

**A DESCRIPTIVE SYNTAX OF THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE  
FROM 1122 TO 1154**

# JANUA LINGUARUM

STUDIA MEMORIAE  
NICOLAI VAN WIJK DEDICATA

*edenda curat*

C. H. VAN SCHOONEVELD

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SERIES PRACTICA

103



1971

MOUTON

THE HAGUE · PARIS

A DESCRIPTIVE SYNTAX  
OF THE  
PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE  
FROM 1122 TO 1154

*by*

DAVID L. SHORES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY



1971

MOUTON

THE HAGUE · PARIS

© Copyright 1971 in The Netherlands.  
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

*No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm,  
or any other means, without written permission from the publishers.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 70-111620

Printed in The Netherlands by Mouton & Co., Printers, The Hague.

*For Betty*  
*my wife*



## PREFACE

In the last few years there has been a steadily growing interest in the study of early English syntax. Up until the last thirty or forty years most linguistic investigations were based on morphology and only incidentally on syntax. A brief glance at any Old or Middle English grammar will at once verify this statement. This earlier dependence on morphology led scholars to describe English up to the eleventh century as a language in which grammatical functions and relationships depended on inflection alone — or at least, to a very large degree — and in which word order had very little significance. This and other recent studies show that this was not exactly true. If we are ever to have a complete description of early English grammar and a sound and accurate description of the nature, growth, and development of the English language, it is essential to have descriptive analyses of the various extant prose and poetic works in Old and Middle English. This study, I believe, is a valuable part of the work that is now accumulating descriptive analyses of the syntax of prose and poetic works which survived the Middle Ages.

I am happy to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Professor William J. Griffin of George Peabody College not only for suggesting valuable improvements in this study but also for introducing me to language study.

I would be remiss if I did not thank Professor Sherman M. Kuhn of the University of Michigan and Professor Charles R. Carlton of San Fernando Valley State College for encouraging me to go on with this study and for supplying me with helpful information. I am indebted, furthermore, to Charles Carlton, Robert Palmatier, Ann Shannon, and William Brown for ideas from their works which I used in the presentation of my data.

I wish to thank Miss Anna Loe Russell for various kinds of cooperative and helpful assistance in locating and obtaining research materials and Louise DeVere for reading the proofs and making helpful suggestions.

I would like to acknowledge the Old Dominion University Education Foundation with gratitude for supporting in part the production of this book.

And, more especially, I wish to thank David, Jr., and Keith, my sons, for being patient even though they must have felt that their father was more interested in 'that

book' than in them, and Betty, my wife, who merits deep gratitude for being both patient and understanding. Very special mention should be made of Betty for sharing her intelligence and for laboring devotedly with the typing from the rough draft through the final copy. In short, the book could not have been finished without her.

