LINGUISTICS

CONTEXT-SENSITIVITY IN OLD AND MIDDLE ENGLISH

JUAN M. DE LA CRUZ

University of Essex

The purpose of this article is to establish which grammatical contexts, and to what degree, determine the word-order of those structures involving verbs and localizers of the class of adverbial particles, in a corpus of Old and Middle English texts.[1] In order to correlate patterns of structure to contextual frames I have devised a contextual grid of 4 major contexts (see table below). The patterns I have recorded in the material under examination are then systematically related to, or excluded from, those contexts. This required the previous classification of such patterns. To this end we may choose a theoretical model embracing all the possible positions of the basic constituents, that is, the verb (V) and the adverbial particle (P)[1a], not only in relation to each other ($A_{(\alpha)}$: PV, $B_{(\alpha)}$: P/V, $C_{(\alpha)}$:VP and $D_{(\alpha)}$: V/P)[2] but also in terms of the objects (prepositional and non-prepositional—whether pronominal or non-pronominal) when they exist, as well as in terms of other elements (subject and modifiers) when they intervene between V and P or between P and V. Accordingly, pattern A would consist of 'particle+verb' (with or without (a) a non-prepositional object or (b) a prepositional object). The presence of a non-prepositional object could be formulated as β_1 or β_2 according to the post- or front-position of such an object with regard to the entire verb-particle frame: VP or V/P or PV+β, and β+VP or V/P or PV or P/V. Similarly, the presence of a prepositional object could be formulated as γ_1 or γ_2 accordingly. When such objects complete the directional modification of the adverbial particle, this might be indicated as γ_3. Such objects may co-occur and they may theoretically precede

---

[1] See text references.

[1a] Note that P=prepositional particle as distinct from P (adverbial). Note also that [(P)]=unspecified particle and P-- =prefix.

[2] The slanted line represents an intervening element between P and V or V and P.

or follow the unit 'particle+verb' (or 'verb+particle') in any of 6 possible combinations: $+\beta_1\gamma_1$, $+\gamma_1\beta_1$, $\beta_2+\dots+\gamma_1$, $\beta_2\gamma_2+$, $\gamma_2+\dots+\beta_1$, and $+\beta_2\gamma_2$. These combinations could be formulated as δ_1, δ_2, δ_3, δ_4, δ_5 and δ_6, with or without the subindex $_j$ according to whether or not the prepositional object completes the directional notion of the adverbial particle as in the case of γ. Pattern B would consist of 'particle+an intervening element+verb' (with or without (a) a non-prepositional object or (b) a prepositional object, as above). In this pattern, 5 subgroups could be distinguished according to the type of intervening element between P and V: subject (B1), modifier (B2), non-pronominal object (B3), pronominal object (B4), prepositional object (B5) (which may or may not complete the directional modification of P); B5 therefore could be specified accordingly: $B5_j/B5$. Pattern C would consist of 'verb+particle' (with or without the objects specified in pattern A and behaving likewise with regard to the verb-particle unit). Pattern D would consist of 'verb+an intervening element+particle', being in all respects like pattern B except for the reversed positions of P and V.

It is self-evident that in a study of context-sensitivity we could make full use of formulae of the type $A \to B$/in the context $X+\dots+Y$; $P \to Q$/in the context $E+F+\dots+G$; $P \to Q+R$/in the context $E+\dots+G+H+K+L$; $P \to \emptyset$/in the context $E+\dots+F$, etc. If, by way of an example, we choose the contrast 'transitive (tr.)/intransitive (intr.)', taking I=direct object and J= prepositional object, we shall have $V \to V_{tr}$ in $P+\dots+I$ (or $I+P+\dots+\emptyset$) and in $P+\dots+I+J$ (or $P+\dots+J+I$, or $I+P+\dots+J$, or $I+J+P+\dots+\emptyset$, or $J+P+\dots I$, or $J+I+P+\dots+\emptyset$), that is, in a structure $A\beta$ and in a structure $A\delta/A\delta_j$. If we substitute P+subject for P we shall have the contexts for $B1\beta$ and $B1\delta/B1\delta_j$. If we substitute P+modifier for P we shall have the contexts for $B2\beta$ and $B2\delta/B2\delta_j$. If we substitute P+non-pronominal object we shall have the contexts for $B3\beta$ and $B3\delta/B3\delta_j$. If instead of a non-pronominal object we put a pronominal one we shall have the contexts for $B4\beta$ and $B4\delta/B4\delta_j$. If we substitute P+prepositional object for P we shall have the contexts for $B5\beta/B5_j\beta$ and $B5\delta/B5_j\delta//B5\delta_j/B5_j\delta_j$. Likewise we shall have $V \to V_{tr}$ in $(\dots)$[3] $+P+I$ (or $I+\dots+P$) and in $(\dots)+P+I+J$ (or $(\dots)+P+J+I$, or $I+\dots+P+J$, or $I+J+\dots+P$, or $J+\dots+P+I$, or $J+I+\dots+P$), that is, in a structure $C\beta$ and in a structure $C\delta/C\delta_j$. If, following the same method, we now replace P by subject $+P$ or by modifier $+P$ or by non-pronominal object $+P$ or by pronominal object$+P$ or by prepositional object$+P$ (that is, systematically reversing the order of the elements we have replaced in A in order to obtain the subgroups of B), we shall have the complete series of the subpatterns β and δ/δ_j in the group-pattern D which, like B, consists of the subgroups 1, 2,

3, 4, 5 and 5_j. In the same way, we shall have $V \to V_{intr}$ in $P+\dots+\emptyset$ and in $P+\dots+J$ (or $J+P+\dots+\emptyset$), that is, in the structures $A\alpha$ and $A\gamma/A\gamma_j$. Effecting the appropriate substitutions (P→P+subject, P+modifier and P+prepositional object) we shall obtain the contexts for $B1\alpha$, $B1\gamma/B1\gamma_j$, $B2\alpha$, $B2\gamma/B2\gamma_j$, $B5\alpha/B5_j\alpha$, $B5\gamma/B5_j\gamma//B5\gamma_j/B5_j\gamma_j$. We shall also have $V \to V_{intr}$ in $(\dots)+P$ and in $(\dots)+P+J$ (or $J+\dots+P$), that is, in the structures $C\alpha$ and $C\gamma/C\gamma_j$. If we effect the replacements P→subject+P, modifier+P, prepositional object+P, we shall obtain the contexts for $D1\alpha$ and $D1\gamma/D1\gamma_j$, $D2\alpha$ and $D2\gamma/D2\gamma_j$, and for $D5\alpha/D5_j\alpha$ and $D5\gamma/D5_j\gamma//D5\gamma_j/D5_j\gamma_j$, respectively.

