C scribe's system, with its combination of the forms *-e*, *-en*, and *-ene*, which provides the best evidence of the variation present in this transitional period. Another interesting feature of the C text is the singular articles, where it is possible that the scribe was attempting to show a genitive article; the O scribe does not share this attempt. Neither scribe has a genitive plural article. A similar pattern is found for the genitive adjective, with singular remnants in C but not O; in the plural there is only one genitive adjective, *alre*. There are a significant number of *of*-phrases, the majority of which show OE influence, with the notable innovation with the genitive of description.

There are some noteworthy innovations. Both scribes produce elliptical genitives, and use compounds rather than genitive NPs. The C scribe has the interesting superlative-partitive construction, while the O scribe has the "genitive with pronoun".

West Midlands conclusion

So what can we learn about the development of the genitive NP from these texts? The dominance of *-es* is quite clear, as is the early loss of the singular genitive adjective. The article seems to have survived for a time, but was in decline by the time of the Layamon MSS. The plural forms had a more convoluted history, with considerable variation between genitive and common plural in the nouns, which may have been influenced by the presence of genitive modifiers, such as *þære* and *alre*. Although the article is eventually lost, *alre* seems to be a very robust form. While there are holdovers from OE, there are also several important innovations, such as the fixing of a possessive before its head noun, the emergence of an elliptical genitive, and the early signs of the rise of *of*. There are also indications that speakers were not confined to genitive constructions, but on occasion used alternative constructions, such as compounds.

III. East Midlands

Introduction

As was mentioned in the Introduction (1.5), the history of the East Midlands is perhaps less well-known than that of the other regions considered in this study. The Fens provided a safe haven for outlaws such as Hereward after the conquest and Geoffrey de Mandeville during the Anarchy (Barlow 1999: 74, 179). Such destructive periods contribute to the lack of Eastern manuscripts from the period; the Peterborough Chronicle records that the abbey was sacked and burned by Hereward and his men in 1070 (Clark 1958: 2). Such unrest would be likely to decrease the manuscript output, and make survivals less frequent. Perhaps as a result of this social unrest, there is not the same level of antiquarian interest as in the West, but nor is there a significant Norman influence.

autograph "[T]hat which is written in a person's own handwriting; the author's own manuscript" (OED). Such texts are free of the normal concern of changes introduced by a copyist, which reduces the possibility of the influence of interference from another period or dialect.

genitive of time An adverbial use of the genitive, often used in expressions such as 'this day', 'this year'. This particular genitive construction will be particularly important for the Peterborough Chronicle discussion.

phrasal verb "A type of VERB consisting of a SEQUENCE of a LEXICAL element plus one or more PARTICLES" (Crystal 2003: 352). ModE examples include 'wake up', 'turn in'.

The *Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations

1. Introduction

1.1 The Text

The *Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations (PCC) are a twelfth century continuation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The text is preserved in Bodley MS Laud Misc. 636, written at Peterborough Abbey in the East Midlands. This version, known also as the E text or Laud manuscript, is the longest version of the Chronicle, with its last entry in 1154. The Continuations are one of the earliest examples of Middle English, and are particularly useful as they are an original composition, rather than a translation or transliteration of another text. I examine the entries 1122-25 and 1137-54, as found in Clark's printed edition. (For comparison, I sometimes refer to the copied entries of 1112-1121.) Despite some dispute as to whether the First Continuation is best considered as OE or ME (Clark 1958: xl), I consider both Continuations to be eME, and so use selections from both.

1.2 The Scribes

There are two parts to the PCC: the First Continuation (1122-31) and the Final Continuation (1132-54). The two Continuations were written by two different scribes. The first scribe was the same man who had copied out the earlier entries of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, sometime after the 1116 fire which destroyed the abbey and much of the town of Peterborough. His Continuation entries are made in six blocks. As the copyist for the earlier OE text, he is the most likely to have been influenced by the older language. The Final scribe was less orderly than the First, sometimes including events from several different years under a single heading; this may or may not be due to the fact that he made all his entries at once, rather than entering them each year. Since, according to Clark (Clark 1958: xxx), both monks were probably natives of the East Midlands, the two Continuations represent the same dialect, but a generation apart. Laing agrees that the language of the Continuations “may be taken to represent Peterborough language” (Laing 1993: 138).

1.3 Native Tradition

From a linguistic point of view the PCC are particularly valuable; in addition to having a fixed location in time and space, they are autograph copies, composed and written down by the same man. The only other early ME text which is an autograph of known date and provenance is the thirteenth century *Ayenbite of Inwit* of Dan Michel (**). Unlike the *Ayenbite*, the Continuations are not a translation, but rather an original composition in the authors' East Midland dialect. This is not to say that Norman French, or for that matter the West Saxon entries copied by the first continuator, had no influence on the language of the PCC. But unlike French translators or the deliberately archaic Layamon, the continuators had no *direct* influence from another language. Occasional OE features are found, as are French borrowings, but the scribes were *composing* in their own ME dialect.

Mention of the possible OF and OE influences raises the subject of the background to the text, both of the *Chronicle* tradition and of English society in the twelfth century. Begun in the late ninth century in the time of Alfred the Great, the *Chronicle* was a venerable document, surviving in six complete versions. However, with

all other versions there is the problem (so frequent in historical documents) of the influence of the copyists, and the competing interference of the West Saxon standard with the scribe's own dialectal forms. This problem at least can be avoided (or kept to a minimum) in the PCC, which had no exemplar, West Saxon or otherwise; we can also avoid the problem of copyist errors, as the Continuations are the authors' autograph.

The reason for the lack of interference/influence of an OE standard form is social; the PCC were written down less than a century after the Norman Conquest. The Conquest removed not only the native social hierarchy, but also the literary one. New standards of written language developed, with Latin initially becoming the language of official documents. With the loss of the prestige of the West Saxon standard, scribes composing in English were "freed" from the influence of the native standard forms, and were more likely to compose in their own dialect.

2. Inflected Nouns

2.1 Singular Nouns

For both scribes there is only one genitive singular inflectional ending, *-es*, from the OE strong masculine noun class. (Grammatical gender has been lost in this dialect at the time of the PCC, and the inflectional endings of the OE strong masculine class are used for all nouns.) There are also four examples of unmarked singular nouns, occurring only in *Sancte Marie* 'Saint Mary's'. According to Mustanoja the "influence of Latin feminine genitives is obviously responsible for instances [with the name *Marie*] ...Cf. *L sanctae Mariae*" (Mustanoja 1960: 72). This is supported by the fact that other saints' names are inflected with *-es*: *Sancte Petres* [*w*] *euod 7 Sancte Paules* 'Saint Peter's altar and Saint Paul's. Since grammatical gender has been lost by this time, it is unlikely that this indicated the survival of the OE feminine genitive; this is more likely a fixed form, preserved because of its high frequency and somewhat special status.

In the First Continuation the inflection is used most commonly for genitive of possession, description, time, and the adverbial genitive.

- (1) *þes eorles sandermen* 'the earl's messengers' (possession)
- (2) *munechades men* 'men of the monastic order' (description)
- (3) *þes dæiges Annuntatio* 'the day of the Annunciation' (time)
- (4) *him togeanes* 'against him' (adverbial)

The latter two uses will be discussed in more detail below. The same uses are found in the Final Continuation, with the exception of the genitive of time. In the Final Continuation, the tendency to use the inflection for possession and adverbs is more pronounced than in the First. Indeed, the only descriptive uses occur with *dæies*. There are three examples:

- (5) *faren al a dæis fare* 'to go all a day's journey'
- (6) *nontid dæies* 'noontide of day'
- (7) *innen dæies* 'inside of [a] day'

The First scribe has a similar example *þa undern dæies* 'the third hour of [the] day'. Although the First scribe's descriptive examples are a definite minority, he does use this function with more than one word. The Final scribe is much more limited, suggesting the possibility that this may have become a somewhat fixed expression for him.

2.2 Adverbial Genitives

Both Continuations have adverbial genitives.

Table 1

<u>First</u>	<u>Final</u>
<i>togænes</i> 'against'	<i>agænes</i> 'against'
<i>þærtogænes</i> 'in opposition'	<i>be nihtes 7 be dæies</i> 'by night and by day'
<i>unþancas</i> 'involuntarily'	<i>nowiderwardes</i> 'in no way'
	<i>togænes</i> 'against'
	<i>efsones</i> 'soon after'
	<i>þankes</i> 'voluntarily'
	<i>unþankes</i> 'involuntarily'

The main question regarding the adverbial genitive is whether it retained any association with the function of the genitive case, rather than just the form. The creation of forms such as *agænes*, *nowiderwardes*, *efsones*, demonstrates that the morpheme *-es* was still productive as an adverbial marker. None of the OE adverbs, *on-geagn*, *na-hwider*, *eftsona*, respectively, are found with the genitive form in Bosworth and Toller. In the OED, the first occurrences of *eftsones* and *agænes* are in ME texts; sometimes the PCC contain the first occurrence. *nowiderwardes* seems to be a very rare word, but adverbs ending in *-ward*, *-wardes* are found even in OE, such as *towardes*.

This does not prove that speakers thought of this as a genitive suffix, only that they considered it a suffix. It is possible that even at this early stage of ME, the form *-es* had taken on slightly different function: adverbial, rather than adverbial genitive. This may seem like a fine distinction, but it still exists in ModE, where adverbs in *-s* (derived from the genitive) are used but without speakers in any way associating this with the possessive 's. The use of ME *-es* and ModE *-s* for adverbs, as opposed to \emptyset , seems almost a matter of individual choice, with ME *eftsone/eftsones* and ModE *toward/towards* both occurring. There also seems to be a possibility that in some of these cases there is a blurring between the categories of adverb and preposition.

The two scribes differ in their syntax in these phrases. The First scribe prefers to place pronouns before, and noun phrases after: *him togænes* but *togænes þa muneces*. The Final scribe prefers placing both pronouns and nouns after: *agænes him*, *agænes þe king*; there is one example of a pronoun before: *Him com togænes*. This syntactic shift probably had little or no bearing on the development of the genitive per se, but syntax and the genitive have a more direct relationship in other functions, as will be discussed in 5. Split Genitives.

An issue for further consideration is the overlap between adverb and preposition; in several cases, there seems to be some overlap between the two functions.

2.3 Genitive of Time

A common use of the genitive singular in the First Continuation is the genitive of time, such as *þes ilces geares* 'the same year.' However, the scribe does not consistently use the genitive in this context.

The following table gives the combined occurrences for *dæg*, *niht*, *gear*, *tyma* (but not compounds of these words, such as *Sunendæi*).

Table 2

year	<u>art. & noun</u>	<u>art., noun, adj.</u>	<u>article only</u>	<u>art. & noun, not adj.</u>	<u>non-inflected</u>
1122	3	0	2	1	2

1123	3	1	0	1	4
1124	4	3	0	0	1
1125	0	3	0	0	2
total	10	7	2	2	9

Nearly one-third of the time expressions are entirely uninflected; the examples in which the entire NP is inflected make up little more than half of the First scribe's uses. Uninflected and inflected NPs can occur in the same environments. The Final scribe has no genitive time expressions. Was this use of the genitive present but dying out in the First scribe's dialect? Or had it already died out, and the scribe was using a construction which he had learned through copying the OE Chronicle text?

In the preceding copied entries, the genitive of time NPs are more consistent; in all the examples which I found the entire phrase is either inflected or uninflected. There also seem to be different environments for using genitive vs. non-genitive; non-genitive *tends* to be used after a preposition, although this is a tendency rather than a rule. The evidence of the earlier entries suggests, to me, that the scribe had learned, however imperfectly, the genitive time expressions from the earlier entries; when he attempted to use them in his own composition he made mistakes in applying the rules.

2.4 The Genitive Plural

2.4.1 Conservation

The use of inflection is extremely rare in the genitive plural. In the First Continuation there are only two possible examples:

(8) *fela oðre godre cnihte* 'many other good knights'

(9) *feower 7 feowerti manne* 'four and forty of men'

The First scribe is not consistent, however; there are many examples such as *feola tunes* 'many towns' where *feola* does not take a genitive, and almost immediately after (9) he writes *six men*; numbers did not have to take a genitive. Examples (8) and (9) are a small minority - *fela* and numerals occur in 21 other examples, and none are definitely genitive, although because of the confusion of endings some are rather ambiguous. As with the genitive of time, this is likely a form which the scribe learned from his earlier copying, rather than one from his own current usage. The genitive plural can still be found in the preceding entries, as in *his agenra manna* 'of his own men'. It is interesting that the two examples which preserve the OE genitive plural are in a sense partitive, an issue that will be further discussed in 4.2.

The Final scribe is even more limited:

(10) *xix wintre* (x2) '19 winters'

(11) *xx wintre* '20 winters'

It is unlikely that these represent a genitive plural understanding on the part of the scribe, but nonetheless these are more consistent than the First scribe's usage. It is likely that the form *wintre* was a fixed expression, one which the scribe knew was used after a number, but which may have lost any genitive association, leaving the form but losing the function. This is slightly different than the form/function relationship discussed under the adverbial genitive. In that case the ending took on a new function and remained productive; for the genitive plural *wintre* the ending is fossilized in a specific environment.