David L. Shores  
Norfolk, Virginia  
December 14, 1969

## CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Preface . . . . .  | 7  |
| List of Tables . . . . .   | 13 |
| 1. Introduction . . . . .  | 15 |
| 1.1. The Problem . . . . .   | 16 |
| 1.2. The Text and Corpus . . . . .   | 16 |
| 1.3. Importance of the Study . . . . .   | 18 |
| 1.4. Related Research . . . . .  | 19 |
| 1.5. Previous Studies of The Peterborough Chronicle . . . . .                        | 21 |
| 1.6. Edition of the Text . . . . .   | 23 |
| 1.7. General Procedure of the Analysis. . . . .                                      | 23 |
| 1.8. Explanation of Basic Concepts used in the Description. . . . .                  | 27 |
| 1.9. The Presentation of the Data . . . . .  | 30 |
| 2. Primary Clause-Level Tagmemes . . . . .   | 32 |
| 2.1. The Subject Tagmeme . . . . .   | 32 |
| 2.1.1. The Pronoun or Modified-Pronoun Phrase . . . . .                              | 33 |
| 2.1.2. The Noun or Modified-Noun Phrase. . . . .                                     | 34 |
| 2.1.3. The Nominal Clause. . . . .   | 34 |
| 2.1.4. The Pronominal Adjective or Modified-Pronominal Adjective<br>Phrase . . . . . | 35 |
| 2.1.5. The Double Subject . . . . .  | 35 |
| 2.1.6. The Case of the Filler of the Subject Slot. . . . .                           | 35 |
| 2.1.7. Agreement with the Filler of the Predicator Slot. . . . .                     | 37 |
| 2.2. The Predicator Tagmeme . . . . .  | 40 |
| 2.2.1. Person . . . . .  | 40 |
| 2.2.2. Number . . . . .  | 41 |
| 2.2.3. Tense . . . . .   | 41 |
| 2.2.4. Passive. . . . .  | 42 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 2.2.5. Mood . . . . .   | 44  |
| 2.2.6. The Complex Verb . . . . .   | 46  |
| 2.2.7. Special Patterns . . . . .   | 49  |
| 2.3. The Direct Object Tagmeme . . . . .  | 50  |
| 2.3.1. The Noun or Modified-Noun Phrase . . . . .                                       | 51  |
| 2.3.2. The Pronoun or Modified-Pronoun Phrase . . . . .                                 | 52  |
| 2.3.3. The Pronominal Adjective . . . . .   | 52  |
| 2.3.4. The Nominal Clause . . . . .   | 53  |
| 2.3.5. The To-Infinitive . . . . .  | 54  |
| 2.4. The Object Complement Tagmeme . . . . .  | 54  |
| 2.4.1. Case of the Filler of the Direct Object Slot . . . . .                           | 55  |
| 2.5. The Indirect Object Tagmeme . . . . .  | 55  |
| 2.5.1. Pronoun and Pronoun . . . . .  | 56  |
| 2.5.2. Noun and Noun . . . . .  | 57  |
| 2.5.3. Pronoun and Noun . . . . .   | 57  |
| 2.5.4. Pronoun and Clause . . . . .   | 59  |
| 2.5.5. Noun and Clause . . . . .  | 59  |
| 2.5.6. Pronominal Adjective and Pronoun . . . . .                                       | 60  |
| 2.5.7. Pronominal Adjective and Noun . . . . .  | 60  |
| 2.5.8. The Dative-Accusative Combination . . . . .                                      | 60  |
| 2.5.9. The Accusative-Accusative Combination . . . . .                                  | 62  |
| 2.5.10. Case of Direct Object and Indirect Object . . . . .                             | 62  |
| 2.6. The Subject Complement Tagmeme . . . . .   | 64  |
| 2.7. General Conclusions . . . . .  | 66  |
| <br>  |     |
| 3. The Order of Primary Clause-Level Tagmemes . . . . .                                 | 68  |
| 3.1. Group 1 (Subject and Predicator) . . . . .   | 82  |
| 3.1.1. Inversion of Subject and Predicator . . . . .                                    | 84  |
| 3.2. Group 2 (Subject, Predicator, and Direct Object) . . . . .                         | 88  |
| 3.2.1. Nouns and Pronouns as Fillers of the Subject and Direct Object<br>Slots. . . . . | 91  |
| 3.3. Group 3 (Subject, Predicator, and Subject Complement) . . . . .                    | 96  |
| 3.4. Group 4 (Subject, Predicator, Indirect Object, and Direct Object) . . . . .        | 98  |
| 3.5. Subjectless Clause Patterns . . . . .  | 103 |
| 3.6. The Coordinated Predication Patterns . . . . .                                     | 104 |
| 3.7. The Relative Order of Primary Tagmemes in Combinations of Two . . . . .            | 106 |
| 3.8. General Conclusions . . . . .  | 108 |
| <br>  |     |
| 4. Secondary Clause-Level Tagmemes . . . . .  | 110 |
| 4.1. Description of the Clause-Level Adverbial Tagmemes . . . . .                       | 110 |
| 4.1.1. The Introductory Formula Tagmeme . . . . .                                       | 113 |
| 4.1.2. The Time Tagmeme . . . . .   | 114 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.3. The Location Tagmeme . . . . .   | 115 |
| 4.1.4. The Manner Tagmeme . . . . .   | 116 |
| 4.1.5. The Purpose Tagmeme . . . . .  | 116 |
| 4.1.6. The Agent Tagmeme. . . . .   | 117 |
| 4.1.7. The Relationship Tagmeme. . . . .  | 117 |
| 4.2. Linear Ordering of Adverbial Tagmemes . . . . .  | 117 |
| 4.2.1. Structures of Predication With One Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmeme . . . . .                             | 118 |
| 4.2.2. Structures of Predication With Two Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmemes . . . . .                            | 120 |
| 4.2.3. Conclusions Relating to Structures of Predication With Two Ad-<br>verbial Tagmemes . . . . .               | 129 |
| 4.2.4. Structures of Predication With Three Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmemes . . . . .                          | 129 |
| 4.2.5. Conclusions Relating to Structures of Predication With Three<br>Adverbial Tagmemes . . . . .               | 138 |
| 4.2.6. Structures of Predication With Four Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmemes . . . . .                           | 138 |
| 4.2.7. Structures of Predication With Five Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmemes . . . . .                           | 141 |
| 4.2.8. Structures of Predication With Six Clause-Level Adverbial<br>Tagmemes . . . . .                            | 143 |
| 4.2.9. Conclusions Relating to Structures of Predication With Four, Five,<br>and Six Adverbial Tagmemes . . . . . | 143 |
| 4.3. General Conclusions . . . . .  | 143 |
| 5. Modified-Head Phrases . . . . .  | 145 |
| 5.1. Part I: The Adjectival Modifiers . . . . .   | 145 |
| 5.2. The Modified-Noun Phrase . . . . .   | 146 |
| 5.2.1. Types of Structures Which Fill the Modifying Slots . . . . .   | 146 |
| 5.2.2. The Tagmemes of the Modified-Noun Phrase . . . . .   | 147 |
| 5.2.3. Linear Ordering of the Tagmemes of the Modified-Noun Phrase. . . . .                                       | 148 |
| 5.2.4. The Modified-Noun Phrase and Concord. . . . .  | 151 |
| 5.2.5. Description of the Modifying Tagmemes . . . . .  | 152 |
| 5.2.6. Patterns of Pre-Positional and Post-Positional Modifiers . . . . .   | 159 |
| 5.3. Other Modified-Head Phrases . . . . .  | 164 |
| 5.3.1. The Modified-Pronoun Phrase . . . . .  | 164 |
| 5.3.2. The Modified-Pronominal Adjective Phrase . . . . .   | 165 |
| 5.3.3. The Modified-Demonstrative Phrase . . . . .  | 165 |
| 5.3.4. The Modified-Numeral Phrase . . . . .  | 165 |
| 5.3.5. The Modified-Adjective Phrase . . . . .  | 166 |
| 5.4. Special Modifying Relationships . . . . .  | 166 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 5.4.1. Genitive Constructions . . . . .                   | 166 |
| 5.4.2. Structures of Apposition . . . . .                 | 170 |
| 5.4.3. The Predicate Adjective . . . . .                  | 172 |
| 5.5. Part II: The Adverbial Modifiers . . . . .           | 173 |
| 5.6. The Modified-Verb Phrase . . . . .                   | 173 |
| 5.6.1. The Negator . . . . .                              | 174 |
| 5.6.2. Multiple Negation . . . . .                        | 175 |
| 5.6.3. The Aspect Indicator . . . . .                     | 176 |
| 5.6.4. The Degree Indicator . . . . .                     | 177 |
| 5.6.5. The Direction Indicator . . . . .                  | 178 |
| 5.6.6. Other Adverbials . . . . .                         | 179 |
| 5.7. Other Modified-Head Phrases . . . . .                | 180 |
| 5.7.1. The Modified-Adjective Phrase . . . . .            | 180 |
| 5.7.2. The Modified-Participle Phrase . . . . .           | 181 |
| 5.7.3. The Modified-Pronominal Adjective Phrase . . . . . | 181 |
| 5.7.4. The Modified-Numeral Phrase . . . . .              | 181 |
| 5.7.5. The Modified-Adverb Phrase . . . . .               | 181 |
| 5.7.6. The Modified-Prepositional Group Phrase . . . . .  | 181 |
| 5.7.7. The Modified-Clause Phrase . . . . .               | 182 |
| 5.8. General Conclusions . . . . .                        | 182 |
| <br>  |     |
| 6. The Relationship and Joining of Clauses . . . . .      | 184 |
| 6.1. Types and Levels of Dependent Clauses . . . . .      | 186 |
| 6.2. Functions of Dependent Clauses . . . . .             | 187 |
| 6.2.1. The Nominal Clause . . . . .                       | 187 |
| 6.2.2. The Adjectival Clause . . . . .                    | 190 |
| 6.2.3. The Adverbial Clause . . . . .                     | 194 |
| 6.3. The Parenthetical Clause . . . . .                   | 202 |
| 6.4. Coordination of T-units . . . . .                    | 204 |
| 6.5. Parataxis. . . . .                                   | 208 |
| 6.6. Correlation. . . . .                                 | 210 |
| 6.7. General Conclusions . . . . .                        | 212 |
| <br>  |     |
| 7. Summary and Conclusions . . . . .                      | 214 |
| <br>  |     |
| Bibliography . . . . .                                    | 222 |
| <br>  |     |
| Index . . . . .   | 225 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. Inflectional Distinctiveness in Fillers of Subject Slots . . . . .  | 37 |
| II. Inflectional Distinctiveness in Fillers of Direct Object Slots . . . . .   | 63 |
| III. Inflectional Distinctiveness in Fillers of Indirect Object Slots . . . . .  | 63 |
| IV. Total Frequencies of Clause Groups and Patterns . . . . .  | 73 |
| V. Frequencies of Independent Clause Groups and Patterns . . . . .   | 74 |
| VI. Frequencies of Dependent Clause Groups and Patterns . . . . .  | 75 |
| VII. Frequencies of Clause Groups and Patterns in First Continuation . . . . .   | 76 |
| VIII. Frequencies of Clause Groups and Patterns in Final Continuation . . . . .  | 77 |
| IX. Frequencies of Independent Clause Groups and Patterns in First Continuation. . .   | 78 |
| X. Frequencies of Independent Clause Groups and Patterns in Final Continuation. . .  | 79 |
| XI. Frequencies of Dependent Clause Groups and Patterns in First Continuation . . .  | 80 |
| XII. Frequencies of Dependent Clause Groups and Patterns in Final Continuation . . .   | 81 |
| XIII. The Relationship Between the Noun and Pronoun as Fillers of the Subject Slot and the SV and VS Orders in Independent Clauses . . . . .   | 84 |
| XIV. The Relationship Between the Presence of Adverbial and Connecting Tagmemes in Initial Position and the SV and VS Orders in Independent Clauses . . . . .  | 86 |
| XV. The Relationship Between the Presence of Adverbial and Connecting Tagmemes in the Initial Position and the SV and VS Orders with Nouns (N) and Pronouns (P) in the Subject Slot in Independent Clauses . . . . . | 88 |
| XVI. The Relationship Between the Different Combinations of Nouns (N) and Pronouns (P) as Fillers of the Subject and Direct Object Slots and the Order of the Subject, Predicator, and Direct Object . . . . .       | 92 |
| XVII. The Relationship Between the Nouns and Pronouns as Fillers of the Subject and Direct Object Slots and the Order of the Subject, Predicator, and Direct Object in Independent Clauses . . . . .                 | 94 |
| XVIII. The Relationship Between the Presence of Adverbials and Connecting Tagmemes in the Initial Position and the Order of Subject, Predicator, and Direct Object in Independent Clauses . . . . .                  | 95 |