In this article, however, I have decided to avoid as far as possible the use of formulae which instead of simplifying the panorama would complicate it unnecessarily. For this reason I shall limit the formalizing to the expression of the basic contextual formulae and the basic patterns or group-patterns, that is, A, B1/2/3/4/5, C, D1/2/3/4/5. The table below will enable us to trace the grammatical contexts of each pattern or group-pattern. After this analysis (which will help...) the basic contextual...

The verb-phrase V (/) P, P (/) V in the context of the sentence

(i)

Context Σ (main sentence and non-finite form of verb)	V±object-goal	trans.: direct object (reflexive or non-reflexive)	(1) underlying (passive)	
			(2) explicit	direct object alone
				direct object+indirect object
				anticipatory object (direct object+direct object)
		intrans.	(3) no object	
			(4) indirect object (including the reflexive dative and the dative of interest)	
	circumstancial modality		(5$_a$) prepositional string	
			(5$_b$) adverbial modifier	
	judgement/question		(6$_a$) affirmative	
			(6$_b$) negative	
			(7) interrogative	

(ii)

Context Σ−(Σ$_s$)$_1$ (phrasal subordination and non-finite form of verb)[4]	(8) various types of relations according to the subordinating nexus

[3] An element I or J in this position would obviously make the pattern mixed. Therefore (…) in the case of the simple patterns concerned =…except for I or J.

[4] The subindex $_s$ stands for structure. Hence (Σ_s) refers to the string constituted by the verb-particle structure. The other abbreviations in the table are as follows: V_{mod}=modal auxiliary, V_s=verbal constituent of the structures under study (V(/)P, P(/)V), inf.=infinitive, S_1-S_1=the subject of V_s (string Σ_s) is the same as that of V (string Σ), part.=participle, S_1-S_2=the subject of V_s is not the same as that of V, V_{aux}=non-modal auxiliary.

(iii)

Context Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (phrasal subordination: the verb of Σ_s is a finite form which complements the verb of Σ)	infinitive	(9) $V_{mod} + V_s$ (inf. $S_1 - S_1$)
		(10) $V + V_s$ (inf. $S_1 - S_1$)
		(11) $V_{(tr.)} + V_{(s\ tr./intr.)}$ (inf. $S_1 - S_2$)
	present participle	(12) $V_{(tr.)} + V_{s\ (tr./intr.)}$ (present part. $S_1 - S_2$)
		(13) $V_{aux} + V_s$ (present part.)
	past participle	(14) $V_{aux} + V_s$ (past part.)

(iv)

| Context Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (phrasal subordination and finite form of the verb of Σ_s — such a verb does not complement any other verb) | (15) $\varnothing + V_s$ |

consists in correlating each pattern to the points specified in the four sections of the table) we shall be able to complete the perspective by considering the number of patterns or group-patterns that each point affects.

My method will be as follows: (a) subcategorial analysis, (b) other contextual aspects, in each pattern or group-pattern, distinguishing the two linguistic periods. The subcategorial analysis makes reference to the points expressed in the contexts Σ (1, 2, 3, 4 -V$\pm$object-goal-; 5_a, 5_b-circumstantial modality-), Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9, 10, 11 -infinitive-; 12, 13 -present participle-; 14 -past participle-) and Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15). The other contextual aspects are those expressed in the contexts Σ(6_a, 6_b, 7 -judgement/question-) and Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8). It should be noted that at least two of the points from 1 to 7 of context Σ affect every structure in every context. If we took into account the combinations of two or more points of one or more contexts in each structure, we would have to formulate a complex series of inter-contextual combinations. Nevertheless, I shall simplify such an issue, by dealing only with the 'defining' or at least 'typical' contexts of each pattern separately. So, if in a structure which exemplifies e.g. points 2 and 6 (context Σ), we have a case of subordination (point 8, context Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_1$) with the order 'PV' (pattern A), I shall not formulate the confluence. I shall limit myself to utilizing the structure of pattern A as a sample of the context Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_1$, which is its typically defining context (in OE.). A pattern D, on the other hand, may be due to the existence of a pronominal object, Σ (2) constituting then its defining context.

Before entering into the discussion of (a) and (b), we should distinguish three basic positions of the verb: (1) initial, (2) medial and (3) final. It will suffice to illustrate them in Old English*. Initial: **Aris** ? *gong to cirican to þæs*

---

halgan Oswaldes lice, ? site þær ? stille wuna... (Bede 186, 26), **Ga** *geond þas wegas ? hegas. ? nyd hig þ hig gán in. þ min hus si gefylled* (Luke 14, 23) —imperative—, **Wolde** *þa hine mid attre acwellan, and asende him ænne focan to láce mid attre gemencged* (Ælfric, Homs. II, 162, 19) —V in a structure $V_{mod} - V_s$—, **Mot** *ic nu cunnian [h]won þinre fæstræd[nes]se, þ ic þonan ongietan mæge hwonon ic þin tilian scyle ? hu?* (Boethius 12, 12) —inverted order in the same type of phrasal subordination (9)—, **cume** *an spearwa ? hrædlice þæt hus þurhfleo, cume þurh o þre duru in, þurh o þre ut gewite* (Bede 136, 2), **Wast** *þu hu ic gewand ymb Croeses þearfe Creca cyninges, þa þa hine Cirus Pcesa cyning gefangen hæfde ? hine forbærnan wolde?* (Boethius 18, 18) —inverted order without phrasal subordination, see below in connection with the inverted order—. Medial: *Iosue se heretoga mid Israhela folce,* **beeode** *þa burh seofon si þum, and ða Godes ðeowas bæron þæt halige scrín mid ðam heofenlicum haligdome...* (Ælfric, Homs. II, 214, 33). Final: *And se heah-engel mid þisum wordum to heofonum* **gewát** (ibid. I, 504, 3) —see below in connection with contexts Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_1$ and Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$—. To these positions we can add two other types: (1) the non-absolutely final positions, frequent in structures $V - V_s$ in subordinate clauses, which we shall be dealing with shortly as one of the aspects of pattern A, and (2) the positions concerning the subject, in particular the inverted order 'VS'.[5]

PATTERN A [6]

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

The subcategorization aspects which concern us here relate to the contexts where V (or V_s in case the discontinuous verb complements another verb) is a finite form: infinitive, present participle or past participle. Such contexts are: (1) Σ (1—underlying direct object: past participle) which also implies context Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14), (2) Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9, 10, 11: infinitive, 12, 13: present participle, 14: past participle—which does not necessarily imply the context Σ (1)), (3) Σ—$(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15 —when the verb form concerned is a finite one: infinitive, present

---

[5] Note that certain subject positions cannot co-exist with certain patterns. The inverted order /VS/ cannot co-exist with B1 nor with C, the inverted order V/S cannot co-exist with B1 nor with D1, the normal order /SV/ can- not co-exist with D1 nor with A, and the normal order S/V cannot co-exist with B1 nor with D1.