2.4.2 Innovation

In the Final Continuation there are possible examples of genitive plural in *-es*:

(12) *Ne hi ne forbaren biscopes land ne abbotes ne preostes*

'Neither did they spare bishops' land nor abbots' nor priests' '

It may be possible to read these as genitive singular, although in her introduction Clark refers to these as plural forms (Clark 1958: 1), as well as mentioning an example from the 1129 entry:

(13) *eall of earcedæcnes wifes 7 of preostes wifes, þet hi scolden hi forlæten*

'all about archdeacons' wives and about priests' wives, that they should them abandon'

Even if the exact meaning is disputable, one must at least consider the possibility that these represent innovative *-s* genitive plurals, although given that the plural had lost virtually any case distinctions it is difficult to say whether nouns with this ending are genitive or common case. It is quite possible that in this dialect there were no longer distinctive case forms in the plural, and that the common plural was now used in all contexts. This is in fact also true of spoken ModE, in which the common plural and genitive plural are identical.

3. Modifiers

3.1 demonstratives

The First scribe has 33 occurrences of the singular genitive article *þes*, *þæs*. It is difficult to determine the exact number of occurrences, as the genitive article form is identical to that of the demonstrative; should *on þæs dæies* be translated 'on the day' or 'on this day'? The consistent agreement between nouns marked as genitive singular and the genitive singular article indicates that the scribe understood perfectly the form and use of this form of the article. Indeed *þes* is the article form with the least variation. Was *þes* a part of the scribe's dialect, or had he learned it from OE? From Millar's analysis, the genitive singular article has the most consistent form and use (Millar 2000: 98-90); perhaps the article patterns followed those of the noun, and while other case forms were less distinct, genitive singular forms for both article and noun remained clear, and so had a longer life.

The scribe does not have any examples of a genitive plural article; it seems that the plural had already been reduced to a single common case. Why case was lost in the plural before in the singular is not a topic for this paper, but this is the regular pattern in all ME dialects at all periods.

The Final scribe is even further along the path of reduction; he has a single article form for all numbers and functions, *þe*. This is the earliest text to show the complete loss of the genitive article.

3.2 Adjectives

Apart from the examples of *ilces* found in the First Continuation genitive of time expressions, there are no adjectives in singular inflected genitive phrases in PCC. The closest thing is in the First Continuation, *here elces riht hand* 'of each their right hand', which has an inflected pronoun. (This is slightly different from the example *elches monnes* mentioned in *Lambeth 3.2*; in that example, *elches* is an

adjectives modifying *monnes*.) Adjectival inflection is often lost before nominal, so it is not surprising that there are no genitive inflected adjectives. While it may seem odd that there are no examples of an adjective in a genitive NP, it is most likely a stylistic choice; strictly speaking, a genitive NP requires only the genitive and head nouns.

There are three genitive plural adjectives: First *oðre* 'other', *godre* 'good', Final *alre* 'all'. All have the *-re* ending descended from the OE strong adjective *-ra*. Do these examples mean that the scribes still used a genitive plural adjective? I think it is unlikely. Firstly, it seems that these men no longer had a nominal plural genitive, making it extremely unlikely that they would still have an adjectival plural genitive. Secondly, these adjectives are only found in a particular context, a partitive construction.

(14) *fela oðre godre cnihte* 'many other good knights'

(15) *alre fyrst* 'first of all'

(14) was discussed in 2.4 as a possible archaism which the First scribe had carried over from the OE text. The form found in the Final Continuation, *alre*, can be considered as a somewhat anomalous retention; for whatever reason the genitive plural of *all* seems to be preserved longer than any other adjective in eME.

4. The use of *of*

4.1 'from'

of in the PCC is still very much the OE *of*, used as a preposition with the sense 'from, out of, separation'. The most frequent occurrence of *of* is in those titles/names which include a location, such as *biscop Roger of Seresbyrig* 'bishop Roger of Salisbury'; there are 77 such examples in the two selections. Such uses highlight the overlap between OE and OF function. The OE sense of 'from' is evident in such uses, as it is in the French *de*. Compare *Willelm of Romare* (1123) with the *Willelm de Romare* (1140). The copied entries are less consistent in the use of *of* in this context, and have forms such as *arcebiscoprice on Cantwarabyrig*, *Philippe de Braus*.

Most of the other uses of *of* are still in the OE sense of 'from'.

(16) *sende ... of Normandi to Englande* (1125) 'sent...from Normandy to England'

(17) *læt hire dun ... of þe tur* (1140) 'let her down...from the tower'

4.2 Genitive *of*

In the First Continuation there are no definite examples of *of* taking over a genitive function. The closest is *na of his gyfe* 'none of his gifts'. However such partitive constructions with *of* can also be found in the earlier entries: *manega of þæs cynges hired* 'many of the king's court'. Constructions with *of* in the partitive sense can be found in place of the genitive inflection in OE texts, although for these there is the complicating issue of Latin influence (Mitchell 1985: §1201).

The Final scribe also employs a partitive *of* construction, as in *mani of þe castles* 'many of the castles'; he also has one example of *of* being used to express ownership: *landes of þabbotrice* 'lands of the abbey'. This example is interesting since all the words in the phrase are native English words, and in the singular; as such, it could potentially have been marked with the inflectional ending *-es*. Considered in the larger context, *begæt thare priuilleges, an of alle þe landes of þabbotrice* 'got there privileges, one for all the lands of the abbey', there seems to be a slight overlap with the partitive, due to the use of *alle þe landes*. From all the possible lands belonging to the abbey which he could

win privileges for, Abbot Martin won privileges for all. This overlap between partitive and other genitive uses is a likely source of the original extension of *of* into the semantic area of the genitive.

These genitive *of* examples are definitely the exception rather than the norm; their importance lies in being among the earliest ME examples of the periphrastic genitive constructions.

4.3 Verbs and *of*

Both scribes use certain verbs with *of*. These often show a sense of the OE meaning 'from'.

(18) *wan of Waleram* 'won from Waleran'

(19) *sturuen of hungær* 'starved from hunger'

There are also in the Final Continuation two examples of *of* used in a passive construction, a function for which *of* was sometimes used in OE (Mitchell 1985: §1199):

(20) *wæl luued of þe king* 'well loved by the king'

(21) *7 of alle gode men* 'and by all good men'

What is the significance of such phrases, which show no innovation? These examples demonstrate not only continuity of the OE usage, but also overlap with OF *de*, which also had the meaning 'from' and could be used to indicate the agent of a passive construction: *furent de Deu hai* '(they) were hated by God' (Kibler 1984: 172). Although these examples are not themselves genitive, they demonstrate that the use of genitive *of* in ME was not sudden nor entirely due to French influence, but rather that the very similar OF *de* could have encouraged the rise of *of*. Whether invader or native, the inhabitants of England who learned a French or English dialect would have encountered a preposition, *of* or *de*, which was already very similar in its uses to their native preposition. (A rather interesting fact in itself, given that *of* and *de* are not cognates (see *Kentish Sermons*, 4.2).

5. Split Genitives

5.1 The First Continuation

In the First Continuation there are seven examples of the construction I call "split genitive." (See also Mustanoja 1960: 78-9)

(22) *þes eorles sandermen of Angeow* 'the Earl of Anjou's messengers'

(23) *for þes biscopes luuen of Særesbyrig*

'for the bishop of Salisbury's love/for love of the bishop of Salisbury'

(24) *þes biscopes nefes of Searesbyrig* 'the bishop of Salisbury's nephew'

(25) *þes kinges stiward of France* 'the king of France's steward'

(26) *þes eorles casteles Waleram* 'the earl Waleran's castles'

(27) *for þes eorles sunu Robert of Normandi, Willelm het*

'for the Earl Robert of Normandy's son, called William'

(28) *Fulkes eorles gingre dohter to wife of Angeow*

'Earl Fulk of Anjou's younger daughter to wife'

The split genitive construction is used for individuals who were known by their title, and usually, but not always, includes a location. (26), (27), and (28) include the individual's name as well. The following pattern is generally followed:

art_{GEN} - title_{GEN} - noun_{HEAD} - (name) - of - PLACENAME

There are slight variations to this pattern: (28) has no article but rather the earl's name;

(26) does not include the place name.

The examples which contain personal names are most informative. In (26) and (27), where the earl's name follows the object, it is uninflected, but *Fulkes*, which precedes both the title and object, is inflected. Despite the, to modern eyes, extraordinary word order of these phrases, the last three examples indicate a transition to a structure which is standard in ModE: a possessor noun MUST precede its object. Only a noun which precedes the object can be inflected.

5.2 The Final Continuation

In the Final Continuation there is only one similar construction: *þe kinges suster of France to wife* 'the King of France's sister as wife'. The article is of course uninflected, as the Final scribe has an invariable article. There is also a shift in word order; while (28) places the location at the end of the phrase, the Final scribe has moved it closer to the person it refers to. Also, the adverbial phrase *to wife* is now outside of the genitive NP, unlike (28) above.

The Final scribe seems to have a variation of the split genitive, in which location is not used but name and title are.

(29) *þe kinges sune Henries* 'the King Henry's son'

(30) *þe kinges dohter Henries* 'the King Henry's daughter'

(31) *Henri þe kinges brother Stephe* 'Henry, the King Stephen's brother'

Unlike the First scribe, the Final inflects both the preceding title and the following name. The Final scribe's uninflected articles raise the question of which part of the NP the article is actually modifying - the genitive noun which immediately follows it, or the head noun.

5.3 The 1112-1121 entries

Split genitives are common in the earlier entries, and frequently follow the pattern $\text{art}_{\text{GEN}} - \text{title}_{\text{GEN}} - \text{noun}_{\text{HEAD}} - \text{of} - \text{PLACENAME}$. There may also be more than one possessor noun, as in this example from 1118:

(32) *þes kinges wyrre of France 7 þæs eorles of Angeow 7 þæs eorles of Flandran*

'the king of France's war and the earl of Anjou's and the earl of Flanders'

There are no similar constructions in the PCC, but this may be due more to a lack of instances in which there were multiple possessors for the same head noun, rather than a grammatical restriction.

These earlier entries contain examples such as *þæs cynges mæn Heanriges* 'the King Henry's men', which follow the pattern used by the Final scribe in *þe kinges sune Henries*, but which the First scribe does not use, despite his presumed familiarity with the pattern. Oddly, in the copied and Final entries, postposed possessives are possible, but not in the intervening First entries. The Final scribe's use is slightly different than the copied entries; he will only post-pose one noun in a split genitive, while in the copied entries both genitives can be post-posed: *se wæs nefa Ansealmes ærcebiscopes* 'he was Archbishop Anselm's nephew'.

6. Summary

The Continuations show a language in flux, with some features which greatly resemble ModE and others which are unchanged from OE. The genitive singular nouns

all end in *-es*, and this ending is used by both scribes for possessive and adverbial genitives. While there are examples of the genitive of time and of description, their limited use and imperfect forms indicate that these are no longer a part of the living language; it seems likely that the First scribe in particular has learned these constructions for the earlier text. The same is true of the genitive plural ending - it is rare and appears to be a remnant; there are also early examples of the common plural used in genitive contexts. The modifiers show a more rapid reduction: only the First scribe has an inflected singular article, and the only adjective which is consistently inflected is plural *alre*. Examples with *of* abound, but most commonly in the formula "PERSON of PLACE". The one example of a possessive periphrastic, at this very early date, is an indication that periphrastic genitives did not originate with French. Finally, the split genitive constructions are particularly interesting; in addition to being the main examples of extended genitive NPs, they are a clear reminder that the evolution of the genitive NP did not always follow the straightforward path so often presented in the standard histories, but could vary widely across time and space.

Vices and Virtues

1. Introduction

1.1 The Text

Vices & Virtues (V&V) is a dialogue between the soul and Reason, preserved in British Library MS Stowe 34. Laing dates the MS to the first quarter of the 13th century, in Essex (Laing 1993: 106). Although the format is not original to the unknown author, there is no evidence that he was working from any pre-existing text; the work appears to have been composed in his own Essex dialect.

1.2 Background

The general content and layout of V&V is not original to the author, but can be found in older works. It is possible that the author was familiar with Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae*, in which the imprisoned Boethius has a dialogue with the personification of Philosophy; the Latin text had been translated into OE during Alfred the Great's time. Much of his material may have come from other sources, both Latin and OE; however, given that the patterns closely follow those of the PCC, I have doubts about the claim that it may be a modernization of an OE work (Dickins and Wilson 1956: 86). It is certainly not in the same vein as the WMid modernization in *Lambeth*. Despite these possible influences from other works in other languages, there is no known exemplar for V&V. As an original composition, the text represents the continuation of the "native" vernacular tradition; that is, a tradition which appears to have had little interference from other languages and traditions.

2. Inflectional Genitives

2.1 Nouns

The most common inflectional ending is the singular *-es*. This is most commonly used with personal nouns denoting possession, such as *godes luue* 'God's love', *mannes hierte* 'man's heart'. In this environment *-es* occurs 35 times. There is one instance of a non-personal possessive noun, *ðas lichames deað* 'the body's death'. However, since the body is closely connected to the idea of a person, this is not a great departure from the *-es*/possessive personal noun tendency, which brings the total uses of *-es* in this context to 36.

There is also one example of a personal possessive noun which does not have *-es*: *mines fader wille* 'my father's will'. This is a remnant of the OE *-r* stem noun class, in which the genitive form was identical to the nominative (see also *Lambeth* 2.1). With the loss of genitive modifier marking, this would have become a very weak form. Indeed the scribe later uses the form *faderes*, a new analogical formation which has the advantage of being unambiguous. Since the scribe uses *-es* in 36 out of 37 times, it seems safe to conclude that *-es* had become the only productive genitive inflection. (Three other examples of possible "endingless" genitives will be discussed below.)

Inflected plural genitives are quite rare. One, *fif þusend wintre* 'five thousand winters', may be a fixed expression; whether the genitive plural here is an active part of the scribe's grammar is not clear. There is one other possible example of a genitive plural: *7 alre mannes* 'and all men's'. The form of the noun is identical to that of the genitive singular, yet the form of the modifier, as well as the context *swa lief swa godes luue 7 alre mannes* 'as dear as God's love and all men's', suggests that this is a genitive

plural. If so, this is an early example of the genitive -s plural; similar examples also appeared in the O text of Layamon and the PCC.