|         |   |     |
|---------|---|-----|
| XIX.    | The Relationship Between the Different Combinations of Nouns and Pronouns as Fillers of the Nominal Slots and the Order of the Subject, Predicator, Direct Object, and Indirect Object in Independent Clauses . . . . . | 100 |
| XX.     | The Relationship Between the Presence of Adverbial and Connecting Tagmemes in the Initial Position and the Order of the Subject, Predicator, Direct Object, and Indirect Object in Independent Clauses . . . . .        | 102 |
| XXI.    | Frequencies of Occurrence of Subjectless Constructions . . . . .  | 103 |
| XXII.   | Frequencies of Occurrence of Coordinated Predications . . . . .   | 105 |
| XXIII.  | The Relative Order of Primary Tagmemes of Subjectful Predications in Combinations of Two . . . . .  | 107 |
| XXIV.   | The Relative Order of Primary Tagmemes of Both Subjectful and Subjectless Predications in Combinations of Two. . . . .  | 107 |
| XXV.    | Frequencies of Adverbial Slots and Their Fillers and Their Positions Relative to the Predicator . . . . .   | 112 |
| XXVI.   | Positions of Adverbial Slots and Their Fillers with Respect to the Predicator in Patterns with Only One Adverbial . . . . .   | 119 |
| XXVII.  | Linear Ordering of the Modifying Slots and Their Fillers of the Modified-Noun Phrase . . . . .  | 149 |
| XXVIII. | Linear Ordering and Co-Occurrence of the Modifier Tagmemes of Modified-Noun Phrases . . . . .   | 150 |
| XXIX.   | Patterns of Modified-Noun Phrases with Only Pre-Positional Modifiers (820) . . . . .  | 160 |
| XXX.    | Patterns of Modified-Noun Phrases with Post-Positional Modifiers (229) . . . . .  | 161 |