[6] As already implied, this must be taken globally, that is, including all the patterns A. The same applies to C. In the case of B and D, I use parallelly the term 'group-pattern', that is, comprising the respective subgroups.

participle, past participle). In the afore-mentioned contexts V_s frequently occupies a final position in structures of verbs without a locative particle such as *Wolde þa hine mid attre acwellan, and asende him ænne focan to láce mid attre gemencged* (Ælfric, Homs. II, 162, 19), quoted above, *and ic ongann be ðam cuðan intingan hwæthwega geornlicor smeagan* (ibid. 32, 23), *On twam þingum hæfde God þæs mannes sawle gegodod; þæt is mid undeadlicnysse, and mid gesælðe* (ibid. I, 20, 1), where we also have an inverted order with regard to V. Nevertheless, we indeed encounter an entire range of sequences $V - V_s$ where V_s appears in various non-absolutely final positions, although always after V [7]. Cf. *Ne mæg man gesceaft fulfremedlice smeagan ne understandan ymbe God* (Ælfric, Homs. I, 12, 18) —note also the inverted order with regard to V— as well as the cases in direct order: *Ic wylle settan min wedd betwux me and eow to þisum beháte...* (ibid. 22, 10), *Ic Ælfric munuc and mæssepreost, swa þeah waccre þonne swilcum hadum gebyrige, wearð asend on Æþelredes dæge cyninges fram Ælfeage biscope, Aðelwoldes æftergengan, to sumum mynstre þe is Cernel gehaten* (ibid. 2, 12).

The important thing is that, given the frequent final position of infinitives and participles (V_s) complementing a verb (V) [8] and given in any case their normal postposition with regard to V, it will be easy to explain the position of the locative particles immediately before V_s in verb-particle structures. However, when V_s corresponds to an infinitive with *to*, the infinitive particle prevents the immediate precedence of P, as we shall see later. We can say, therefore, that the configuration of pattern A is due in such cases to the syntactic structure of the Old English verb. Furthermore, the adverbs in general and very frequently the pronouns, tend to precede the verb, which is thereby relegated frequently to a more or less final position. Hence the well known principle of 'precedence of modifier', taking 'modifier' in a broad sense. The final position of the verb and the precedence of the modifier are therefore the defining factors of pattern A. Note that, although we can talk here of a considerable degree of contextual constraint, instead of stylistic variation, context-sensitivity is only relative. [9] In the following examples we can see V_s in

---

[7] Except when the clause is subordinate. See below.

[8] Note that the so-called auxiliary and modal verbs exhibit an indisputably autonomous origin in English as in other languages. Cf. for example the evidence of participial concord in Germanic and Romance.

[9] Other complements, such as the simple objects and prepositional objects, vary in their position. In those cases where we have more than one complement, R. Huchon distinguished a variety of patterns expressed in the following formulae, where S=subject, V=verb, O=simple object without flexional case-marker, 1=simple object with flexional case-marker, 2=prepositional object: SVO1, VSO1, SV1O, VS1O, *S1OV, SO1V*, SV12, SV2112, *S21V, (S)12V, (S)122V, S212V, (S)2V1(2)*, SOV2, S21V2, etc. As can be seen, the patterns in italics exhibit the precedence of the complements. Cf. R. Huchon (1923: 255 ff.).

---

final position: Σ (1) *þar bið wop 7 tolþa gryst-lung; Ðænne ge geseo þ abrahan. 7 isaac. 7 iacob. 7 ealle witegan on godes rice. 7 ge beoð ut-adrifene* (Luke 13, 28), *For- þam ælc þe hine úp-ahefð. bið genyðerud. 7 se ðe hine nyðeraþ se bið up-ahafen* (ibid. 14, 11), *nis hyt nyt ne on eor þan ne on myxene ac hyt bið út-aworpen* (ibid. 14, 35), *þá wæs æfter wiste wōp ūp āhafen/micel morgen-swēg* (Beow. 128), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9) *Da bealh he hine 7 nolde ingan* (Luke 15, 28), *7 hig ne mihton hine inbringan 7 alecgan beforan him* (ibid. 5, 19), *Ic nat nu ðeah ðu wille cweð [an þ] þa goodan onginnen hwilū þ hi ne magon forðbringan* (Boethius 110, 32), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (10) *Ond æfter þon he hine gereste medmicel fæc, ða ahof hine up 7 ongan aweg gan, gif he hwær ænige freond metan meahte, þe his gymenne dydde 7 his wunda læcnian wolde* (Bede 326, 9), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11) *þa com sum þara hina, cleopode me 7 het utgan 7 cwæ þ...* (ibid. 392, 28), *...and hit him on gefeaht. 7 hine on orreste ofer com 7 syððan he ofer cumen wæs. him het se cyng þa eagan ut adón. 7 sy þðan belisnian* (O. E. Chron. a. 1096, E 232, 21), *þa heton þa consulas Hasterbale þæt heafod of acéorfan, 7 aweorpan hit beforan Hannibales wicstowe* (Orosius 198, 29), *he het him þa honda of aceorfan* (ibid. 218, 11), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (12) *we gesawon sumne on þinum naman deofol-seocnessa út-drifende 7 we hine for-budon* (Luke 9, 49), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (13) *Da gestod he se biscop æt hiere 7 orationem gecwæð ofer hiere 7 geblætsode 7 gesægnode 7 wæs utgongende* (Bede 392, 25), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) *se eadiga papa Gregorius, æfter þon he þæt setl þære Romaniscan cyricean 7 þære apostolican þreottyne gear 7 syx monað 7 tyn dagas wulderlice heold 7 rehte, þa wæs forðfered, 7 to þam ecan setle þæs heofonlican rices læded* (ibid. 94, 2), $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15) *Da cwæð se engel ingangende. hal wes ðú mid gyfe gefylled. drihten mid þe* (Luke 1, 28), *Ða cwæþ se hælend hine upbeseonde* (ibid. 10, 30) *þurh inno þas úres godes mildheortnesse. on þam he ús geneosode of east-dæle up-springende* (ibid. 1, 78). Note that in a case like (11) *And þa ðe he to þam huse cóm, ne let he nanne mid him in-gán buton petrum 7 Iohannem...* (Luke 8, 51), the position of V_s must be considered virtually final, whereas in circumstances such as those occurring in (15) *Ða gewordenum dæge se hælend ut-gangende ferde on weste stówe* (ibid. 4, 42), where the action of V_s precedes temporally that of V, it is difficult to conceive of greater relegation. It is also to be noted that the non-absolutely final position is often due to symmetrical balancing when we have two objects, for instance, I and J, resulting in a structure such as 'I+PV+J' or 'J+PV+I': (9) *7 þa hi ne mihton hine inbringan for þære mænigu* (Mark 2, 4), (10) *Da ongan he of þam temple ut-drifan þa syllendan 7 ða bicgendan* (Luke 19, 45), (11) *Da he ða inne wæs, ða heht he his tungan forðdóon of his muðe 7 him heawan: genon hine ða bi his cinne 7 mid tacne ðære halgan rode hio gesegnade* (Bede 388, 24). Obviously a case like (9) *... & hit nyle úparæran to ðam staðole fulfremedes weorces* (Cura Past. 65, 15) with V between I and PV_s belongs to the same category.