2.2 Modifiers

There are very few modifiers present in the inflected genitive phrases. There are only two instances of a definite article:

(1) *ðas lichames deað* 'the body's death'

(2) *ðe deade man[n]es þruh* 'the dead man's coffin'

It is impossible to make definite judgments based on two examples; it is interesting to note that (1) is the only possible example of an inflected article, while (2) is definitely uninflected. Yet the scribe has not completely lost the inflected forms of the article, for example using a plural form *þo*, or accusative singular *þane*; in both contexts he also uses indeclinable *þe*. As has been mentioned before, there is overlap between the forms of the definite article 'the' and demonstrative 'this'. In his data, Millar find only articles with a distinct genitive form *þVs* (Millar 2000: 117). If this is correct, then it raises the interesting question of which word the article modifies, the genitive noun or the head noun (*Peterborough* 5.2).

Adjectives are slightly more frequent, appearing in seven of the inflected genitive NPs. Like (2) above, none of the singular adjectives are inflected.

The only lexical adjective which has a genitive form is *alre*, the plural adjective found in the phrase *alre mannes* discussed above. From comparison with other ME texts, it appears that 'all' maintains inflection and number marking longer than any other adjective, although why this should be so is unclear.

2.3 Adverbial Genitives

The scribe still uses the -es inflectional ending for the adverbial genitive. The most common example is *a3eanes*, which occurs ten times. However, there are also four examples of non-genitive *a3ean*, meaning that the scribe was using the genitive slightly more than 70% of the time. There are two other adverbial genitives, *mucheles* 'greatly' and *un3ewares* 'unawares'; there are also two examples of an expression which in OE used the genitive, but which this scribe no longer marks as such. *be dai3e 7 be nihte* 'by day and by night', *be nihte* would previously have been genitive, but the scribe has lost this particular adverbial use, and seems to be using the dative form commonly found after prepositions (see also Layamon 2.2). These two phrases follow a preposition, while the rest do not. Since the non-genitive forms *a3ean* do not follow a preposition, but occur in the same environment as the *a3eanes* forms, the presence of a preposition is not the sole trigger for losing the genitive adverbs, although it may have encouraged such a trend.

These adverbial genitives have rather interesting later careers. *a3eanes* is the ancestor of Standard English *against*, but *a3ean* also has a descendant, *again*. (Historically it is the genitive form, *a3eanes*, which is derived from the non-genitive *a3ean*.) ModE still has 'unawares', the descendant of *un3ewares*. Speakers do not consider such forms as genitive.

2.4 Eternal Consequences: Compound or Genitive

Apart from the earlier example *mines fader wille*, there are three "endingless" genitives:

- (3) *heuene heinesse* 'highness of heaven'
- (4) *helle depnesse* 'the deepness of hell'
- (5) *heuene riche* 'kingdom of heaven'

(4) could perhaps be explained as one of the endless genitives derived from the OE strong feminine declension, which sometimes appear in ME (Mustanoja 1960: 71). (3) and (5), however, involve *heuene*, which was a strong masculine noun in OE, and should appear as *heuenes*. Why did the scribe opt for the innovative form? Could these possibly be compounds? In the glossary to his edition, Holthausen lists these examples in the form of hyphenated compounds, yet his definitions are periphrastic genitives, e.g. "deepness of hell." Perhaps here there is an overlap between form and function, genitive and compound. A related example is *domesdai3e* 'Doomsday'. In OE this was a genitive NP consisting of two words, *domes dæg*. The V&V scribe writes it as a single word, and even the ModE equivalent preserves the -s- from the old genitive, although it is not certain that speakers consider this related to ModE 's.

2.5 *kennes*

There are two examples of this word:

- (6) *eueles kennes sade* 'seed of an evil kind'
- (7) *sumes kennes (lean)* '(reward) of some kind'

(The third example with this word, *a manies kennes* 'in many ways', is a plural noun.)

These are the only examples of an inflected genitive of description, from which it would appear that this use of the inflection is being lost. One of the remarkable things about these examples is that the adjective markers agree with those of the noun. As the examples in 2.2 show, modifier agreement with a noun was not common, yet both adjectives which occur with *kennes* are in agreement. Why is the adjectival inflection preserved here, and why also the genitive of description? It is, as Wardale says, "a curious construction" (Wardale 1949: §103). He further says "the genitive force of [OE] *cynna* was hardly felt, and it had almost adjectival significance" (Wardale 1949: §94). According to Mustanoja, there was also often confusion between singular and plural genitive forms (Mustanoja 1960: 85). Unfortunately, neither author provides a thorough discussion of the use of *kennes*, which seems to deserve an independent study of its own, especially given that the MED attributes some Old Norse influence.

The genitive of description with *cunnes* was also mentioned in 2.3 of the Layamon discussion; however in that case the occurrence of such constructions was less surprising, since the C scribe preserves other non-possessive uses of the genitive inflection. Finding *kennes* constructions in V&V is more surprising, since apart from these two examples the scribe's genitive inflection is limited to personal possessives and adverbials.

3. *of*-phrases

of phrases are common in V&V, occurring a total of 75 times. According to function, these phrases can be divided into three types: genitive, prepositional, verbal phrases.

3.1 Genitive Phrases

There are 37 genitive *of*-phrases; these are NPs where in OE an inflected genitive would often be found. I say often; as I have mentioned (Introduction 1.7), for some functions an *of*-phrase was a possibility even in OE. Nonetheless, the functions in which these *of*-phrases occur are often considered the domain of the genitive inflection. *of* can be used with both singular and plural nouns, for a variety of functions. The following table gives examples of some of these phrases, along with their function.

Table 1

<i>an of ðe heued-sennes</i>	partitive
<i>þe luue of gode</i>	possessive-objective
<i>þe cloþes of religiun</i>	possessive-subjective
<i>besantes of ðe fif wittes</i>	description

The one area in which it does not appear to have made a serious expansion into is the area in which the majority of the inflectional genitives are found - singular personal nouns of physical possession. In the selection I found no examples of *of* being used in this environment. The personal nouns which are inflected are a slightly different type of possessive; they often convey a sense of actual ownership, of physically having. Abstract nouns, such as *religiun*, *sennes*, are not capable of physically possessing the head noun which they modify. The decision between inflection and periphrasis may have been influenced by the animacy of the genitive noun (see *Lambeth* 2.2.1).

One example is particularly useful for seeing the overlap of the original OE *of* 'from' and the ME genitive use. *aingles of heuene* 'angels of heaven', which could easily be translated as 'angels from heaven'. This demonstrates how *of* would have extended into the functional/semantic space occupied by the genitive inflection: the angels are from heaven, it is their place of origin, in a sense the angels belong to heaven. But since heaven is incapable of physical ownership, the periphrastic genitive is used, rather than the inflected genitive.

3.2 Other Prepositional Equivalents

The scribe's use of *of* is not limited to genitive constructions. He still retains the OE meaning of 'from', in the phrase *cumb of* 'comes from'. *of* is also used in the headings for each section, such as *Of sorinesse* 'On sadness, About sadness.' This use seems to mimic the pattern of Latin works, which frequently used *de* in such titles, as *De Anima*. Since Latin *de* was viewed as the equivalent to English *of*, this reflects the influence of Latin (possibly French), even if it were a conscious imitation. However, since even in OE *of* is found in the sense of 'about', this cannot be entirely attributed to foreign influence.

3.3 Verbal Phrases

There are 25 examples of verbal phrases which appear with *of*. Again, the following table gives examples of forms and functions, but does not show every possible function.

Table 2

<i>bieð of hei3e kenne</i>	'is of high family'	origin
<i>þenchen of ðine for(ð)siðe</i>	'think of your death'	'about'
<i>andswerien of alle ðine dades</i>	'answer for all your deeds'	'for'

<i>iwēr3ede of alle hadede hafde</i>	'cursed by all ordained heads'	passive
<i>haueð of ... wrecchade ibroht</i>	'had from ... wretchedness brought'	'from'

In many of these examples, the preposition retains its OE sense of 'from', and it could be argued that these are not phrasal verbs at all, but simply verb phrases, in which the preposition is independent of the verb. This explanation seems particularly probably with verbs which imply directionality, such as *3edriuēn* 'driven'. With certain verbs, *of* is part of a compound preposition, *ut of*: *3edriuēn ut of* 'driven out of'.

By my count, there are still 14 examples in which *of* combines with the verb to create a phrasal verb, rather than a verb phrase. Some of the examples from Table 2 are good examples: *þenchen of ðine for(ð)siðe*, *andswerien of alle ðine dades*, *iwēr3ede of alle hadede hafde*.

These examples demonstrate how the preposition was able to move into the functional space previously occupied by the genitive inflection. To begin with, *of* was clearly a semantically versatile word, which could be used with a variety of meanings. There was also the functional overlap with the inflection, as *bieð of hei3e kenne* shows. Like *aingles of heuene*, this example shows how the semantic overlap between the inflection and preposition led to a functional overlap and eventually a takeover.

4. Summary

The V&V scribe already shows a tendency to reserve the inflected genitive (-es) for singular personal nouns of possession, while the periphrastic *of* constructions are expanding into functional/semantic areas that in OE were filled by the genitive inflection. The non-singular, non-possessive uses of the inflection may well be somewhat fixed; it is possible that the scribe did not consider forms like *a3eanes*, *wintre* to be genitive, but simply learned these as the form for these words. In this the scribe is similar to the other texts so far examined; it is the details, his micro-system, which are of greatest interest. The consistent but rather puzzling preservation of genitive forms with *kennes*, the possibility that the presence of a preposition may have affected the adverbial genitive, and the ambiguous compounds, all these features are peculiar to this text.

East Midlands Conclusion

The East Midlands texts are less conservative than those of the West. The singular inflection is also *-es*, and as a productive morpheme is confined to personal nouns of possession. There is also a continuing trend of associating the genitive inflection with animate nouns. *-es* is also the adverbial ending, but in this case it is possible that speakers no longer associated the ending with “genitive”. There is no convincing evidence for plural noun inflection; the most common example in these texts, *wyntre*, is a fixed form with no genitive function. There is also a loss of article inflection (except in First Continuation), and of inflected adjectives, with the exception of *alre*. The use of *of* is beginning to increase, particularly in *V&V*, yet the one area in which it is not common is the area which is most common for the inflection – singular personal possessives. In these texts, many of the uses of *of* show clear signs of the overlap between *of* ‘from’ and *of* ‘genitive’.

IV. Kent

Introduction

In the southeast the influx of Normans was strong, with the Conqueror's half-brother Odo, bishop of Bayeux, made earl of Kent in 1067. As was mentioned in Introduction 1.5, the position of Kent, the area of England closest to Normandy, made the natural point of landing for the French invaders. Unlike Worcester, at Canterbury Englishmen were early replaced by men from the Continent; Lanfranc of Pavia, formerly abbot of Caen, was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1070. With the archbishops came other clerics from the Continent, bringing with them their own texts and scribal traditions. Given the strong French presence, in terms of government, Church, and quite possibly general population, this seems to be the ideal area in which to explore the possible influences of French patterns, as well as those of translation and bilingualism.

The Kentish Sermons

1. The Texts

The *Kentish Sermons* are preserved in Bodley Library MS Laud Misc. 471 (I use the printed texts in Bennett and Smithers' *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*). The manuscript is bound with another, and is dated by Laing to the second half of the thirteenth century (Laing 1993: 137). The sermons are in the Kentish dialect, possibly written at Canterbury. They are a translation of Maurice de Sully's sermons 2, 3, 5, and 6 from his series of homilies, originally composed between 1168 and 1175. (The MS also includes an Anglo-Norman translation of sermons 7-36). As a source for the Old French original I use the Robson's edition of the text of the Sens Cathedral Chapter MS, c. 1230, which from the orthography appears to be derived from the author's autograph (Robson 1952: 59). The popularity of Maurice's sermons in England is evidenced by the existence of eleven MSS from the thirteenth century which contain part or all of his sermons, although apart from Laud Misc 471, none are in English. (One of these, Bodley MS Douce 270, was in use in Somersetshire in the early fourteenth-century.) While it is unlikely that the Sens MS itself was the exemplar used by the Kentish scribe, the correspondences between this and the Laud MS are so close that it can be reasonably be used as a basis for the ME text.

2. Thirteenth Century England: Multilingualism and Translation

2.1 Multilingualism

In thirteenth century England there were three languages commonly employed for writing: Latin, Anglo-Norman, and Middle English. (Introduction 1.6) Latin would have been a learned, not native, language for all scribes, but Middle English and Anglo-Norman would have been native languages; by the thirteenth century it is even possible that a scribe might be bilingual in both languages, a possibility which is supported by the presence of both English and Anglo-Norman translations of Maurice's homilies in MS Laud Misc 471 (Bennet and Smithers 1966: 213). In addition, during the thirteenth century it became more fashionable to learn the Francien dialect of Paris, rather than the Anglo-Norman form that had developed in England after the Conquest (Baugh and Cable 1993: §101, Strang 1970: §125).

Bilingualism and the influence of French have often been topics for historians of English, but the standard histories are too inclined to treat the English-French relationship as a one-way street, and to limit their discussions to matters of lexical borrowing (see Introduction 1.1). Unfortunately, discussions of medieval translation are often literary, rather than linguistic, and include little discussion of the significance of the native bilingual working between his two languages. Yet surely, if we wish to understand bilingualism and language contact in Norman England, this would be the logical starting point.