## INTRODUCTION

Over seventy years ago Otto Jespersen, the great Danish scholar, noted the neglect of syntax in historical studies of the English language.<sup>1</sup> At just about the same time, C. Alphonso Smith in the opening sentence of his study of word order of Alfred's *Orosius* and Ælfric's *Homilies* wrote that few subjects "have been so persistently slighted as that of the position of words and clauses".<sup>2</sup> It would seem that after such urging, studies of syntax would abound, but Etsko Kruisinga as late as 1926 remarked that it was "strange that there should be no book of any type, whether advanced or elementary, on Old English syntax".<sup>3</sup> Still later, George W. Small observed that syntactic research in Old English was so lacking that scholars had failed to produce an adequate method of conducting it.<sup>4</sup> A chief reason for this neglect perhaps has been the belief that Old English was a highly inflectional and synthetic language which showed the various relationships within clauses and sentences predominantly by the variations of the forms of words. That is, inflection was the primary signal and almost autonomous, and syntax was based on it.

In the last few decades, a lively interest has been shown in the study of early English syntax. It now appears that syntax is, if not more important than morphology, at least equally important in both diachronic and synchronic studies of early English. Of late, scholars have repeatedly revealed the significance of syntax in any account of the English language. This shift in interest may have been brought about because morphological studies have reached the saturation point, but a more likely reason is that several investigations<sup>5</sup> have demonstrated that word order was functional as early as the ninth century. These studies have given firm support to Jespersen's notion that certain fixations of word order preceded the reduction of inflections. Some investigations have been concerned with limited word order patterns and their historical development, and others have been devoted to rather complete descriptive studies

<sup>1</sup> Otto Jespersen, *Progress in Language* (New York, Macmillan and Co., 1894), p. 352.

<sup>2</sup> C. Alphonso Smith, "The Order of Words in Anglo-Saxon Prose", *PMLA*, VIII (1893), 210.

<sup>3</sup> Etsko Kruisinga, "How to Study Old English Syntax", *English Studies*, VIII (1926), 44.

<sup>4</sup> George W. Small, "On the Study of Old English Syntax", *PMLA*, LI (1936), 3.

<sup>5</sup> These investigations will be listed and briefly described in the section on related research.

of a single text, distinguishing and classifying the different types of word groups. Both of these approaches have yielded interesting and very significant results which have demanded the modification of some of the key notions about the historical development of the English language. These studies, furthermore, have accentuated a special need for a series of exhaustive descriptive synchronic studies of the existing examples of the language of all periods.