The situation gets complicated in cases of confluence of contexts, for

instance, $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a} + \Sigma$ (1). Cf. *þa geseah heo þære foresprecenan Godes þeowe sawle Hilde þære abbudissan in þæm seolfan leohte, engla weorodum gelæden-dum, to heofonum up borenne beon* (Bede 340, 10), where the underlying direct object of the passive construction appears in the surface string of the active structure $(V+O~(S_{pas.})+(V_s+V_{aux.~pas.}))$ whose $V_{aux.~pas.}$ assumes the absolute final position. It should be observed that V_s complements such an auxiliary and that both V_s and the auxiliary complement V. Note that such a complementizing hierarchy is not reflected in the sequential order of the string. A special interest has the confluence $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a} + \Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_1$, that is, infinitives and participles complementing V in subordinate clauses, but I shall leave this for the moment until we have discussed such clauses in section (b).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

I refer here fundamentally to $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_1$ (8). The ordinary structures of verb without a locative particle subordinated to a main clause show a clear tendency to the final position of their verb: *Gif ðu þonne ðis lytle bebód tobrecst, þu scealt deaðe sweltan* (Ælfric, Homs. I, 14, 12), *Maran lufe nimð se heretoga on gefeohte to ðam cempan, þe æfter fleame his wiðerwinnan ðegenlice oferwinð, þonne to ðam þe mid fleame ne ætwánd, ne ðeah on nanum gecampe naht ðegenli-ces ne gefremode* (ibid. 342, 2). This is the reason why we frequently have pattern A when in the structure there is no particle *ne* directly modifying a V_s. The particle *ne* would split the unit 'P V' (see the next pattern). So we shall easily encounter cases like *ʒif hio tobyrst, ni þer gewit, oððe upastihð* (Leech-doms II, 160, 27), *þa slog hie mon æt æg þrum cirre, þæt hira feawa on weg comon* (O. E. Chron. a. 918, A 98, 29), *þa hy þa hine onweg dydon, þa cwom of inneweardre þære byrgenne swa micel stenc...* (Bede 174, 28), *læddon hine ofer ðæs muntes cnæpp. ofer þone buruh getimbrud wæs. þ hi hine nyðer bescufon* (Luke 4, 29), *þa cerde he ða sona on da swiðran hond, mec ongon lædan suðeast on ðon roðor swa swa on wintre sunne upp gongeð* (Bede 428, 23), *... se þe hine from swa monegum ermþum, teonum generede, to heanisse cynicrices forðgelædde* (ibid. 130, 11), *for- þam- þe ge secgað þ ic on bel-sebub deofol-seocnessa ut-adrife* (Luke 11, 18).[10]

As I have already pointed out, the situation gets complicated when there are confluences. Here we must have a close look at the confluence $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a} + \Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_1$ already mentioned. In these cases, the absolutely final position is frequently assumed by the non-finite form (V) immediately or almost im-

---

[10] As is well known, a difference of sentence stress between the main clause and the subordinate clause has frequently been adduced as a determining factor of the diverse position of the verb in the two types of clauses, as happens, for instance, in Sanskrit. However, this is far from being conclusive. Cf. B. Delbrück (1919: 74).

mediately preceded by the infinitive or the participle (V_s): *þæt nigode wite wæs, þæt becomon ðicce ðeostru and egeslice ofer eallum Egypta-lande, swa þæt heora nán binnon ðrim dagum oðerne ne geseah, ne hi of ðære stowe styrian ne mihton, and on Israhela ðeode wæron gewunelice dagas* (Ælfric, Homs. II, 194, 3), *... & sua ungewealðes ofslieð his geferan, he ðonne sceal fleon to anra ðara ðreora burga ðe to friðstowe gesette sint & libbe* (Cura Past. 167, 1). In accordance with this we have 'P V' structures of the type *þa he ða eft þonan ut faran wolde, þa het he beodan ofer ealle þa fierð þæt hie foron alle ut æt somme* (O. E. Chron. a. 905, A 94, 3). However, this is far from being a constant feature of the subordinate clause[11]. We also have the typical order of the main clause: *Mid ðy ic ðæt dyde , wæs ingongende, þa gemette ic heo glade ondwleotan , hale , gesunde* (Bede 392, 30), like *nis hyt nyt ne on eorþan ne on myxene ac hyt bið út-aworpen* (Luke 14, 35), *Da gestod he se biscop æt hiere , orationem gecwæð ofer hiere , geblætsode , gesægnode , wæs utgongende* (Bede 392, 25), etc. Likewise we also have simple cases of parataxis with the order 'V_s—V': *þara trea æcyrfe , láfe oð þe fyre forbærnde wæron... oððe cuðlice útworpen wæren , in forhogdnisse hæfde, , fótum treden , in eorðan gehwyrfde wæron* (Bede 224, 15).