2.2. Translation

The *Sermons* are particularly important not only because of their position in time and space, but also for the light this translation sheds on the influence of French on the Middle English genitive. Despite Bennett and Smithers's description of the *Sermons* as a "close and rather stiff English rendering," (Bennet and Smithers 1966: 213) I would argue that the scribe is an excellent translator, who managed both to make a close

translation of the original and also to make that translation into a natural English text. Indeed, I believe it is this very quality that makes the *Sermons* so useful in learning about the development of the native constructions, and the possible extent to which French influenced English usage. The Kentish scribe was a translator, not a glossator; he renders his OF original into his own English dialect, with his own grammar.

Despite all the ink which has been used to discuss the French influence on ME, none of the standard histories, such as Baugh and Cable, mention translations between the various languages used in thirteenth century England. These authors (and many others) discuss, sometimes at length, the state of bilingualism in Norman England, yet no mention is made of the written evidence of this bilingualism, which surely has much to tell us about the structure of early Middle English. The only linguistic study which begins to address this issue is that of Pope, who in her discussion of Anglo-Norman orthography acknowledges that the "scribal traditions of three schools conflicted - English, French, and Latin." (Pope 1952: §1205) How a scribe maps a foreign expression back onto his own native language patterns is a source of information on ME which seems to have been completely overlooked; at the very least this essay should show how important this area is, and how it can contribute to our understanding of eME.

4. Old French Genitive

In order to compare the ME and OF genitive constructions, a brief overview of those constructions in OF is needed. Following Kibler, there were three common methods of indicating possession: the genitive use of the oblique case, the preposition *a*, and the preposition *de* (Kibler 1984: 140).

4.1 The OF Case system

Old French is characterized by a two-case system: nominative and oblique. The nominative is used for subjects, direct address, and appositives; the oblique is used for all other functions, including the genitive. Originally the oblique genitive was used when the possessor was a person. Table 1 represents a somewhat simplified version of the case system (Kibler 1984: 23, 37).

Table 1

	I	II	III
NS	la fame	li voisins	li sire
OS	la fame	le voisin	le seigneur
NP	les fames	li voisin	li seigneur
OP	les fames	les voisins	les seigneurs

(**I** represents a feminine noun; **II** and **III** masculine nouns.)

The OF system differs in several respects from the ME. Firstly, the oblique was a form which could be used for several cases. OF could also make a distinction between singular and plural genitives, a feature which has disappeared from many ME dialects (excepting certain fossilized expressions). Syntactically, the formally inflected genitive noun in OF follows the head noun it modifies, where in ME the inflected noun precedes the head. How the scribe chooses to translate the OF formal inflection is important; does he use the equivalent formal inflection *-es*, or does he prefer the construction with *of*?

4.2 OF prepositions

Unlike ME, OF could use two prepositions to indicate possession. The first, *a*, was used when the possessor was a person. The second, *de*, originally was used with inanimate possessors, but became more widely generalized and by the time of Maurice's sermons can be used in all contexts. Etymologically, the OF prepositions have an interesting relationship to *of*. While *de* is generally regarded as the equivalent to *of*, it is actually *a* which is the cognate preposition, being derived from Latin *ab*, which comes from the same IE root as *of*, **apo* (OED).

As in the morphological system, the prepositional usage differed between OF and ME. In ME there was only one preposition which could be used to indicate possession, whereas OF used two. How the scribe chooses to render *a* could be quite significant for our understanding of the ME system. Does he understand these to be possessive constructions? If so, how does he choose to translate them into ME, with inflection or preposition?

4.3 Anglo-Norman

If the scribe was bilingual, he would likely have been bilingual in Kentish and Anglo-Norman, rather than the Francien-Picard dialect of Maurice. Anglo-Norman, the variety of Norman French which developed among the French speakers in England in the centuries following the Conquest, was as different from the Central French dialect as Kentish was from the dialects of the Midlands. While there are differences between Anglo-Norman and Francien at all levels of language, particularly important for this discussion are the differences of nominal morphology. As Pope points out, both ME and OF were "honey-combed with local divergences and [were] also rapidly changing" (Pope 1952: §1079). Anglo-Norman saw a much earlier reduction of the case system than the continental varieties of French. How much impact would this insular French dialect have had on a scribe from Kent? Could his knowledge of Anglo-Norman have affected his translation of the central dialect of Maurice? The translation dates from a time when Anglo-Norman was being replaced by the now more prestigious dialect of Paris, giving our scribe a rather unique opportunity of knowing both Anglo-Norman and Francien, as well as his own Kentish dialect, which reinforces the importance of considering translations to a full understanding of ME developments.

5. Inflected Genitives

5.1 Nouns

There are 17 nouns with formal genitive inflection. Of these, 15 are singular, with one ambiguous example which could be singular or plural. The scribe's use of the inflection *-es* has become much more restricted than in OE. With one exception, this ending is used only with nouns denoting persons, and only for possession. In this the scribe's use very much resembles the patterns of ModE. The single non-possessive, non-personal occurrence is *mai longe liues wene* 'may hope for long life'. This is the scribe's only remnant of the more extensive usage common to the OE genitive, and has no parallel in the OF text. From Laing's description it appears that the scribe has simply copied this from the poem *Memento Mori*, which is bound in the same MS and begins with *Man may longe liwes wenen* (Laing 19993: 137).

There is only one unambiguously plural form *xxxi wyntre* 'thirty winters,' (derived from the OE genitive *wyntra*) which is certainly a fixed expression, rather than a

conscious use of the genitive of measure; indeed, it occurs as part of an *of*-phrase: *of xxxti wyntre* ‘of 30 winters’. This does not have a parallel French construction; this is a feature of the Kentish dialect of the scribe. There are modern parallels for an old genitive construction which has kept its form but lost the functional meaning, such as the American English expressions

(1) *three mile long* (genitive of measure)

(2) *the cleaning woman always comes Tuesdays* (genitive of time)

(Mustanoja 1960: 89)

It is quite possible that the scribe has retained a fixed form without any knowledge of the original function, in a manner similar to what has occurred in these examples. It is even possible that *wyntre* may be a plural, in much the same way that (2) has been re-analyzed as plural by speakers, who have no idea that the *-s* is derived from an older genitive singular. It seems certain that *wyntre* is a fixed form, as all other genitive plurals are formed with *of*.

The remaining inflected example is slightly ambiguous as to number: *to here godes sacrefise* ‘to their god’s/gods’ sacrifice.’ If the scribe was following the OF, then this would be singular, which seems likely given that the only definite inflected plural is the fixed expression discussed above. It certainly fits the scribe’s patterns for the singular: a personal noun denoting possession. Also, there are no examples of a genitive plural inflection, although there are many (in fact all in this text) which are formed with *of*. Considering these factors, it is more probable that *godes* is here a singular genitive; to see it as a plural may be to anticipate a later state of the language.

5.2 Modifiers

The scribe does not have inflected modifiers, with a single exception: *þes lordes commandement*. However, as there are only four modifiers, it would be unwise to place too much emphasis on these, other than to say that a loss of inflected modifiers would reflect the general pattern of ME, in which adjectives in particular lose inflectional endings earlier than nouns. While this particular ME phrase differs from the OF equivalent, the OF still makes distinctions between the case and number of the definite article; French influence was not sufficient to affect the scribe’s article system. More interesting than the scribe’s English adjectives are some of his translations of the OF adjective, discussed below.

5.3 Translation Issues

The following table summarizes the correspondences between the inflected genitives of the ME text with those of the OF original.

Table 2

parallel OF and ME	7
ME phrase not found in OF	6
OF possessive pronoun	2
OF <i>de</i>	2

In the two cases where the scribe translates a possessive pronoun with a genitive noun, it seems possible that this was done for the sake of clarity. The most interesting divergence is when the scribe translates *de* with an inflected genitive. Both of these cases *-þe gode Cristenemannes herte: corage del bon crestien* and *Godes luue: l’amor de Deu -*

fit the scribe's usage; a personal noun of possession is inflected. It must be said this is not an infallible guide; for examples of the scribe's use of *of* in the same context see the discussion of *God* below. What is clear is that the Kentish scribe was not slavishly following his exemplar.

It is this approach to translation, close but not word-for-word, which enables us to learn about the contemporary language patterns. The Kentish scribe is consistent in preserving the sense of the source text, but does not do this in a way which interferes with his own language patterns. While there are many French lexical items (as we would expect from a bilingual scribe), the translation is structurally independent from its source. A good example of this comes from the two phrases for the payment which the vineyard owner and workers had agreed on beforehand:

- (3) ME *peny of forewarde* 'penny of agreement'
 OF *covenant d'un denier* 'agreement of a penny'

The two phrases have the same meaning, yet their syntactic structure is "backwards."

6. *of* phrases

There are 106 *of*-phrases in the selections, more than six times the number of inflected genitives. (This includes all *of*-phrases, even those few, such as *ut of*, which do not intrude upon the genitive territory; however for many phrases it is impossible to draw a clear line between the OE function and the newer ME functions.) This dramatic increase from OE times is certainly significant, and does in many cases parallel the OF structure of the original. However, 32 of the *of* phrases I found do not have *de* in the original French. In some cases, this is because the English scribe has introduced a phrase which is not present in the OF (see 7 below). But in many of these cases the scribe chooses to translate the non-*de* OF structure with an *of*-phrase. These mismatches tell us much about how the scribe used *of*.

6.1 OF inflection

There are six examples of the scribe translating an OF inflection with an *of*-phrase. There does appear to be a constraint: these examples only occur when the OF genitive noun is *Deu* or *Nostre Segnor*. While this constraint may be semantic or stylistic, it is certainly significant that these examples involve the scribe translating a singular, personal noun. As I mentioned in 5.3, there is also one example of the scribe translating OF *de* with inflected *Godes*, which will be further discussed below. The scribe clearly understood both forms, inflectional *-es* and phrasal *of*, to occupy the same functional space. The following examples show to what extent the scribe considered these two constructions to be equal:

- (4) *wille of ure Louerde* *volenté Nostre Segnor* 'will of our Lord'
 (5) *ure Lordes beringe* *naisence Nostre Segnor* 'our Lord's birth'

Both fit the pattern of singular, personal possessives, and the choice of inflectional form would seem to be reinforced by the OF, yet the scribe chooses to use an *of*-phrase in (4) but the inflection in (5), indicating that two forms occupy the same functional space, and may even be interchangeable.

6.2 OF adjective

There are four examples of the scribe translating an OF adjective with an *of*-

phrase, as in *nature of man: l'umaine nature*. It is apparent that the scribe considered that the *of*-phrase had an adjectival or modifying quality. There is an extent to which any genitive, whether inflected or analytic, is adjectival, as such phrases always modify another noun; given this, it is perhaps not surprising that the scribe would replace an adjectival modifier with a genitival phrase. As in 6.1, his translation shows that *of* has moved into the semantic space of the old inflection.

6.3 OF *a*

There are three examples in which the OF expresses possession not with *de* but with *a*:

(6) *herte of þe gode Cristenemanne cuer al crestien* ‘heart of the (good) Christian’

(7) *amonestement of þo dieule l'amoneste al diable* ‘temptation of the devil’

(8) *time of his prophetes al tans ...as autres prophetes* ‘time of his/the prophets’

OF had two prepositions which could be used to express possession; English had only one. The scribe does not choose to use the inflection, despite the fact that (6) and (7) would seem to fit the general pattern for using *-es*; i.e. a singular personal noun expressing possession. The scribe seems to restrict the inflectional ending to singular nouns, so it is perhaps no surprise that he translates (8), which is plural, with *of*. *of* has extended even into the most basic area of the inflection’s functional space: singular personal nouns of possession.

The scribe is able to translate all these different constructions without altering the sense, so there is no question of him not understanding the function of a particular form. That he translates inflectional OF forms with *of*, and vice versa, indicates that he perceived these two forms as occupying the same functional space (both in OF and ME). (6), (7) and (8) are particularly interesting; when it came to using prepositions to express genitive functions, ME had only one option, where OF had at least two, which indicates that when considering the French influence on ME, there is more to consider than a simple comparison of *de* and *of*.

7. *blisce of heuene* ‘bliss of heaven’

This phrase is particularly striking, not so much for its structure, but for the fact that none of the five occurrences has an OF parallel. The scribe is choosing to use *of* because that is how he would express this idea. Using *of* to express this genitive function is a natural part of the scribe’s speech. This example also shows how the OE preposition *of* expanded into the functional space of the genitive inflection; there is a sense in which bliss comes from or originates from heaven. While it is possible in this case to connect the use of *of* with its OE function -from, origin- the scribe does not use the inflection in this way, indicating that the preposition has taken over this role.

8. *God* and the genitive

There are 20 examples which have *God* in the ME translation and/or the OF original.

Table 3

OF and ME match	9
translational difference	2
OF possessive pronoun, ME <i>-es</i>	2

OF <i>de</i> , ME <i>-es</i>	1
OF genitive, ME <i>of</i>	6

The six examples of OF genitive translated with ME *of* were discussed in 6.1 above. The one example of the reverse process, *Godes luue: l'amor de Deu*, is similar in that it shows the equality these two structures must have had for the English scribe. As has been mentioned, the replacement of a French possessive pronoun with an inflected English noun may have been a stylistic choice, where the scribe may have thought that using a proper noun helped clarify the meaning. The remaining two examples are rather interesting:

- | | | |
|------|-------------------------|----------------|
| (9) | <i>for Godes luue</i> | <i>por Deu</i> |
| (10) | <i>for luue of Gode</i> | <i>por Deu</i> |

For whatever reason, the Kentish scribe seems to have preferred to translate “for God” with “for God’s love/for love of God.” As in my ModE translation, the scribe can use either inflectional or phrasal genitive to express this concept, with no change in meaning. There is a possibility that (9) is a subjective genitive where (10) is objective, but in context it is difficult to make a perfect distinction.