### 1.1. THE PROBLEM

The chief purpose of this study is to identify and describe the syntactic patterns in the latter part of the Peterborough Chronicle from the years 1122 to 1154, to tabulate their frequency, and to illustrate the descriptive statements with examples from the corpus. The approach is synchronic in that its concern is with the nature of the syntax of a corpus of a specific period, and it is quantitative in that its observations are based on frequency counts. The study, using a combination of traditional and more modern linguistic methods, will focus primarily on the analysis of clauses and the structure of larger syntactic units. Specifically, the study will center on the following problems:

- (1) the primary tagmemes of clause patterns and their order;
- (2) the secondary tagmemes of clause patterns and their order;
- (3) the nature of modification structures;
- (4) the relationship of clauses and the modes of joining them.

Attention, of course, will be given to the relevant relations between morphology and syntax. The purpose, however, is not to analyze morphology.

### 1.2. THE TEXT AND CORPUS

Of the different versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Peterborough Manuscript is the fullest and continues the longest, until 1154. Scholars now generally believe this manuscript, known as "E", was written by one scribe at one stretch up to 1121; they believe the same scribe then added at intervals annals 1122-1131 (the First Continuation). Later, early in 1155, the section dealing with events from 1132 to 1154 (the Final Continuation) appears to have been added by another scribe.<sup>6</sup> The corpus used in this study is the portion of the Peterborough Chronicle covering the

<sup>6</sup> For recent discussions of the paleographical features of the Peterborough Manuscript, see Dorothy Whitelock, *The Peterborough Chronicle* (Copenhagen, Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954), pp. 13-35; and N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 424-426. Cecily Clark mentions these aspects of the manuscript in her *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. xxx-lxvi and in "Gender in the Peterborough Chronicle, 1070-1154", *English Studies*, XXXVIII (1957), 109-110.

years 1122 to 1154. This portion is regarded by scholars as an uncorrupted original document which was not only written but composed at Peterborough. Charles Plummer as early as 1899, in his revision of John Earle's *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, stated that its origin was certain. "From end to end", he said, "it is unquestionably a Peterborough book."<sup>7</sup> The most recent study shows that Plummer's conclusion has been left unassailed, for Cecily Clark writes that the annals from 1122 on were composed at Peterborough and adds:

And this makes them precious among medieval English texts, for ... there is hardly another of which it can be said both that it is an original, not a garbled copy, and also that its date and provenance are precisely known.<sup>8</sup>

She goes on to call attention to the vigorous and vivid language and notes its almost complete abandonment of the formulaic and annalistic patterns.<sup>9</sup> Dorothy Whitelock considers the Peterborough Chronicle important for the student of the English language because it is the earliest extensive example of the East Midland language, the dialect considered the chief ancestor of our modern standard English, and because it affords:

... the most substantial piece of English writing from the post-Conquest period. It was written at Peterborough, and thus the sections which were composed for it, not merely copied into it, ALLOW AN ESTIMATE TO BE FORMED OF TWELFTH CENTURY ENGLISH in a part of the Danelaw. [Emphasis mine.]<sup>10</sup>

The manuscript was among Archbishop Laud's collection of manuscripts and is now in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, where it is catalogued as MS. Bodley Laud Misc. 636. Charles Plummer's revised edition, the standard edition, has been the basis of most of the discussions of the Peterborough Chronicle and is the chief source for this study. Cecily Clark's book also includes an edition based on the original manuscript. Clark's edition is unlike Plummer's in that it does not closely follow the graphic devices used in the manuscript, but uses modern punctuation. It is, nevertheless, a reliable text for language study. With Plummer as the primary basis and Clark as the secondary, the sixteen annals were copied by the present investigator, after division into syntactic units, on analysis sheets, but only after a close comparison with a facsimile<sup>11</sup> of the original manuscript. The most literal translation (and hence very useful for the present type of study) is S. I. Tucker's,<sup>12</sup> and the most literary is G. N. Garmonsway's.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>7</sup> John Earle and Charles Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel* (London, Oxford University Press, 1892-99), II, xxxv.

<sup>8</sup> Clark, *op. cit.*, p. xxx.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

<sup>10</sup> Whitelock, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>11</sup> This is included in Whitelock's edition, already cited in footnote 6.

<sup>12</sup> S. I. Tucker, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1042-1154)", in *English Historical Documents 1042-1189*, edited by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenway (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1953), pp. 102-203.

<sup>13</sup> G. N. Garmonsway, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London, Everyman, 1953).

## 1.3. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

If we are ever to have a sound and complete description of the nature, growth, and development of the English language, it is essential to have descriptive analyses of the various extant prose works in early English as well as of representatives of Modern English. This study, it is believed, will be doing a valuable part of the work that is now accumulating descriptive analyses of the syntax of prose and poetic works which have survived the Middle Ages. The earlier dependence on morphology, mentioned before, led scholars to describe Classical Old English as a language in which syntactic relationships depended on inflection alone, or at least predominantly, and in which word order had very little significance.<sup>14</sup> Even Charles C. Fries reflected the traditional view in 1940:

In Old English, however, the order of the words in such sentences (actor-action or subject-verb-object) has no bearing whatever upon the grammatical relationships involved. Taxemes of selection do the work, and word-order is non-distinctive and connotative.<sup>15</sup>

Recent studies show that this is not exactly true. However, before any conclusive generalizations can be made about the matter, there will have to be analyses of many more texts.