In addition to the contextual restriction effected by the determining factor of the final or quasi-final position of the verb in the cases I have mentioned (when we have infinitives or participles complementing a verb in a finite form or finite verb-particle structures in subordinate clauses), we must consider other less specific contexts in which the verb is in fact also relegated to a final position. Cf. *Ond heo sona arison , ut eodon; woldon gewitan hwæt þæt wære* (Bede 174, 17), *He awearp þa rican of setle. , ða eadmodan up ahóf* (Luke 1, 52), *, hyra stefna úp-ahofon , cwædon...* (ibid. 17, 13), *Ðonne þas þing agynnað beseoð , eowre heafdu úp-ahebba þ* (ibid. 21, 28), *, ic for þon of þeossum ge-beorscipe úteode, , hider gewat, for þon ic naht singan ne cuðe* (Bede 342, 30), *Soðlice on þinum worde ic min nett ut-læte* (Luke 5, 5), *God man of godum gold-hórde hys heortan. god forð-bringð. , yfel man of yfelum gold-horde yfel forð-bring þ* (ibid. 6, 45). It should be noted that the possible formal influence of Latin translations must also be borne in mind. Obviously the majority of the phrasal structures consisting of 'verb+locative particle in adverbial function' have Latin preverbial or 'prefixal' counterparts which arose precisely from a pattern A similar to the Germanic and indeed the Old English one, as a result of the Indo-European preverbial consolidation (cf. de la Cruz 19—: 1 - 18). All this has contributed to the frequent occurrence of pattern A in Old English which, as a matter of fact, also occurs in circumstances other than these. Cf. *He þa ineode on þæt halige Salemannes templ, & þa út awearp*

---

[11] Cf. R. Huchon's data concerning Ælfric: 23 infinitives and 45 participles in post-verbal position as against 16 infinitives and 32 participles in pre-verbal position (Huchon 1923: 267).

þa sceomolas þara cypemanna (Blick. Homs. I, 71, 17), ⁊ *nyðer-alede hyne* ⁊ *on scytan befeold* ⁊ *lede hine on aheawene byrgene on þære næs þa gyt nænig aléd* (Luke 23, 53), *Genom þa þære moldan dæl in þære stowe, gebond in his sceate, þohte þæt seo ilce molde to læcedome* ⁊ *to hælo geweorðan meahte untrumra monna: ond he eft forðeode in his weg* (Bede 180, 18), *Mid ðy seo adl swiðe weox* ⁊ *hefegade, eft se cyng ineode to him hiene to niosianne* ⁊ *to lærenne* (ibid. 438, 13), *Apollonius hit þa ut bær on ða stræte and sealde þam cynge* (Apollonius 32, 9), ⁊ *þa he ut-adraf hine on heora midlene* (Luke 4, 35), *Sume cwædon on bel-zebub deofla ealdre he ut-adrifð þa deofol-seocnessa* (ibid. 11, 15).

As I have explained, the configuration 'P V' or pattern A results mainly from the positional mechanism of the verb (V$_{(aux. pas., etc.)}$, V$_s$) in the wider framework of the sentence. According to the surrounding circumstances, the mobility of the verb crystallizes in the various positions assumed by the verbal component. It will not be necessary, therefore, to insist on the radical difference between such a pattern and the prefixal or preverbial units. This is the contrast between 'P V' as conditioned by context and 'P V' in all circumstances. Note that by prefixal unit I understand a fixed unit (word) without any possibility of ever behaving like a phrase. For the structures of the preverbial consolidation there is no possible return to the phrasal domain. Nevertheless, it may be appropriate to add a few observations. There would not be any problem at all if we only had adverbial structures 'V P' (with a preposed adverb which in other circumstances may appear postposed) and preverbial structures 'P—V' (fixed, consisting of 'prefix+verb'), since both categories simply exclude each other. We have some elements of the class P which exclude any interpretation other than the adverbial in Old English, that is, elements which have not entered the derivative system of the preverbs nor the prepositional domain. I refer to the adverbs *up, ut, forð, (of)dune,* etc. The most that can happen to them, in the Old period, is that they should appear in fossilized or quasi-fossilized patterns A, thus causing them to lose their characteristic freedom. But it so happens that we also have elements (P) which can function as adverbs, and as prepositions and prefixes. In fact, what we have is adverbial developments of prepositions which preserve the prepositional function and its frequent prefixal counterpart (as is typical in the Indo-European languages after the well known consolidation 'prefix/preposition'). This is the case in Old English of *fore, of, ofer, on, to, þurh, under,* and only partially of *æt, mid* and *wið,* as I have pointed out on another occasion (de la Cruz 1972: 75 ff.). We may have a situation in which it is not prima facie clear whether we have a prefixal state or a pattern A (adverbial). The elucidation of such a situation is further complicated by the fact that in Old English the prepositions show a tendency to constitute structures similar to those of our pattern A, above all under certain circumstances. Two specific circumstances that are reminiscent of those which frequently deter-

mine pattern A are: (1) the passive relative constructions of the prepositional verb (category 'a')[12]: *þæt hus wear þ ða forburnon buton þam anum poste | þe þæt halige dust on ahangen wæs se post ana ætstod ansund mid þam duste. | and hi swyde wundrodon þæs halgan weres geearnunga | þæt þæt fyr ne mihte þa moldan forbærnan* (Ælfric's Lives of Saints XXVI, 140, 232); (2) the relative constructions of the two categories of the prepositional verb: (a) *Æfter þæm he gegaderade fierd,* ⁊ *wolde faran on Perse,* ⁊ *bebead, þonne he eft wære eastane hamweard, þæt mon hæfde anfiteatrum geworht æt Hierusalem, þæt he mehte Godes þeowas on don, þæt hie dior þærinne abite* (Orosius 286, 9), (b) *Da cwæð he: Hwæt, þu wast ðæt ic þe ær sæde þ sio sode gesælð wære good,* ⁊ *of þære sodan gesælðe cumað eall ða oðru good þe we ær embe spræcon,* ⁊ *eft to* (Boethius 86, 16). To this must be added the postpositional use of prepositions with respect to their objects during the Old period, which is represented by the patterns 'OPV' and 'O/PV'. Note that the postposition with respect to the object results in a front-position with respect to the verb: ⁊ *se engel hyre fram gewat* (Luke 1, 38), ⁊ *ealre þære costunge gefylledre. se deofol him sume hwile fram gewat* (ibid. 4, 13), … ⁊ *cwæð; Ic wylle. si þu geblænsud; And sona se hreofla him fram ferde* (ibid. 5, 13), *His modor* ⁊ *his gebroðru him to comun* ⁊ *hi ne mihton hine for þære menegu geneosian* (ibid. 8, 19), *þa cwæð he sum me æt-ran. ic wiste þæt maing me of eode* (ibid. 8, 46 -Hatton-). Needless to say, the postpositional variety 'VOP' is also very frequent (see below in connection with pattern C).