9. Summary

The *Kentish Sermons* provide valuable information on the usage of genitive inflection and *of*-phrases. The scribe tended to limit the inflectional ending to singular personal nouns expressing possession; it seems likely that the examples which do not fit this pattern are not the scribe's own usage, but rather remnants of the earlier pattern. From his translation of OF inflection and *de*, it is clear that the English scribe viewed these and their ME equivalents as occupying the same functional space, possession; this represents a significant departure from earlier texts. The translation also indicates that the *of*-phrase has moved into other functional areas previously occupied by forms of the genitive, such as the genitive of description. And perhaps most significantly, the scribe’s use of *of* in examples which have no OF equivalent indicate that the *of*-phrase has become a natural part of his grammar.

The Ayenbite of Inwit

1. Introduction

1.1 The Text

The *Ayenbite of Inwit* is a Middle English translation of the Old French treatise *La Somme le Roi*. This is a compilation of treatises on basic matters of the Christian faith, such as the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, etc. (Francis 1942: xxi-xxii). It is preserved in British Library MS Arundel 57, written in 1340 in Canterbury by Dan Michel (Laing 1993: 66). Like the PCC, the *Ayenbite* is an autograph copy. We know the author's name and exact date of composition, as well as his location, and even have a general idea of his age. As Dan Michel writes in his preface:

Pis boc is dan Michelis of Northgate / y-write an englis of his a3ene hand. þet hatte: Ayenbyte of inwyt. And is of þe boc-house of saynt Austines of Canterberi. (Gradon 1979: 1).

"This book is Don Michael's of Northgate, written in English in his own hand, which is called *Ayenbite of Inwit*. And is of the book-house of St. Augustine's of Canterbury."

and later

þet þis boc is uolued ine þe eue of þe holy apostles Symon an Iudas / of a ne broþer of þe cloystre of sa(yn)t austin of Canterberi / Ine þe yeare of oure lhordes beringe. 1340. (Gradon 1979: 1).

"that this book is completed on the eve of the holy apostles Simon and Judas, by a brother of the cloister of St. Augustine of Canterbury, in the year from our Lord's birth 1340."

Based on records which list Dan Michel as being ordained a priest in 1296, Gradon calculates that he would have been at least 70 when he completed the MS, and probably some years older (Gradon 1979: 12). As a result, Dan Michel's language is more reflective of the late thirteenth century, rather the mid-fourteenth century period that the manuscript dates from (Laing 1993: 66).

Although we know that the *Ayenbite* is written in Dan Michel's own hand, what is not clear is whether he was the translator or only the copyist; for a discussion of the arguments see Gradon 1979, Introduction, esp. 10-12. Dan Michel appears to have been a scholarly man, and is known to have copied, and studied, several other manuscripts, both sacred and secular (Gradon 1979: 13-14).

1.2 The French text

La Somme le Roi was compiled in 1279 by Frère Lorens of Orleans; it had been begun at the request of Phillip III of France. Its popularity is shown by the large number of manuscripts which preserve all or part of the text, 79 (Francis 1942: xi), including two French texts in England, British Library MS Cotton Cleopatra A.v and British Library Royal 19 c.II. As well as English, the French text was translated into five other languages (Francis 1942: xxviii), often more than once. In English, there are also fourteenth century copies, as well as the fifteenth century translation of Caxton (Francis 1942: xxxii).

The inflectional system of this text shows signs of decay, such as the use of *peres*, with analogical nominative singular *-s*, rather than the etymologically correct form *pere*. Lorens was from Orléans, an area with a similar dialect to that of Maurice, but one

hundred years later; it is to be expected that the *Somme* text would show more advanced decay of the case system than the works of Maurice (see Pope 1952: §772).

For the French text I use the text of MS Cotton Cleopatra A.v, as printed by Varnhagen in *Englische Studien*, vol 2. As with all other texts which are versions of a pre-existing text, the Cleopatra MS is not the exemplar for the *Ayenbite*. Although this is not the text from which the *Ayenbite* was translated, "the closeness of the translation makes such a procedure relevant" (Gradon 1979: 55), providing that we remember that "[i]ts evidence...though often illuminating, must always be used with caution" (Gradon 1979: 56). The dating of the Cleopatra MS is uncertain, but placed in the first half fourteenth century (Gradon 1979: 54, footnote 2).

1.3 Reasons for Using the *Ayenbite*

Given the above comments about Dan Michel's language, this text represents the Kentish dialect perhaps a generation later than the *Kentish Sermons*. Like the *Sermons*, the *Ayenbite* is also a translation of a French text. Like the *Peterborough Chronicle* Continuations, these two texts provide an opportunity to study the development of the genitive NP in a single dialect, and under relatively similar circumstances (translation of an OF text). However, there is an important difference between Dan Michel and the *Sermons* scribe: the *Sermons* scribe was bilingual, Dan Michel was not.

2. Inflection

Inflected genitive noun phrases make up a very small percentage of the total genitive NPs in *Ayenbite*: there are only seven inflected NPs, versus the 135 *of*-phrases. The genitive ending is *-es*, and occurs only with one noun, *god* 'God'. There are no modifiers in these seven NPs, so nothing can be said about Dan Michel's genitive modifiers. This is due to the fact that 'God' was not modified, a feature common to all the ME texts.

In all examples, the OF original also has an inflectional form rather than periphrastic. As was mentioned in the *Kentish Sermons* discussion, word order of genitive NPs is different in the two languages; in OF the genitive noun follows its head, while in the ME text it must precede. There is one example with a rather unusual word order:

(1) *þe zoþe godes zone li vrais fiz dieu* 'the true son of God'

The OF forms make it clear that the article and adjective are modifying the head noun *fiz*, not the genitive *dieu*. Because of the tendency for the article and adjective to lose inflection earlier than nouns, in the English it would seem possible that these are modifying either noun; however, given the aforesaid habit of *not* modifying *god*, this does not seem likely. Perhaps in Dan Michel's dialect the genitive noun must immediately precede its head.

3. *of*-phrases

The *Ayenbite* selection has the highest number of *of*-phrases of any selection: 134. This is perhaps not surprising, since this is the latest text. Genitive *of*-phrases can occur with singular and plural nouns, animate and inanimate, and for all genitive functions (the genitive functions of ME, not OE).

3.1 OF adjective, ME *of*-genitive

There are five examples of an *of*-phrase being used to translate an OF adjective. These are similar to those found in the *Sermons*, where the OF adjective is replaced by *of* and the corresponding noun.

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (2) | <i>uayrhede of his kende</i> | 'beauty of his nature' |
| | <i>sa droit biauté naturele</i> | 'his proper natural beauty' |
| (3) | <i>alle wylle of ulesse</i> | 'all desire of flesh' |
| | <i>toute affection charnele</i> | 'all carnal affection' |

These examples highlight the inherently adjectival nature of the genitive. In addition to this, the choice to translate an OF adjective with a ME periphrastic genitive shows that the English construction, even if influenced by French, was an independent system (see also *Sermons* 6.2).

3.2 OF inflection, ME preposition

There are nine examples in which the OF inflected genitive is translated with an *of*-phrase. These cases are limited to nouns referring to the deity (*Sermons* 6.1): *dieu*, *pere*, *seignor*, *Jesu Crist* 'God, father, lord, Jesus Christ', such as the following:

- (4) *sanc Jesu Crist bloode of Iesu crist* 'the blood of Jesus Christ'

These examples fall into the group of singular, personal nouns of possession, the area in which the inflection was most likely to appear. Yet even here the periphrastic construction is making inroads.

That the French text uses the inflectional genitive more frequently than the English makes us reconsider the influence of the French construction on the English. At this moment, in this text, the two systems are quite similar: inflectional genitive for singular, personal nouns of possession, and periphrastic genitive for all other uses. Yet the OF text shows a greater incidence of inflected forms, and as is discussed below, there are periphrastic genitives found in the OF text which are so translated as to no longer be genitive.

Perhaps the high incidence of *of* is stylistic; perhaps Dan Michel considered the periphrastic genitive more formal than the inflected. At the same time, however, inflection is only used with *god*, a reference which one would expect to be the most formal. In this selection, the percentage of periphrastic constructions is as high as that found in a 20-century text, 95% (Mustanoja 1960: 76).

4. OF genitives not found in the *Ayenbite*

4.1 Inflectional Genitive

There are eighteen genitive NPs in the Cleopatra MS which are not found in the *Ayenbite* translation. In one of these examples, the only one in which the OF phrase is inflected, it seems that the translator has misunderstood the genitive inflection:

- (5) OF *la cortoisie dieu nostre pere, qui nous done*
'the grace of God our father, who gives us'

ME *þe cortaysyse god oure uader. þet ous yeff*
'the graciousness God our father. that us gives'

As Varnhagen remarks in the footnote to his text, Dan Michel has not recognized that *dieu* is a genitive (Varnhagen 1879: 32). There is a slight difference in the sense as a

result of the mistranslation. However, since this text of the *Somme* does show some signs of decay of the OF case system, this does not mean that the English translator did not understand the OF genitive, but rather in this particular context he misinterpreted the entire sentence, not the genitive NP.

4.2 ME translation of *de*

Table 1

expressions of quantity	9
preposition other than <i>of</i>	2
<i>trouver/finde</i> 'to find'	1
compound	1
other	4

There is only one example of a French genitive being translated with an English compound:

(6) *li rais du soleil* 'the ray of the sun' *þe zonne byam* 'the sun beam'
 Nonetheless this is a small reminder of the fact that ME had more than two options for dealing with previously genitive function.

Possibly the most interesting examples are those involving expressions of quantity. The following illustrate these uses:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| (7) <i>plus de cent mile</i> | <i>mo þanne an hondred þusend</i> | 'more than 100 000' |
| (8) <i>mout d'autres manieres</i> | <i>uele oþre maneres</i> | 'many other manners' |
| (9) <i>tant de pecchiés</i> | <i>zuo uele zennes</i> | 'so many sins' |
| (10) <i>tant de poudres</i> | <i>zuo moche doust</i> | 'so much dust' |

The seven examples of this type are incredibly important: they show that this dialect has lost the partitive use of the genitive, *while the OF still has it*. This is not only a difference of form, but also of function. Like the use of *of* in place of OF inflection discussed in 3.2, such examples lead us to wonder about the exact nature of the French influence. The example with *trouver* may be a similar: *troveroit de beles notelettes* 'found some beautiful little notes'. This seems to be a partitive use, and so the *Ayenbite* translation, *vinde uayre notes* 'find fair notes', without any partitive sense, fits the pattern of the above examples.

5. Translation

Dan Michel's translation is very close to the original text, yet at the same time very "English". Morphology and syntax are generally English (Gradon 1979: 55), but this quality is perhaps most noticeable in that oft-discussed area of French influence, the lexicon.

Table 1

ME	OF	ME	OF
<i>seruice</i>	<i>servise</i> 'service'	<i>uorespeche</i>	<i>prologue</i> 'prologue'
<i>eritage</i>	<i>eritage</i> 'inheritance'	<i>uayrhede</i>	<i>biauté</i> 'beauty'
<i>paradys</i>	<i>paradis</i> 'paradise'	<i>anlicnesse</i>	<i>semblance</i> 'semblance'

This "English" element is much more prominent in the *Ayenbite* than the *Sermons*; this is likely due to the fact that the *Sermons* scribe was bilingual, and more likely to import French words, whereas Dan Michel probably learned French as a second language. Of course it is also interesting to find such a high level of periphrastic genitives in a text which is so much more "English" than the *Sermons* (See Kentish Conclusion).

6. Summary

The *Ayenbite* is the text which shows the periphrastic *of*-phrase fully occupying the genitive functional space. Indeed, Dan Michel makes as much use of periphrasis as a modern translator (Mustanoja 1960: 76). He certainly does not translate every OF inflectional form with the ME inflection, even when the OF meets the requirements for using inflection in ME, namely a singular personal noun of possession. Another difference between the OF and the ME is the occurrence of OF partitive *de* constructions, which in the translation are not partitive. While it is possible to claim that Dan Michel's high incidence of *of*-phrases is due to his French source, the fact that the French text uses inflection more, and preserves the partitive function, make this claim an over-simplification.

Kentish Conclusion

There is a higher level of consistency between these two texts than any other dialectal pair, or even between the two Peterborough Continuations. It seems that by this time the genitive system in Kent had stabilized, at least in the written form of Canterbury. The two Kentish texts appear to be the most "modern" in their use of genitive phrases; inflection is limited to singular, personal nouns of possession, and *of* is used in all other contexts. I find this particularly interesting in light of the fact that Kentish is usually considered the most conservative dialect of Middle English. It is also interesting since, as mentioned above (*Ayenbite 5*), these two texts were written by men of different linguistic backgrounds, a feature which shows up in the vocabulary (the traditional area of greatest French influence), but NOT in their use of the genitive.

The inflected forms make up a small percentage of the total genitive NPs, and are generally confined to singular personal nouns of possession, with *of*-phrases occurring for this and all other functions, with noun both singular and plural, animate and inanimate. These texts show the highest incidence of *of*-phrases, and by comparing these to the source texts we can see that inflection and periphrasis were often considered interchangeable. We also see that the translators did not always follow the French originals; particularly interesting are cases in which *of* is used to translate the French inflection, adjective, and the preposition *a*.