Since 1930, a number of studies have been concerned with the historical development of word order patterns of English. Some of these studies,<sup>16</sup> based on samplings from carefully selected manuscripts, centered on word order patterning of English from the Middle Ages to the present time. They stressed for the most part the relative position of subject, verb, and object. Some, however, were even concerned with the ordering of the finite and non-finite forms of the verb. For example, David Payne Harris in 1960 made a study of the positions of the verb and its auxiliary in twelfth-century English.<sup>17</sup> More complete and valuable studies have been made by Charles R. Carlton, Ann Shannon, Robert A. Palmatier and William H. Brown, Jr.<sup>18</sup> They are more complete and valuable in the sense that these scholars chose a single corpus and made a clause by clause analysis, describing the whole syntactic pattern, not just one selected relationship. The present study is a continuation of the Carlton-Shannon-Palmatier-Brown work of a descriptive syntax of a single corpus.

<sup>14</sup> This view is generally expressed in books on the history of the English language.

<sup>15</sup> Charles C. Fries, "On the Development of the Structural Use of Word Order in Modern English", *Language*, XVI (1940), 199.

<sup>16</sup> For a brief discussion and bibliographical data on studies by Cassidy, Magers, Saitz, Harris, see the section on related research.

<sup>17</sup> David Payne Harris, "Word-Order in Twelfth Century English", *Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honor of Charles C. Fries*, edited by Albert H. Marckwardt (Ann Arbor, The English Language Institute, University of Michigan, 1964), pp. 187-198.

<sup>18</sup> A brief discussion of these works and bibliographical data will be presented in the section on related research.

## 1.4. RELATED RESEARCH

It would be impractical to mention all the works which have had something to do with the study of early English syntax. Many of these have yielded some interesting information in spite of weaknesses and inadequacies. An excellent and thorough account of investigations before 1955 has been given by Robert L. Saitz.<sup>19</sup> Charles R. Carlton, a few years later, in summary form noted the phases through which the study of early English syntax has gone, briefly discussed the treatment of syntax in some recent grammars, and mentioned the studies of limited patterns.<sup>20</sup> The present study is more closely concerned with those investigations which have been devoted to a synchronic description of a single dated corpus. It has, nevertheless, an affinity with some of the studies which have traced the development of limited patterns such as the subject-object relationship and the periphrastic genitive, that is, the studies which have contributed to an understanding of the relationship of inflections and word order as syntactic signals.

Russell Thomas was perhaps the first to offer some confirmation that syntactic patterns were important signaling devices in early English when he found that the adnominal periphrastic genitive appeared in samples from all the periods and, more important, that the pre-positive genitive was established by the eleventh century, constituting 76.6 per cent of the genitive expressions that occurred in the samples studied.<sup>21</sup>

In his report of an investigation of the beginnings of the substitution of the periphrastic dative for the indirect object-direct object construction, Frederic G. Cassidy gave a complete historical account of the construction in a very extensive collection of texts of Old English prose. Although he was generally concerned with the problem of inflectional loss, his study specifically focused on the dative object-accusative object patterns. He found that periphrasis began to be used noticeably only after 1150. But what seems more important is the evidence that some of the word order patterns of Modern English were already well established around A.D. 900, when case distinction was still strong.<sup>22</sup> He concluded that the pronominal dative object preceded the accusative object about 73 per cent of the time and that nominal dative objects followed the accusative object about 76 per cent of the time. By 1050, despite the inflectional distinctiveness of the dative and accusative objects, Cassidy concluded, case distinction was redundant, because the word order of Modern English was oc-

<sup>19</sup> Robert L. Saitz, "Functional Word Order in Old English Subject-Object Patterns", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1955, pp. 4-41.

<sup>20</sup> Charles R. Carlton, *Descriptive Syntax of the Old English Charters* (The Hague, Mouton, 1970), pp. 13-22.

<sup>21</sup> Russell Thomas, "Syntactical Processes Involved in the Development of the Adnominal Periphrastic Genitive in the English Language", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1931, pp. 111-113.

<sup>22</sup> Frederic G. Cassidy, "The Backgrounds in Old English of the Modern English Substitutes for the Dative-Object in the Verb + Dative - Object + Accusative - Object", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1938, pp. 86-87.

curing 75 per cent of the time and by 1100, about 80 per cent. His corpus included over 10,000 examples from the early ninth century up to 1200.