Of course the spelling is not a reliable criterion for distinguishing any of the structural types concerned. Cf. the prefixal structures *æt swummon* (O. E. Chron. a. 918, A 98, 29), *be sæton* (ibid. a. 1016, E 150, 12), *ge axode* (ibid. a. 1052, E 177, 24), *ofer cumen* (ibid. a. 1096, E 232, 21), and the strings of particle and verb separated, joined with or without a hyphen, both adverbial —*up gongeð* (Bede 428, 25), *ni þer gewit… upastihð* (Leechdoms II, 160, 27), *utabirst* (Cura Past. 279, 8), *ut-ga þ* (Luke 4, 37), *nyðer-alede* (ibid. 23, 53)— and prepositional: *ac gif ðu eall ðæt gemunan wilt þ we ær spræcon, mid ðæs Godes fultume ðe we nu embe sprecað, ðonne meaht ðu ongitan þ…* (Boethius 104, 18), *& ðonne æfter firste hine lyst tælan & slitan ðara lif butan scylde ðe he ðonne ymbs [p]crid* (Cura Past. 279, 6), *& eac ða welegan ongieten ðætte ða welan ðe hie onlociað & habbað, ðæt hie ða habban ne magon* (ibid. 183, 6), *Da cwæþ maria her is drihtnes þinen. gewur þe me æfter þinum wórde,* ⁊ *se engel hyre fram gewát* (Luke 1, 38), *he him fram-gewat* (ibid. 4, 35), ⁊ *he hym fram ge-wat* (ibid. -Hatton-).

The criterion that can help us identify the prefixal structures is simply the position of the infinitive particle *to* or the negative particle *ne.* The exist-

---

[12] These are relative structures in which the additional direct object becomes the passive subject (or subject of a resulting state). I distinguish two categories of prepositional verbs; 'a' with a direct object in addition to the object of the preposition and 'b' with only the object of the preposition.

ence of one of these particles between the locative particle [(P)] and the verb normally rules out the possibility of prefixation when those same elements of the verb-particle structure (including the units of the prepositional verb) appear, whether joined or one following immediately after the other in a sequence [(PV)] in other circumstances. Cf. ... *forð to brenganne* (Cura Past. 417, 16), ... *ut ne specað* (ibid. 273, 19), ... *on to locienne* (Boethius 14, 13), ... *fram ne gewite* (Luke 4, 42). These strings constitute precisely (the adverbial and the prepositional ones alike) the order of our group-pattern B, subgroup B2 (see below). The prefixal structures in identical circumstances exhibit the order 'to/ne+P-V' instead of 'P+to/ne+V': *& hio bið micle ðe ieðre to oferfeohtanne ðe hio self fieht wið hie selfe mid oferspræce to fultome ðæm wiðfeohtende* (Cura Past. 277, 24), *Ða ðonne hie beræsað on suelce weamodnesse hie sindon sua micle wærlicor to oferbuganne sua mo[n] ongiet ðæt hie on maran ungewitte beoð* (ibid. 295, 20), *Ða ðis þa gesprecen wæs, þa gesugode þ Mod, ⁊ seo Gesceadwisnes ongon sprecan ⁊ þus cwæ þ: Eala, Mod, eala; an yfel is swiðe to ascunianne* (Boethius 41, 7), *⁊ wildu dior ðær woldon to irnan ⁊ stondan swilce hi tamu wæren, swa stille, ðeah him men oððe hundas wið eoden, ðæt hi hi na ne onscunedon* (ibid. 101, 28). Cf. the structural ambiguity, theoretically speaking only, illustrated in *Ongit nu hu unmehtige þa yflan men bioð, nu hi ne magon cuman ðider ðider ða ungewittigan gesceafta wilniað to to cumane* (Boethius 108, 3). The only point in favour of the interpretation 'to (prep.) + to (infinitive particle) + V' instead of 'to (infinitive particle) + to (prefix)' is the fact that *to-cuman* 'come to' does not exhibit in other circumstances any prefixal state.

Quite another thing is the further classification of the structures so isolated, either as adverbial (the verb-particle structures we are concerned with) or as prepositional. The contextual frame that must be analysed in this connection is '[(P)]+*to*+V' where P is not an adverbial particle. A detailed investigation reveals to us that the particles concerned are normally prepositions which do not in themselves constitute a directional goal, and whose relationship with a goal-object is fully manifested in an ordinary prepositional nexus, which we can easily obtain through the appropriate transformation. It is enough to contrast systematically the various positional orders of structures with the same constituents. In synchronic terms we could say that the structure is transformable into other more explicit structures in terms of their grammatical nature. Many of the so-called elliptical uses of prepositions are not as adverbial as they might appear at first sight. But what is beyond any doubt is that a structure '(O) *P*+*to*+V' of the category 'a' of the prepositional verb (that is, with a direct object in addition to the object of the preposition) or of the category 'b' also of the prepositional verb (that is, with only the object of the preposition) exhibits, within the proper boundaries of the infinitive clause, an object with which the locative particle is related, at least at deep-structure level. We have an antecedent which constitutes with the

preposition a continuous nexus (subordinating continuity): ... *bæd Osweo þone cyning þæt he þær forgefe stowe mynster on to timbrenne þæm foresprecenan Godes þeowe Trumhere*... (Bede 238, 22), *Ne sindon þa woruldsæl þa ana ymb to þencenne þe mon þōn hæfð, ac ælc gleaw mod behealt hwelcne ende hi habbað* (Boethius 16, 19). Note that the infinitive in both categories may be connected either with a simple direct object (or an adjective qualifying such an object), or with a noun or predicative adjective of a copulative verb.

The structures 'P+*to*+V' of the categories 'a' and 'b' of the prepositional verb constitute part of a tightly knit system which in Old English does not only consist of the afore-mentioned structures (in the active voice), but also of relative structures (in both active and passive in the case of category 'a' and only in the active in the case of category 'b'). (From the middle of the Middle English period onwards, and with the new order 'VP' —like our pattern C—, the system comes eventually to acquire the essential complexity by which it is at present characterized, with infinitive structures in the passive, relative structures in both active and passive not only of category 'a' but also of category 'b', and pure passive structures of category 'b'). The structures of the Old English system, though not necessarily transformable into alternative structures with the normal order 'P+O+*to*+V'[13], are generated from basic prepositional phrase-markers at deep-structure level. Moreover, I would postulate that infinitive structures such as *forðæm he wisse ðæt hit bið swiðe unieðe ægðer to donne, ge wið ðone to cidanne ðe yfel deð, ge eac sibbe wið to habbenne* (Cura Past. 355, 21), or even non-infinitive structures of the type *Hu ne wast þu þ hit nauht gecynde ne nauht gewunelic þ ænig wiðerweard þing bion gemenged wið oðrū wiðerweardū, oððe ænige geferrædenne wið habban?* (Boethius 37, 17)[14] imply a prepositional relationship. It could be argued that

---

[13] Note that the infinitive of both categories may be connected (1) with the direct object of a verb (ModE. *I gave you a (good) pencil to write with*), (2) with a predicate nominative qualifying the direct object of a verb (ModE. *I gave you a pencil good enough to write with*), (3) with the predicate nominative of a copula (ModE. *this is (a) (good) (pencil) to write with*), (3) with a predicate nominative (adjective) qualifying the predicate nominative (noun) of a copula (ModE. *this is a pencil good enough to write with*), (5) directly with the copula (ModE. *this (good) (pencil) is to write with*). As to the general constraint I have mentioned, it should be noted that it is not exclusive to Old English or to Middle English, just as the normal prepositional position in cases like *person with whom he could live* as against *person he could live with* are not exclusive to the Modern period either (although in the Old period there is no doubt that the normal prepositional positions in relative clauses are much less frequent). So in Modern English we cannot effect the relative transformation with normal order except in (1) and in (3) when the noun-predicate is or includes a noun. For the concept of 'alternative' cf. J. M. de la Cruz (1970: 339 - 340).