V. Conclusion

1. Summary of Findings

1.1 Nouns - genitive singular

All texts use the form *-es* for the genitive singular; an inflected genitive noun must precede its head noun. The variation is in the functions for which this form can be used. In *Lambeth* this form has many functions: including possession, measure, partitive, description, object of a verb. In this text the genitive inflection can be used for all nouns, whether animate or inanimate. In *Layamon*, while remnants of a wider use can be found, there are only two productive functions, possession and adverbial; in the case of the latter, it is possible that only the form of the genitive has survived, and that speakers viewed such words as adverbs, not adverbial genitives. The EMid texts are similar to *Layamon*; the most common examples of the genitive singular are in possessive and adverbial contexts, although there are remnants of the wider usage once employed. The most common such remnant is the descriptive genitive, which appears in both the PCC and *V&V*, although in such a limited context that it seems likely that the descriptive genitive is no longer productive, but a fixed form surviving in only a few expressions. The Kentish texts show a genitive singular that has been greatly restricted, confined to personal nouns of possession.

1.2 Nouns - genitive plural

The forms of the genitive plural are more varied than the singular; also unlike the singular, this variation is region specific, with the WMid texts showing the greatest number of inflected genitive plural nouns (a feature which also relates to language contact). The most interesting feature of the *Lambeth* plurals is the interaction between noun and article, with marked genitive plurals being preferred for NPs without an article, and the common case plural often appearing with the marked genitive article. The systems found in the *Layamon* texts are even more interesting, with the C scribe employing common plural, genitive plural, and a doubly marked form, while the O scribe has only the genitive plural, and even there there is some doubt as to whether the O scribe truly had a genitive plural.

In the EMid texts there is no evidence that the genitive plural inflection was still a productive form, current in the scribes' dialects. The First Continuation has some examples, but it seems likely that these were forms learned from his earlier copying, as there are only two examples; the scribe does not use the genitive form in other identical contexts. The Final Continuation has only the form *wintre*, which is certainly a fixed expression, in which the form survives but not the function. There is also limited evidence for the use of the common plural in genitive contexts. The *V&V* selection shows one example of genitive plural (*wintre*) and one of common plural (*alre mannes*). The EMid examples are not numerous enough to make sweeping statements about the genitive, but they are suggestive of the direction it was moving in.

In the Kentish texts there is only one example of a genitive plural noun, *wyntre* from the *Sermons*. This is certainly a fixed expression, with no genitive function. Apart from this example, all plural genitive NPs are formed with *of*, not the inflection.

1.3 Articles

Article inflection is confined to two texts: *Lambeth* and the First Continuation. Both texts have a genitive singular form *þes*, which is used with great consistency. There is no doubt that these scribes understood perfectly this form and its use; the only question is whether this is a part of their respective eME dialects, or whether it was learned from the OE. The evidence that the C scribe of Layamon also used a genitive singular article is inconclusive; his forms are less consistent, as is his usage. In both texts of Layamon it is possible that the form *þVs* is the demonstrative rather than the article. The other texts have no evidence of a singular genitive article, despite preserving other article forms.

The only text to use a genitive plural article is *Lambeth*, although here there is also the question of influence from OE. The scribe's article use is reasonably consistent, and is quite interesting for the impact it has upon the forms of the genitive plural noun (discussed above). As with nouns, plural articles lose a distinct genitive form before the singular, although exactly why this should be so is unclear.

1.4 Adjectives

The adjective is the first constituent of the genitive NP to lose inflection. Examples in the singular are quite rare; the most consistent use appears in V&V, in the descriptive genitive phrase with *kennes*, which is itself unusual. In general the plural adjectives are also unmarked, with the interesting exception of *alre*, which is consistent in the W and EMid texts, and which may have been responsible in some texts for carrying the functional load. Even this is lost in the Kentish texts, which have no inflected genitive adjectives. The continued use of *alre* sets adjectives apart from nouns and articles, where plural forms lose inflectional marking before singular.

1.5 genitive alternatives

The most common alternative to the genitive inflection is the *of*-phrase. Examples can be found in every text, although with great variation in application. There are only a handful of examples in *Lambeth*, but used for a variety of functions with both singular and plural nouns. The Layamon selections show approximately ten times as many *of*-phrases, but in many cases the distinction between *of* 'from' and *of* genitive is much less clear. One of the most common examples of this unclear distinction between 'from' and genitive are expressions of origin. This blurring of meanings is also apparent in the EMid texts. This blurring of meanings, the slow shift of function from one form to another, was encouraged, but not caused, by the similar French construction with *de*. The Kentish texts show the complete transition of *of*, which has a minority of 'from' meanings, often combined with the preposition *ut*; the overwhelming majority are genitive constructions.

Another possible alternative is the compound noun. Although never frequent, such examples serve as an important reminder that there were more than two options available to speakers in eME, and that a thorough discussion of the genitive NP cannot be limited to a discussion of inflection and *of*.

An alternative construction peculiar to the O text of Layamon is that using the possessive personal pronoun, as in *Arthu[r] his borde*. This construction is a fascinating example of speakers utilizing pre-existing elements to form a replacement for the genitive inflection.

1.6 language contact

The possible influence of OE upon the WMid texts, as well as the First Continuation, has already been mentioned. What is the exact nature of the contact in these situations? In the WMid it would appear that this is a case of learned contact, in which scribes adopted forms which had become familiar to them through a study of OE. The very early date of the First Continuation makes it rather more difficult to decide whether the scribe's contact with OE occurred solely through study; however based on the discussion of the evidence, I think there are many instances, such as the genitive of time, in which the First scribe was using a construction which he had learned through his previous work with the OE entries.

There is also the question, ever-present in discussion of ME, of the impact of French. From the early appearance of *of*-phrases in the PCC, to Dan Michel's preference for the periphrastic even where the OF has inflection, it can be seen that OF may have encouraged the rise of *of*, but is not the original source. Already in OE *of* could sometimes be a functional equivalent for the genitive inflection, and the start of its expansion into the functional space of the genitive began in a time and place in which the French influence would not have been strong enough to be the source of this change. OF could encourage the extension of *of* into the genitive functional space, but from the translations it is clear that English had its own system, influenced by but still independent of the French. There is also the fact that of all the old case forms, only the genitive singular has survived, despite the fact that in French the prepositional phrase eventually replaced the inflection in all contexts.

2. Significance of Findings

The features which are common to all texts are those which sum up the change from the OE genitive NP system to that of ModE; in a sense this is the "big picture", the picture which has generally been used to represent the evolution of the ME genitive NP. However, evolution, of any kind, does not have a predetermined end, and there are many variations, not all of which survive. Just because they did not survive does not mean they were not important; my hope is that this paper has gone some way towards showing the importance of these variant micro-systems, how they show us not just what did happen, but what *might* have happened.

2.1 Micro-systems

The evolution of a language is much like biological evolution: a mutation arises first in only one individual, and may or may not spread to the entire population. This combination of individuality and unpredictability is why the micro-system is so important. By always applying Mustanoja's criteria of using only those features which have "an obvious bearing upon contemporary syntactical usage", by neglecting those forms which did not become part of the standard language, we overlook a lot of information about English. To understand all the ways in which speakers used the resources of the language, to fully comprehend the complex linguistic situation of the period, it is necessary to look at the fine detail as well the big picture, to consider the mutations which did not survive as well as those which did.

2.2 Implications for Language Change and Directionality

The evolution of the genitive noun phrase is an excellent example of how, although languages *tend* to move in a certain direction, a given change does not need to proceed all the way along a path, nor is there a single path which all dialects will follow. The genitive plural constructions are a good example of this variability. The Western texts, perhaps under the influence of Old English, show signs of distinct genitive plural constructions, marked variously with the noun, article, and adjective (*alre*). However, these texts and those of the EMid also show the beginnings of a common plural form for the genitive, in addition to the use of the *of* construction. So far, these developments seem to point to the ModE system, in which the common plural genitive and periphrastic construction are both used. However, the Kentish texts depart from this apparent path, using *of*-phrases exclusively, which would seem to break the pattern from Old to Modern English. Another example of the lack of directionality is the split genitive construction (*Peterborough* 5.3). But speakers are not restricted to following any particular pattern. To continue the analogy to biological evolution begun in the above section, there is no predetermined set of characteristics which *must* survive. Perhaps one day those forms which did not survive will once again be used; there may already be an English-based pidgin or creole in which, like the O scribe, speakers use possessive pronouns rather than inflection to indicate possession.

2.3 The Genitive Noun Phrase and the larger history of English

Middle English was the period in which the language shifted from mostly synthetic to mostly analytic, when inflectional endings tended to be replaced by analytic constructions, such as increase in prepositions and fixing of word order. The development of the genitive NP reflects this pattern, with the inflection often being replaced by the *of*-phrase, and with the fixing of inflected forms in preposition and periphrastic forms in postposition. What makes the genitive distinctive is that the inflection survived, albeit in much more limited contexts than before.

Another pattern which is found in both the genitive NP and in the language as a whole is the reduction of inflectional endings. Apart from a very small number of exceptions, there is only one genitive singular ending. The plural forms show more variation, but there is evidence of the emergence of the common case plural. (The divergent paths of the genitive plural found in the different texts were discussed above.) The loss of case inflection tended to occur in a certain order, with first the adjective, then the article and finally the noun losing endings, with the noun preserving some inflection while the adjective and article became invariable. This is generally true of the genitive inflection, although there are departures, such as the use in *Lambeth* of a distinctive genitive plural article with an unmarked noun.

Middle English was also the time of greatest dialectal variation (in writing) and the genitive NP also reflects this, with each region, sometimes each scribe, using a slightly different system. It is in these individual micro-systems that we find the variation of the English language, and in that variation the source of change.

Appendix Data

Lambeth Homilies: In Die Pentecosten

Lambeth

fifti da3a
 on egypte lande
 lomb of ane 3eres
 godes engel
 godes folc
 godes fortacne
 bi godes wissunge
 cristes ðeðþe
 from deofles þeowdome
 of pharanes þeowdome
 on fures heowe
 cristes þrowunge
 on moyses da3en
 godspelles bodunge
 under godes 3ife
 efter cristes to-cume
 under godes 3ife
 moyses .e.
 godes 3ife
 godes bibode
 þera apostla lare
 on þes pistles redinge
 hired cristes apostles
 efter cristes upsti3e
 onbodinde his bi-hates
 to þes folkes igederunge
 þes wite3an cwide ioheles
 þurh þes wite3an muð
 monna bern
 his feder riht alfe
 on cristes nome
 þreo þusend monna
 fif þusend monna
 to þes apostlas fotan
 þurh þere apostlan hondan
 to þere apostlan fereden
 fondian godes
 to godes folke
 on cristes setl
 efter godes tecunge
 .xxx. 3era
 simeon þes h[e]lendes mei

Royal

fiftig daga
 on egypta lande
 lamb anes geares
 godes engel
 godes folc
 godes wuldor
 be godes dihte
 Cristes slege
 fram deofles þeowdome

 on fyres hiwe
 cristes þrowunge

 godspelbodunge
 under godes gyfe
 æfter cristes tocyme
 under godes gyfe
 moyses æ
 godes gifu
 cristes bebodun
 þæra apostla lare
 on ðisere pistolrædinge
 heape cristes hiredes
 æfter cristes upstige
 andbidiende his behates
 to þæs folces gegaderunge
 þæs witegan cwyde ioheles
 þurh ðæs witegan muð
 manna bern
 his fæder swiðran
 on cristes naman
 þreo ðusend manna
 fif þusend wera
 to þæra apostola foton
 þurh ðæra apostola handum
 to þæra apostola geferrædene
 fandian godes
 on godes gelaðunge
 on cristes setle
 æfter godes tæcunge
 þritig geara
 symeon þæs hælendes mæig

bi heore abbodes iwissunge
 efter noes flode
 on-3en godes willan
 oðres speche
 þere wurhten
 twa hun manna
 þurh þes halie gastes to-cume
 cristes apostlas
 þere apostlan admodnesse
 þere eontan modinisse
 on fures heowe
 ane culfre onlicnesse
 alle moncunnes dema
 on culfren onlicnesse
 monna hufelnesse
 on domes deie
 on fures heowe
 on godes willan
 umbe godes riche
 godes murhðe
 ðere heðene monnan heortan
 þes monnes heorte
 þes budeles word
 þes fares icunde
 On culfre onlicnesse
 on fures heowe
 godes gast
 on godes willan
 godes icwime
 þere monnan heortan
 eorðliche monnes heorte
 to godes lufe
 to alre sunnen for3ifenesse
 þes mannes heorte
 dauides heorte
 þe ilcan godes gast
 fore godes blisse
 Ðisses dei3es hehnesse
 monna cun
 on cristes akennednesse
 þe almihti3a godes sune
 godes bern
 godes bern
 þurh þes hali3an gastes 3ife
 Puruh cristes menniscnesse
 from deofles ðeowdome

be heora ealdres dihte
 æfter noes flode
 ongean godes willan
 oþres spræce
 ðæra wyrhtena

 þurh ðæs halgan gastes tocyme
 halge heap cristes hiredes
 heora eadmodnys
 þæra enta modignys
 on fyres hiw
 on anre culfran anlicnysse
 ealles mancynnes dema
 on culfran anlicnysse
 manna yfelnyssa

 on godes willan
 ymbe godes rice
 godes mærpæ
 þæra hæðenra manna heortan
 ðæs mannes mood
 ðæs bydeles word
 Fyres gecynd
 On culfran onlicnysse
 on fyres hiwe
 godes gast
 on godes willan
 godes gecweme
 þæra manna heortan
 þæs eorðlicran mannes heorte
 to godes lufe
 to forgyfenysse ealra synna
 þæs mannes mod
 dauides heortan
 se ylca godes gast