Mildred K. Magers in her study set out to demonstrate how a "syntactic order had replaced inflectional form as a grammatical vehicle". Her concern was the subject-verb-object order and the notion that this order appeared to fill the need of inflectional loss. She found that there was a definite trend by the tenth century toward the subject-verb-object pattern and concluded that word order as a grammatical device was well established and preceded the loss of inflection.<sup>23</sup>

Robert L. Saitz investigated word order and inflection in the subject-object relationship. After a detailed look at the possibility of inflectional distinctiveness in the Old English paradigms, he found that even in the ninth century, inflections could not have distinguished the subject and object in the subject-object pattern more than 41 per cent of the time and that if there had to be distinction between subject and object, there must have been some other signaling devices to mark the distinction 59 per cent of the time. Furthermore, he showed that in those patterns where case inflections did not distinguish subject and object, the subject stood before the object 94 per cent of the time.<sup>24</sup>

All these studies, which are quantitative in that the evidence is based on frequency counts, point to the fact that word order was functional in early stages of the English language.

It remains now to look at the studies which are more closely similar to the present one.

The first of these is Charles R. Carlton's study of the syntax of a carefully selected group of original charters written from A.D. 805 to 1066.<sup>25</sup> Adapting to the study of Old English the method of Charles C. Fries' *Structure of English*, Carlton divided his corpus into basic syntactic units (sentences) as identified by formal and structural characteristics. Sentences were divided then into their functional parts. Once the primary and secondary elements were discussed and illustrated, Carlton moved on to the investigation of inflection and word order as grammatical devices. He concluded that inflection was the primary syntactic signal but because of the tendency of elements toward a certain pattern or patterns, that word order was also a functional syntactic signal.

Ann Shannon's study presented a descriptive syntax of a portion of the Parker Manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Instead of a sentence-level analysis, Shannon used a clause-level analysis. She described the clause (which she believes is the most convenient unit to employ in the analysis of Old English) as characterized by having only one essential element, the verb. In her analysis, then, there were as many

<sup>23</sup> Mildred K. Magers, "The Development of the Grammatical Use of Word Order for Relationships Expressed by the Accusative with Special Reference to the Development in Subordinate Clauses", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1943, pp. 44 and 89.

<sup>24</sup> Saitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-126.

<sup>25</sup> Carlton, *op. cit.*

clauses as finite verbs. She treated the order of major and minor elements, the combination of clauses, and morphosyntactic relations. One of her most important conclusions was that subjects and objects were not always distinctively marked by case endings and that morphological and syntactic signaling in many examples seemed to be redundant.<sup>26</sup>

William H. Brown, Jr., used an approach similar to that of Shannon in his study of King Alfred's *Pastoral Care*. He worked with a 22,000 word corpus from the Hatton Manuscript. The focal point of Brown's analysis was also the clause, and he also assumed that there were as many clauses as finite verbs. He recognized that nominal and verbal phrases had clearly established patterns and that the order of the subject, verb, and object fell into consistent, limited patterns, despite the fact that they occurred in all possible positions.<sup>27</sup>

Robert A. Palmatier described the syntax of the *Ormulum*, an early Middle English text in the East Midland dialect, dated about 1200. Palmatier, like Shannon and Brown, used clause-level analysis and assumed there were as many clauses as finite verbs. He concluded that syntactic relationships were signaled by inflectional agreement, order of occurrence, and semantic association, that syntactic patterns such as the noun-headed phrase were essentially like those of Modern English, and that the subject-verb, subject-verb-object, subject-verb-indirect object-direct object, and subject-verb-complement patterns were normal.<sup>28</sup>

These studies, all in all, show that early English did not depend entirely upon one kind of system for indicating relationships and that many of the syntactic patterns characteristic of Modern English have appeared and been operative in the earlier stages of the English language. Furthermore, it is evident that a descriptive linguistic method can be effectively applied to early stages of a language; scholars are now well on their way to providing the series of synchronic studies which are needed in giving an account of the nature and growth of the English language from generation to generation.

#### 1.5. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE

The interest in the language of the latter part of the Peterborough Chronicle has been exceptional. The earlier description of the corpus has explained why this portion of the Chronicle has special attraction and importance for the students of the English language. However, much of the study of the document has dealt with morphology

<sup>26</sup> Ann Shannon, *A Descriptive Syntax of the Parker Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 734 to 891* (The Hague, Mouton and Company, 1964), p. 67.

<sup>27</sup> William H. Brown, Jr., *A Descriptive Syntax of King Alfred's "Pastoral Care"* (The Hague, Mouton, 1970).

<sup>28</sup> Robert A. Palmatier, *A Descriptive Syntax of the "Ormulum"* (The Hague, Mouton, 1970).

and vocabulary. The earlier studies centered on the nature of the inflectional system of the language. The first was O. P. Behm's *The Language of the Latter Part of the Peterborough Chronicle*.<sup>29</sup> Another similar study of the inflectional system was Heinrich Meyer's *Zur Sprache der jüngeren Teile der Chronik von Peterborough*.<sup>30</sup> Neither of these went beyond morphology; they focused on what they generally described as a decaying and arbitrary inflectional system.

In other studies, portions of the Peterborough Chronicle have been used as samples of twelfth-century English in diachronic studies which have given a historical account of a single form of expression or of limited patterns. Examples are found in the dissertations of Thomas and Cassidy, both of which were mentioned earlier.