[14] Cf. also the well known 'elliptical usages' in cases like *& nu fundiað [fandiað] swelce wræccean & teod to* (Cura Past. 50, 22), *Berað hiere to hlæd, & ymsittað hie, & gað to mid rammum* (ibid. 162, 10), etc.

these structures do not contain any object with which the particle can be related within their boundaries and that the particle represents therefore an elliptical or adverbial usage, not to mention the fact that the structures concerned do not constitute a part of any tightly knit system which can be even remotely compared to that of the infinitive and relative structures of categories 'a' and 'b' of the prepositional verb. Nevertheless, the majority of the so-called elliptical usages are normally no more than the result of the omission of an anaphoric logical object. By this I mean that the proper object appears at some point in the sentence of which the verb-particle structure is a constituent. This can be verified in the afore-mentioned examples. It is clear that we have a paratactic discontinuity instead of a hypotactic continuity, but the prepositional relation is no less obvious. The object the preposition refers to is implicit in the prepositional structure since it is explicit in the wider frame of the sentence. This situation represents an early exponent of the tendency of English to confer various degrees of adverbialization upon the prepositional particles, without these undergoing the full process of adverbialization (cf. de la Cruz 1970: 339 - 340). It could be argued that the treatment of the last two types of structures mentioned implies that I give too much emphasis to the concept of 'directional goal' whereby I distinguish an adverbial structure from a prepositional one (the goal of the former is the adverb, whereas that of the latter is the object of the preposition). In principle, the concept of directional goal must be supported by formal analysis. Cf. the evidence in German of the verb *sprechen* with the particle *zu* (a) as preposition and (b) as adverb. It must be said, however, that in English, formal analysis and directional goal usually agree. On the other hand, given the fact that anastrophic positions are normal in the Old period, it is difficult to assign an exclusively adverbial rôle to *to* in *tocweðan, cweðan to*, for instance. In the great majority of cases, there is no doubt that our pattern A can be isolated not only from the prefixal P—V structures but also from the prepositional *PV* structures.

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

In Middle English the subcategorization aspects that interest us are the same ones we have seen in the Old period, with the specification that they only affect the early Middle English period and with much less regularity. Since our pattern A (apart from the cases of Latin positional calques) follows mainly the general positional behaviour of the verb, the persistence of pattern A in Middle English is in direct relation to the more reduced percentage of final or almost final positions held by the verb in the contexts mentioned in (OE.). Insofar as there are cases like *hwo se þouhte hu god sulf was i ðisse witte iderued:*

heo wolde þet derf. þuldeliche þolien (Anc. Riwle 46, 18) —context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9)— and *þe sixte reisun is. hwui ȝe habbeð þene world i vlowen. familiaritate. þet is. forte beon priue mid ure louerde* (ibid. 74, 33) —context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14)—, it is logical that we should have a certain 'lingering on' of patterns A with infinitives and participles, relics to a greater or lesser extent, of the previous situation. It should be noted, however, that these patterns do not necessarily appear in an absolutely final position, even when they follow the verb they complement. Cf. *kumeð þe coue anonriht , reueð hire. hire eiren. , fret al þ of what heo schul-de uorð bringen hire cwike briddes* (Anc. Riwle 28, 35) —confluence of contexts $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9)— where the subordination does not alter the order $V_{aux}—V_s$, and *Uor alle þe soulen þ beoð forðfaren iðe bileaue of þe vour gospelles þ holdeð al cristendom up auourhalues* (ibid. 13, 7) —confluence of contexts $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14)— where the subordination does not alter the order $V_{aux}—V_s$ either. This structure also exhibits an extreme tendency towards the fossilization /PV/ already from the Old period onwards. The context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (with or without confluence of $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$) in general leaves a trace which is also perceived in later works: (prose) *þu wost wel, dowtyr, þat þe Deuyl hath no charite. for he is ful wroth with þe & he myth out hurtyn þe* (Kempe 158, 7), *Wyth that sir Raynolde gan up sterte with his hede all blody and com streyte unto sir Launcelot* (Arthur 276, 25), *And þan owr Lord seyde to Mary Mawdelyn, "Go telle my bretheryn & Petyr þat I am vp-reson"* (Kempe 197, 27)[15], (verse) *And þou con alle þo dere out dryf | And fro þat maryag al oþer depres* (Pearl 777), *Ye ben acumbrid with coveitise ye conne not out crepe, | So harde hath avarice haspide yow togideris!* (Piers I, 170), *He wænde mid his crucche us adun þrucche* (Laȝ 2007), *Thanne, whanne thou gost thy body fro, | Fre in the eir thou shalt up go* (Rose 5653), *Ne though men sholde smyten of hire hed, | She kouthe nought a word aright out brynge* (Troilus III, 958), *I can my hand vphefe | and knop out the skalys* (Town. Plays XXI, 409). We also have a certain 'lingering on' in the context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15) above all with participles: (prose) *, biginneð anon veni creator... mid up aheuinde eien , honden toward heouene* (Anc. Riwle 6, 34), (verse) *, heo biheold upward, | wið upaheuen heorte* (St. Katherine 2372).[16]

(b) Other contextual aspects.

What I have said in the previous section (a) also applies to the context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8). The Old English tendency to relegate the verb to the end of the phrase in subordinate clauses is still manifested at times in Middle English, particularly in the earlier texts: *Bideie summe time oþer bi nihte þencheð , ge-*

---

[16] Cf. the result of participial fossilization in Modern English.