 ðises dæges wurþmynt
 manna bern
 On cristes acennednysse
 se ælmihtiga godes sunu
 godes bern

 þurh gife þæs halgan gastes
 þurh cristes menniscnysse
 fram deofles þeowte

þurh þæs hal3e gastes to-cume
 menne saule
 þurh þæs hal3an gastes isundunge
 godes gast
 nis he na godes
 Elches monnes weorc
 Godes gast
 Deofles
 to godes lufe
 þæs hal3en gastes to-cume
 mid godes ei3e
 efter þæs hal3an gastes to-cume
 et þere apostlan fotan
 þæs deofles bern
 Biscopes þæs ilcen hades
 on godes ilaðunge
 to godes hirede
 on culfren heowe
 cristes hirede
 fures ilicnesse

þurh tocyme þæs halgan gastes

 þurh neosunge þæs halgan gastes
 godes gast
 nis he godes
 ælces mannes weorc
 Godes gast
 deofles gast
 to godes lufe
 þæs gastes tocyme
 mid godes ege
 æfter þæs halgan gastes tocyme
 æt þæra apostola foton

 Biscopas synd þæs ylcan hades
 on godes gelaðunge
 to godes hirede
 on culfran hiwe
 cristes hirede
 fyres gelicnysse

Royal Genitives replaced by different Lambeth Constructions

huse of þam egyptissen folces
 mid gode fowerti da3es
 Ðas fifti da3es fram
 sum of heore ehte
 cuþen ale spechen
 ewilcum of þan wurhtan
 iscead godra gast 7 ufele
 irecdnesse of misliche spechen
 paul þet hermede cristene men
 for þon eie of þon heðene
 aferede of nane licamliche pinunge

 3efan þam hal3an gaste

huse þæs egyptiscan folces
 mid gode feowertig daga
 ðas fiftig daga fram
 sumne dæl heora landes wurþes
 ingehid ealra gereorda
 ælcum þæra wyrhtena
 toscead goddra gasta 7 yfelra
 gerecednysse mislicra spræca
 Paulus ehte cristenra manna
 for ogan iudeisces folces
 forawen ealle lichamliche pinunga
 sind bearn þæs hextan
 gifum þæs halgan gastes

La3amon's Brut

Caligula

1.5118-214

tiðende of Luces þon kinge
 a feole cunne wisen
 breke grið ... of nauere nane þinge
 si3en to-gæderes
 his hiresdes grið

Otho

tidinge of Luces þan kinge

 wenden heom to-gadere
 his griþ

Seuarus hired
 flu3en forð-rihtes
 makeden ...forð-riht
 Enne ende of Scot-londe
 Scotte-wær[d]
 vt of Scot-len
 feole londe
 monie of weorcmonnen
 bisides Scotlonde
 dæies 7 nihtes
 ne dæies ne nihtes
 ræden of his muchele neode
 uerde of folke
 folke of þissen ærde
 feole his Romwæren
 Of Sæueres dæðe
 Sæueres dæðe
 Sæuarusses lic
 noht of are moder
 Basianes moder
 of Brut-londes ærd
 Brut-londes ærd
 Gezanes moder
 of Romanisce monnen
 1.9261-476
 nom him forð-rihtes
 gumenene ældere
 beon icnowen of his pliht
 mid muchele vn-riht
 his gult beon icnawen
 gumenene lauer[d]
 eorlene wraðest
 þas da3es lihte
 scende of mine wife
 mucle weorldes scome
 castles ... of his eoldrene istreon
 eoldrene istreon
 wifene aðelest
 comen forð-rihtes
 nanes cunnes monnen
 dæies na nihtes
 monies kinnes leoden
 to-gæderes
 Ut of Lundene tun ferde
 Lundene tun
 ferde uorð-rihtes

Seuarus heap
 flowen forþ-rihtes
 -- -- --
 On hende of Scotlonde
 þat norþ
 vt of Scotland
 fale kinelondes
 mani strong worcma[n]

 dai and nihtes
 daies no nihtes
 rede of his mochele neode
 ferde
 -- -- --
 moche of hi[s] folke

 Seuar
 noht of one moder
 Basian his moder
 Brut
 -- -- --
 Gesanes (ellipsis)
 Romain icud

 nam anon rihtes
 eorl of Cornwale
 beon icnowe of his pliht
 mid mochele onrihtes
 of his gult beo cnowe
 eorl of Conrwale
 wroþliche swipe
 þes dai3es lihte
 scende of mine wifue

 castles ... of his hilderne streone
 hilderne streone
 treouwest alre wifue
 comen forþrihtes
 none manne
 dai3es no nihtes
 mani cunnes leode
 to-gaderes
 Ut of Londenestoun verde
 Londenestoun
 wende forþrihtes

of þan eorle naþing iwinnen
monnen alre læðest
ælcnes weies
naþing of his wille
of seoluere and of golde
ma of þan kunne
leofest alre kinge
þritti solh of londe
feole wintre
him to-3ænes
nanes cunnes þinge
of his londe
forð-rihtes
þritti solh of londe
Gorloises wiue
-- -- --
of him ... singen
of his breosten ... æten
of his blode ... drunke
of his e3ene ... fleon
<ta>cnen of þan sune
cumeð of
and of Ygærne
of Vðere ... arisen
uerde þas kinges
þes kinges ferde
him to-3eines
þene ræd of mine londe
wimmo[n]nen leofest
mo[n]nenen alre laðest

neouðer [seoluer na gold]
ricchest alre monnen
þas eorles (ellipsis)
of nane londe icoren
strengðe of Tintaieol
þeos eorles stiward
þas castles 3æte
1. 14180-277
of allen folke
forcuðest hæleðe
forcuðest kingen
þe wite3e wes mære
sæ3est wimonne
Ut of Eouerwike
of hire cnihten twei3e

of þan eorl noþing a-winne
man alre loþest
in (e)che weyes
noht of his wille

mo of hure cunne

þritti solh of londe
fales wyntres
him to-3eines
none þing
of his londe

þritti solwene lond
Gorloys his wifue
of him telle
of him ... singe
of his brost ... eate
of his blode ... dronge
of his e3ene .. fleo
tockne of þan sone
comeþ of
and of Igerne

folke þeos kinges
þes kinges ferde
a3eines him
þane read of mine lond

Gorloys his wifue
none cunne 3eftes

þe eorles (ellipsis)
of none londe icore
strengþe of Tyntagel
þis [eorl]es stiward
þan castel-3eate

for-(r)e cnihte
onwrest.
þat wisest was of manne

..wike
twey. .ire cnihtes

nusten men of þere quene
 wraðest kinge
 him to 3eines heolde
 tuhten to-gadere
 unimete folke
 idon of lif-da3e
 Ar[ð]ures hered-men
 alle of Arðures borde
 Arðures borde
 fosterlinges of feole kineriches
 of twa hundred þusend monnen
 of his cnihtes tweien
 cnaue þe wes of his cunne
 Cadores sune þe eorles of Corwaile
 Cadores sune
 a to þines lifes
 Vðeres da3en
 uairest alre maidene

 wroþest alre kinge
 him to-3ea.e(s) ...lde
 icode to-gaderes
 onimete folke of cnihtes
 idon of lifda3e
 Arthures hiredmen
 alle of Arthu[r] his borde
 Arthu[r] his borde
 fosterlin..s ofne-riche
 of two hundred þusend manne
 twei of his cnihtes
 cnaue þat was of his cunne
 Cador his sone eorl of Cornwale
 Cador his sone
 bi þine liue

The Peterborough Chronicle Continuations

First Continuation

1122

wes 'þes' dæies vii
 Palmes Sunendæi
 Þes night viii
 on þæs dæi vi
 fram þa undern dæies
 Þeos ilce gears
 on þæs dæies xiii
 þærtogeanes
 wæs þæs dæies vii

1123

þes eorles sandermn of Angeow
 him togeanes
 munec/hades man
 clerchades man
 munece regol
 togænes muneces
 munechades men
 þærtogeanes
 þes eorles sandermen
 na of his gyfe
 togeanes riht
 for þes biscopes luuen of Særesbyrig
 hit wære here unþancas
 þes kinges hirdclerc

þes Papes spræce
 togeanes þa muneces
 togeanes rihte
 Sancte Petres [w]euod
 and Sancte Paules
 þes cwenes canceler
 wæs þes dæiges Annuntatio
 þes biscopes nefe of Searesbyrig
 for þes biscopes luuen
 eall þes geares
 him togeanes
 hem togeanes
 þes ylces geares
 Ðes ylce geares
 micel ungerime folces
 wæs þes dæges xiii
 1124
 alremest
 on þes dæges Annuntatio
 Annuntatio Sancte Marie
 þes kinges stiward of France
 Hugo Gerueises sunu
 fela oðre godre cnihte
 'hem' togeanes
 þes kinges cnihtes
 Hugo Gerueises sunu
 Hugo Gerueises sunu
 þes eorles casteles Waleram
 him togeanes
 þes eorles sunu Rotbert of Normandi, Willelm het
 Fulkes eorles gingre dohter to wife of Angeow
 Ðes ilces geares
 On þes ilces geares
 wæs þes dæies Idus
 on þes dæies ix
 On þæs dæies xix
 Ðes ilces geares
 Sancte Andreas messe
 þes kinges ðæines
 ealles feower 7 feowerti manne
 here elces riht hand
 On þes ilces gæres
 Cristes wefod
 Sancte Michaelles messe
 On þes ilces geares
 Sancte Laurentius messedæg

Þes ilces geares

Final Continuation

1137

agænes him heoldon

be nihtes 7 be dæies

þa mannes throte

nowiderwardes

xix wintre

al a dæies fare

biscopes land

ne abbotes

ne preostes

xix wintre

xx wintre

Sancte Petres mæssedæi

þe landes of þabbotrice

Stephnes kinges time

Drihtines luue

1138

Him com togænes

1140

þe kinges sune Henries

nontid dæies

agænes þe king

agenes heore lauerd

þe kinges dohter Henries

Henri þe kinges brother Stephnes

þe kinges cuen

þe kinges freond

te eorles freond

efsones he

sume here þankes

sume here unþankes

þe kinges sune

þe kinges suster of France to wife

agenes him

1154

Midwintre Dæi

innen dæies

Vices and Virtues

on godes awene muðe

godes luue

7 alre mannes

Of sorinesse

an of ðe heued-sennes
ofþingþ of alle gode
for godes luue
for godes luue
on godes wrkes

Of a-solknesse. Vnlust.

on godes weorkes
oðermannes sare swimk
on godes seruise
on of ðe heued-sennes
beswikð mucheles ðe mare
þe ænde of ðessere senne
name of

Of modinesse. pride.

an3in of alle sennes
heuene heinesse
helle depnesse
Of ... 3ewriten
godes wiðerwinen
a3eanes
godes forbode
iwreken of his unwine
farð ut of lande
ðe cloðes of religiun
healdeþ of oðre
bieð of hei3e kenne
bie of hei3e menstre
menn of ðe world
a3eanes mine laferede

Of vnbussumnesse

3edriuen ut of heuene
heuene riche
ut of paradise
ðe pine of helle
fif þusend wintre
for ðe luue of gode
kæie of alle oðre sennes
ðe treu of paradise

Of oðe(s) sueriingge.

mare of ðe ...
ðe eueles kennes sade
godes a3wene name
a manies kennes
sume of mine friende
a3ean godes bebode
sacleas of ðessere senne

seggen of
 ðas lichames deað
Of lesinge.
 Adames ofspring
 fader of leasinge
 of al ðat
 a3eanes Criste
Of heuele bafte(s)pache.
 godes luue
 luue of mannes
 mannes hierte
 a3eanes (mw)
 godes forbode
 a3eanes ðine broðer
 A3eanes him
 [domesdai3e]
 ofdradd of
 cumþ ut of
 godes au3ene muðe
 godes forbode
Of swicedom.
 besecheð of
 sumes kennes (lean)
 ... of ðouhtes
 oðer of wordes
 oðer of weorkes
Of wer3hinde.
 godes handiwerc
Of vnðolemodnesse.
 a3eanes gode
Of a3en-wille.
 lat godes (wille)
 gastliche faderes (wille)
 of ðes liue fare
 godes wille
 a3eanes gode
 a3eanes ðe kinge
 for-bisne of mire ...
 mines fader wille
 ða aingles of heuene
 godes wille
 godes hali mildse
Of hunrihtwisnesse.
 ðe deade man[n]es þruh
 full of wermes
 full of euele þohtes

on3eanes alle ...
Of ða fif wittes.
 wreið ... of ða ...
 lokin of mine ...
 ðine lauerdes blisse
 besantes of ðe fif wittes
 mines lauerdes eihte
 besantes of ðe fif gewittes
 besantes of gode þohtes
 7 of gode wordes
 7 of gode woerkes
 þenchen of
 andswerien of
 se þiesternesse of helle
 chiueringe of toðen
 cumþ of
 nam of his hal3en
 bien ut of his iwitte
 ðo pinen of helle
 dieules lare
 cumð un3ewares
 ðese godes hali (wordes)
 ofdrad of ...
 godes lofsang
 cumþ ut of ...
 ... godes awene muþe
 erres of ðare laczste
 iwer3ede of alle hadede hafde
 godes luue
 7 mannes
 gode(s) wraððe
 loke of sare birewnesse
 Moder of mildce
 for3iuenesse of mine sennes
 nam of ...
 haueð of ... ibroht
 godes muchele mildce
 ða giue of ðe hali gaste