More recent investigations have been concerned with the vocabulary and certain grammatical forms relating to gender and the relative pronouns. Cecily Clark has provided a relatively complete study of the vocabulary<sup>31</sup> and Angus McIntosh published a short paper on the relatives *þe* and *þat* in early Middle English.<sup>32</sup>

There are three further studies which have treated some aspects of syntax of the latter part of the Peterborough Chronicle. One is Wilhelm Roth's *Die Wortstellung im Aussage-Hauptsatz Angelsächsischen Originalprosa, Annalen 800-990, 1066-1154*.<sup>33</sup> Roth's corpus included a very early portion of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the latest, the portion under investigation here; however, his investigation seems to be mainly concerned with the relationship of verbal modifiers to the other parts of the sentence. The other study, an investigation of the word order of the complete Peterborough Chronicle, is Ewald Rothstein's "Die Wortstellung in der Peterborough Chronik".<sup>34</sup> Rothstein's study is more useful to the student of the language of the Peterborough Chronicle, yet it is far from being a descriptive syntax. Rothstein was preoccupied with the movement of the elements to the position they occupy in Modern English. The study noted also the influence of verbal modifiers on the order of the subject and verb. Both of these latter studies are somewhat dated. Rothstein's would be of greater use if he had drawn generalizations separately from the portion up to 1121 and the portion from 1122 to 1131. The third is Bruce Mitchell's article<sup>35</sup>

<sup>29</sup> O. P. Behm, *The Language of the Latter Part of the Peterborough Chronicle* (Uppsala, [n.n.], 1884).

<sup>30</sup> Heinrich Meyer, *Zur Sprache der jüngeren Teile der Chronik von Peterborough* (Leipzig, Buchhandlung Gustav Fock, 1889).

<sup>31</sup> Cecily Clark, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle, 1070-1154", *English and Germanic Studies*, V (1952-53), 67-89.

<sup>32</sup> Angus McIntosh, "The Relative Pronouns *þe* and *þat* in Early Middle English", *English and Germanic Studies*, I (1947-48), 73-90.

<sup>33</sup> Wilhelm Roth, *Die Wortstellung im Aussage-Hauptsatz Angelsächsischen Originalprosa, Annalen 800-900, 1066-1154* (Berlin, Mayor and Miller, 1914).

<sup>34</sup> Ewald Rothstein, "Die Wortstellung in der Peterborough Chronik", *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, LXIV (1922), 1-108.

<sup>35</sup> Bruce Mitchell, "Syntax and Word-Order in *The Peterborough Chronicle 1122-1154*", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, LXV (1964), 113-144. What similarity there is between the conclusions of Mitchell's study and this one was not due to the investigator's use of Mitchell's study. In fact, the investigator, although he searched diligently for, and wrote to experts in the field about, such works, did not discover Mitchell's work until he had almost finished his study.

“Syntax and Word-Order in *The Peterborough Chronicle 1122-1154*”. Mitchell set out to show what was modern and what was archaic in the language of the latter part of the Peterborough Chronicle and concluded that the language was changing to Modern English, but that it was not as far advanced as earlier scholars had maintained. Thus far, Mitchell’s study is the most accurate description of this corpus, and hence, the most useful; however, it lacks the detail and coverage of the present study. The present study made only limited use of these three works on word order and goes beyond them in its description of the syntax of the portion of the Chronicle studied.

#### 1.6. EDITION OF THE TEXT

The basic edition used in the study was Charles Plummer’s revision of John Earle’s edition, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Scholars seem to be unanimous in thinking that any linguistic account of the Peterborough Chronicle must be based on Plummer’s revision of Earle.<sup>36</sup> Plummer reproduced the manuscript very accurately, retaining most of its peculiarities. Even so, the investigator compared it with other editions and constantly referred to a facsimile reproduction of the original manuscript. In illustrating the descriptive statements in the analysis with examples from the corpus, all the features of Plummer’s edition are kept, except that the following abbreviations in the original have been expanded to their full form:

|          |            |
|----------|------------|
| ab̄b     | abbot      |
| ab̄brice | abbotrice  |
| ærcēb    | ærcēbiscop |
| ḅ, ḅisc  | biscop     |
| Ihc      | Iesus      |
| S’, s̄cē | sancte     |
| ḃ        | ḃet, ḃat   |
| ḍ        | ḍet, ḍat   |

#### 1.7. GENERAL PROCEDURE OF THE ANALYSIS

The general procedure of analysis used in this study is derived from descriptive techniques of modern linguistics. The investigator did not, in the analysis of the corpus, follow the method of any single linguist but rather adapted some of the ideas which were gathered from several books and articles.<sup>37</sup> The presentation of the data, as well

<sup>36</sup> See, for example, Garmonsway, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiii.

<sup>37</sup> Benjamin Elson and Velma Pickett, *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax* (Santa Ana, California, Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1964); W. Nelson Francis, *The Structure of American English* (New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1958); Charles C. Fries, *The Structure of English* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952); H. A. Gleason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1955); Zellig Harris, *Methods in Structural Linguistics* (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1951); *idem*, *String Analysis of Sentence Structures* (The Hague, Mouton and Company, 1962); Archibald Hill, *An Introduction to Linguistic*