The Kentish Sermons

Kentish Sermons

Inflected genitives

ure Lordes beringe
 here godes sacrefise
 þe gode Cristenemannes herte

Maurice de Sully

naissance Nostre Segnor
 sacrefisse Deu
 corage del bon crestien

for Godes luue
 Godes sune
 Godes oghe mudh
 Godes luue
 þes lordes commandement
 Cristes seruisse
 Godes beliaue
 þo deueles werkes
 Cristes seruisse
 Cristes seruisse
 of xxxti wyntre
 Cristes seruisse
 Godes seruisse

Periphrastic genitives

godespelle of tedai
 ibore was of ure Lauedi
 cite of Bethleem
 seauinge of his beringe
 kinges of heþenesse
 king of Gys
 king of Geus
 kingriche of Ierusalem
 ongel of heuene
 seywinge of ure Lordes beringe
 godespel of today
 speche of þe godspelle
 kinges of heþenesse
 brichtnesse of þo sunne
 herte of þo gode manne
 smech of þe store
 herte of þo gode Cristenemanne
 luue of Gode
 yemernesse of ure flesce
 luue of Gode
 amonestement of þo dieule
 signefiance of þo offringes
 kinges of heþenesse
 blisce of heuene
 kinges of painime
 grace of þo Holi Gost
 blisce of heueriche
 godspel of today
 londe of Ierusalem
 faten of watere
 ydres of stone

por Deu
 li Fils Deu
 le boce Deu
 l'amor de Deu

 le servise Deu
 sa creance

 el servise Deu

 de .xv. ans u de .xl.
 el servise Deu
 son servise

evangile d'ui
 fu nés de Nostre Dame
 cité de Bethleem
 demonstrance de sa naisence
 rois de paienime
 rois des Juis
 rois des Juis
 le regne terrien
 li angeles Nostre Segnor
 li glorios miracles de la naisence
 li evangiles d'ui
 parole de ceste evangile
 li troi roi paien
 le rai del soleil
 cuer del buen homme
 fume de l'encens
 cuer al crestien
 l'amor Deu
 malvaistié de nostre cor
 geuner por Deu
 l'amoneste al diable
 senefiance de l'offrande
 li troi roi

 rois paiens
 grasie del Saint Esperit

 Li sains evangiles d'ui
 terre de Jerusalem

 idres de piere

faten of watere
 wille of ure Louerde
 idrunke of þise wyne
 imaked of þe watere
 miracles of ure Louerde
 commencement of þo miracles
 chald of þo luue
 luue of Gode
 fer of helle
 blisce of heuene
 anheet of þe luue
 luue of ure Lorde
 signefiance of þe miracle
 anheet of þo luue
 luue of Gode
 chold of Godes luue
 blisce of heuene
 godspelle of todai
 tempeste of wind
 dred of þise tempeste
 folk of little beliaue
 godspel of teday
 helere of þe folke
 manere of diadliche senne
 godespelle of teday
 godspelle of todai
 peny of forewerde
 berdene of þo pine
 and of þo hete
 hete of al þo daie
 seruise of ure Lorde
 tides of þo daie
 time of þis world
 begininge of þis wordl
 time of his prophetes
 alast of þis wordl
 blisce of heuene
 of diuers wordles
 sigge of þe elde
 elde of eueriche men
 seruise of age
 age of men
 men of xxxti wyntre
 oþer of furti
 nature of man
 of greater strengþe

les vaisels d'aigue
 volenté Nostre Segnor
 gosté del vin
 fait d'aigue
 miracles Nostre Segnor
 commencemens des miracles
 refroidi de l'amor
 l'amor Deu
 feu d'infer

 escaufé de l'amor
 l'amor de Deu
 senefiance del miracle
 escaufés de l'amor
 l'amor de Deu
 refroidés de l'amor de Deu
 (la soie glorie)
 evangile d'ui
 une grans tormente
 paor de la tormente
 gent de petite foi
 evangiles d'ui
 li salveres del pueple
 autre pecié dampnable
 l'evangile d'ui
 l'evangile d'ui
 covenant d'un denier
 le fais
 le paine del caut

 le servise Deu
 les diverses hores
 tans de cest siecle
 commencement de cest siecle
 al tans Moysi e Aaron e as autres prophetes
 fin del siecle

 des divers tens de cest siecle
 dire de cascun home

 l'age de .xv. ans
 u de .xl.
 l'umaine nature

of greater hete
elde of man
ende of þe liue
blisce of heuene
dai of his diaþe

The Ayenbite of Inwit
Dan Michel

Inflected genitives

þe zoþe godes zone
to godes seruice
to godes seruice
to godes seruice
godes regne
godes riche
godes riche

Periphrastic genitives

þe wysdom of god þe uader
þe wones of his cort
þe zuete name of þe uader
lhord of house
of heuene
and of erþe
an nameliche of his children
is of man
þe boc of wysdome
beþengþ of oþer half
kyng of alle þing
þo3t of man
and of angle
bold and of grat wyl
bold and of guode wyll
word of la3e
la3es of þe emperurs
child of a guod man
child of yre
and of helle
our of adopcion
children of holy cherche
[of] þe largesse
uol of uolk
of þise grace
eritage of oure uader
blysse of paradys

de gregnor calor
la vieillece
la fins de la vie

le jor de sa mort

Cleopatra MS

li vrais fiz dieu
au servise dieu
au servise dieu
au servise dieu
li regne dieu
le regne dieu
li regnes dieu

la sapience dieu le pere
les usaiges de sa court
le dous non dou pere
sires de l'hostel
du ciel
e de la terre
nomeement de ses enfans
c'est des homes
li livre de sapience
ramentoit d'autre part
rois de quanques il i a
pensee d'ome
e d'angle
tu soies preus e vigereus
tu soies vaillans e preus
uns mos de lois
les ois de l'empereor
le fil d'un povre home
fil d'ire
e d'enfer
nous de adopcion
fil de saint eglise

pleine de gent
de ceste grace
l'eritage nostre pere
la gloire de paradis

of one uader
and of one moder
of god
and of holy cherche
lemes of þe zelue body
uela3rede of al holy cherche
out of uela3rede
deþ out of uela3rede
man out of uela3rede
boc of þe la3e
zay ... of mine half
children of y[s]rael
delyuri ... of þe þreldome
names of oure lhorde
spekeþ of his guodnesse
 and of his wysdome
 oþer of his mi3te
maneres of speches
þe zoþe of þe byinge
byinge of god
to spekene of ... þinge
speke we of god
man of huam
uele of zuyche þinges
spekeþ of god
uindeþ of words
of non oþre þing
manere of hare kende
guo out of þe ri3te waye
bold and of guode wyll
langnesse of his eurebleuinge
brede of his charité
dyepnesse of his zophede
he3nesse of his magesté
bene of þe holy pater noster
uorespeche of þe holy pater noster
inguoinge of þe viþele
wysdom of god
yefþes of þe holy gost
zennes of þe herte
Of þise zeue benes þe þri uerste
holynesse of man
ymage of þe trinité
3efþes of god
uayrhede of his kende
anlicnesse of þe uader

d'un pere
e d'une mere
de dieu
e de saint eglise
li membre d'un meisme cors
commaunauté de toute sainte eglise
hors de compaignie
met hors de compaignie
home hors de compaignie
livre de la loi
de par moi
les fiz d'Irael
delivre ... du servage
tous les nons nostre seignor
parolent de sa bonté
 e sa sapience
 ou de sa puissance
manieres de paroles
la verité de l'estre
l'estre dieu
parler de si haute chose
parlons de dieu
homme dont
mout de tiex choses
parlons de dieu
trouvons de mos
de nule autre chose
mnaiere de lor nature

tu n'es preus e vigereus
la longesce de sa eternité
la largesce de sa charité
la profundesce de sa verité
la hautesce de sa majesté

le prologue de la sainte pater nostre
une entree de viele
la sapience dieu
dons du saint esperit
vices chevetains du cuer
De ces VII peticions les III
la sainteté d'omme
l'image de la trinité
dons de dieu
sa droit biauté naturele
la semblance dou pere

and of þe zone
 and of þe holy gost
 benes of þe pater noster
 yefþe of þe holy gost
 yefþe of wysdom
 yzed of smac
 and of smacky
 zuetnesse of god
 zuetnesse of þe guode wyne
 gost of wysdom
 herte of man
 uelþe of alle erþliche loue
 and of alle wyll
 wyll of ulesse
 comene al out of smak
 is out of smak
 hal3eþ of al
 deþ ... of alle wreþe
 deþ ... al þenche of god
 seruice of god
 deuocion of Iesu crist
 dronke of þe precieuse blode
 zop of hot bryead
 gost of wysdom
 yuayred of alle uelþe
 dronke of þine loue
 mo of oþren
 bloode of Iesu crist
 deuocion of uest loue
 name of oure uader
 ondo of þe ilke uestnesse
 ne of þise grace
 grat grace of god
 loue ... zuetnesse of god
 of no þing þenche
 Bene of þe holy pater noster
 oþre bene of þe pater noster.
 þe regne of god
 gost of onderstondinge
 þyesternesse of þe ni3t
 þyesternesses of þe herte
 of motes
 and of doust
 sseweþ of oþre half na3t
 of herte
 and of þo3tes

e dou fil
 e dou saint esperit
 peticions de la pater nostre
 don du saint esperit
 le don de sapience
 dite de saveur
 e de savourer
 douçor de dieu
 la douçor du bon vin
 l'esperit de sapience
 le cuer d l'home
 ordure de toute terriane amour
 e de toute affection charnele

 devenir tout fades quanques
 l'eaue est fade
 dedie du tout
 de tout corous
 met du tout a penser a dieu
 le servise dieu
 devocion de Jesu Crist
 abevrés du precieus sanc
 soupe de pain chaut
 l'esperit de sapience
 nettoié de toutes ordures
 enyvéré de l'amour
 jamais d'autre
 sanc Jesu Crist
 devocion de fervent amour
 li nons nostre pere
 desjoindre de ceste fermeté
 ne de ceste grace
 grant grace de dieu
 l'amur ... la douçor dieu
 a riens penser

 seconde petition de la pater nostre
 Li regnes de dieu
 l'esperit d'entendement
 les tenebres de la nuit
 le tenenbres de cuer
 de pouties
 e de poudre
 remostre d'autre part
 de cuer
 e de pensées

and of wyckede wylles
zi3þe of god
spade of zoþe sscrifþe
lokinge of þe ilke clyernesse
and of þe ilke pays
Bene of þe Holy Pater Noster.
uader of heuene
angles of heuene
yefþe of red
yefþe of þe holy gost
lheuedy of al þe herte
angles of heuene
benes of þe Pater Noster.
yefþe of wysdom
yefþe of onderstondinge

e de mauvaises volentés
la veue dieu
la pele de vraie confession
regart de cele clarté
e de cele pais

pere du ciel
angles du ciel
don de conseil
don du saint esperit
dame de tout le cuer
angles du ciel
peticions de la pater nostre
don de sapience
don d'entendement

Bibliography

Texts

Morris, Richard. *Old English Homilies*. London: Trübner, 1868.

Clemons, Peter. *AElfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Brook, G.L., and R.F. Leslie. *La3amon - Brut*. Vol.1. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

---. *La3amon - Brut*. Vol.2. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Clark, Cecily. *The Peterborough Chronicle: 1070-1154*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Holthausen, Ferdinand. *Vices and Virtues*. London: Trübner, 1888.

Bennet, J.A.W., and G.V. Smithers. "Kentish Sermons." *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966. 213-22.

Robson, C.A. *Maurice of Sully and the Medieval Vernacular Homily*. Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1952.

Morris, Richard. *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwit*. London: Trübner, 1866.

Varnhagen, Hermann. "Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik von Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt*." *Englische Studien*. 2. (1879): 27-59.

General

Baker, Peter S. *Introduction to Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Barlow, Frank. *The Feudal Kingdom of England: 1042-1216*. 5th ed. London: Longman, 1999.

- Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. *A History of the English Language*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Bosworth, Joseph, and T.N. Toller. *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Clanchy, M.T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.
- Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Malden: Blackwell, 2003.
- Dickens, Bruce, and R.M. Wilson. *Early Middle English Texts*. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1956.
- Francis, W. Nelson. *The Book of Vices and Virtues: A Fourteenth Century English Translation of the Somme le Roi of Lorens d'Orléans*. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Franzen, Christine. *The Tremulous Hand of Worcester: A Study of Old English in the Thirteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Gradon, Pamela. *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwit*. Vol 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Hall, J.R. Clark. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. London : Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Hatim, Basil and Jeremy Munday. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Kibler, William. *An Introduction to Old French*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1984.
- Laing, Margaret. *A Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval*

- English*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1993.
- Lawman. *Brut*. Trans. Rosamund Allen. London: J.M. Dent, 1992.
- Le Saux, Françoise. *Layamon's Brut: The Poem and its Sources*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1989.
- Middle English Dictionary*. Kuhn, Sherman ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.
- Millar, Robert McColl. *System Collapse System Rebirth: The Demonstrative Pronouns of English 900-1350 and the Birth of the Definite Article*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Mitchell, Bruce. *Old English Syntax*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1985.
- . *A Guide to Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. *A Middle English Syntax: Part I, Parts of Speech*. Helsinki, Société Néophilologique, 1960.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 12 June 2008. Oxford University Press. 28 August 2008. <www.oed.com>.
- Pope, Mildred K. *From Latin to Modern French, with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952.
- Prins, A.A. *French Influence in English Phrasing*. Universitaire Pers Leiden: Leiden, 1952.
- Quirk, Randolph, and Sydney Greenbaum. *University Grammar of English*. London: Longman, 1973.
- Stanton, Robert. *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002.

Strang, Barbara M.H. *A History of English*. London: Methuen, 1970.

Thomason, Sarah G. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.

Wardale, E.E. *An Introduction to Middle English*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.