[16] Cf. *Lord, what thay ar weyl | that hens ar past! | ffor thay noght feyll|theym to downe cast* (Town. Plays XII, 1).

dereð in owre heorte alle sike ꝛ alle sorie þ wo ꝛ pouerte þolieð (Anc. Riwle 13, 18). Needless to say, the possible confluence $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ does not always result in the loss of the primacy of the absolutely final position for V_s, as I have pointed out in connection with the Old English discussion and also in the previous section (a). Only in a very reduced number of cases does the verb of the subordinate clause maintain the tendency to a final position which, in addition, is only relative in the case of the afore mentioned confluence. Cf. *Uor þe ten hesten þ ich ibroken habbe. summe oðer alle and me sulf touward te...* (Anc. Riwle 12, 18), as against *alle cunneð wel þeos asaumple amon þet leie ine prisune ꝛ ouhte muche raun-sun. ꝛ onone wise ne schulde ne ne muhte ut bu'te ȝif hit were vorte hongen. er he hefde al his raunsun fulliche ipaied* (ibid. 54, 37). The fact is that in Middle English the final positions still persist in the context $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$. This is surely the reason for the survival of pattern A in such a context: (prose) *He dalf up precious periles. (That is to seyn, that he that hem first up dalf, he dalf up a precious peril...)* (Boece L. II, M. V, 36), (verse) *And blusched on þe burghe, as I forth dreued* (Pearl 980), *"Betere is that boote bale adoun bringe, | Thanne bale be bet, and bote nevere the betere"* (Piers IV, 79), *And manye mylions mo of men and of wommen | That of Seth and his sistir siththe forth come* (ibid. X, 147).

We are not going to concern ourselves here with the study of the evolution of pattern A. What interests us here is the interpretation of the late evidence of such a pattern. However, now it is convenient to bear in mind that in Middle English, when pattern A gradually retreats in the circumstances which fundamentally determined its occurrence in the previous period, there are other contextual aspects of an external character which acquire a greater relevance. I refer (1) to the Latin influence which becomes much more visible, and (2) to the specifically poetical legacy of the order 'P V' frequently endowed with a certain archaic flavour. I have dealt elsewhere with the aspect of the Latin influence (de la Cruz 1972a: 18 ff.). It involves positional calques from Latin: *Now nyȝ it was that thei shulden vp breke the ȝates* (Wyclif, Genesis 19, 9) —reffringerent—, *þe leke he oppynd and vp grofe it* (Hampole Ps. vii, 16) —effodit—, *Awai-berand for to wende | Fyhtes to þe landes ende* (EEPs. xlv, 10)—auferens—, *þou out-þrew þam when up-hoven ware þai* (ibid. lxxxvii, 15) —dejecisti... adlevarentur—, *Whar-to, Laverd, awai-puttes þou bede mine* (ibid. lxxxvii, 15) —repellis—. As far as the poetical relevance of pattern A is concerned, it suffices to consider that those structures 'P V' which lie outside the scope of the contexts which we have regarded as determining pattern A (and which are not calques) are more rare in prose than in verse. It is true that in both styles an emphatic type develops which survives to the present day and which is characterized by the inversion 'VS' when S is not a 'light' pronominal subject. But, apart from this, pattern A appears more frequently in verse: *Ah swa he, wiðuten woh, | adweschte ꝛ adun warp | þene wiðerwine of helle*

(St. Katherine 1189), *Flor and fryte may not be fede | þer hit doun drof in moldeȝ dunne* (Pearl 29), *Of his quyte syde his blod outsprent* (ibid. 1137), *And forth his heed and necke outstraughte* (Rose 1515), *"...I wole wel holde hym for a man; | Now late hym come" — and he forth ran* (ibid. 6059), *And at the noys the heed upcaste, | Ne never sithen slept it faste* (ibid. 7129). Of course the recourse of the stylistic variation in poetical language is a factor that must be taken into consideration even in structures of the type *"Ich", quoð þe meiden, | "sone se ich awei warp | ower witlese lei..."* (St. Katherine 829), *Fordem, nu, me ꝛ mine, | þ we, aȝeines þin heast, | þ licome awei ledden, | ꝛ leiden in eorðe* (ibid. 2217), *So shett, that I ne myght in gon* (Rose 529). If, on the other hand, we consider that the persistence of contextual restriction is only relative in the prose works themselves, it will be easily understood why the material contained in the works in verse is even more doubtful as testimony of contextual restriction properly speaking, and hence the fact that I have distinguished between prose and verse in my previous evidence. In prose, those patterns A which lie outside the scope of the restrictive contexts, normally constitute the inverted order type which, as has been pointed out, crystallizes fundamentally as an emphatic variation with a non-pronominal subject. So, compared with very few cases like *the othir saw that and caste up hys shelde and spored hys horse forewarde, but the stroke of kynge Ban downe felle and carve a cantell of the shelde* (Arthur 33, 19). *Than into Tuskayne he turned whan he tyme semed, and there he wynnys towrys and townys full hyghe, and all he wasted in his warrys there he away ryddys* (ibid. 244, 4), the normal are strings 'P V $S_{non-pron}$': *The meanewhyle as thys was adoynge, in com Merlion to kynge Marke and saw all thys doynge* (Arthur 72, 12), *Than oute ran the Romaynes on every syde, bothe on horse and on foote, to many oute of numbir* (ibid. 209, 20), *So forth rode thes three knyghtes and aspyed in the woodis men of armys rydyng on sterne horsys* (ibid. 213, 7), *So with that forth yode sir Florens, and his felyshyp was sone redy, and so they rode thorow holtys and hethis, thorow foreste and over hyllys* (ibid. 228, 14). In the same category we must classify the following structures despite the consecutive nexus: *Than the kynge sterte up unto hym and raught hym a buffete and kut his baly in sundir, that oute wente the gore, that the grasse and the grounde all foule was begone* (ibid. 203, 15), *Than were they so wroth that away wolde they never, but rathly russhed oute their swerdys...* (ibid. 229, 21). Note that in this last structure the subject is pronominal.

The patterns A of Middle English must not be confused with the prefixal structures either. All I have said in connection with this distinction in Old English applies also to the Middle period, both with regard to the contrast 'prefixal structures / phrasal structures' and also with regard to the distinction 'adverbial structures / prepositional structures'. In Middle English (where there is a gradual loss of prefixes) the following cases must beyond any doubt be regarded as prepositional structures of category 'b': *Ne no beggere ete bred that*

benis in come, | But coket or clermatyn, or of clene whete (Piers VII, 287), *For this Fortune that I of telle...* (Rose 5463), *and there they shewed hym the lettyrs of kynge Arthure, and how he was the gastfullyst man that ever they on loked* (Arthur 191, 21). Although the prefixal claim is stronger for the Old English counterparts, there is no conclusive evidence even for this period. [17] On the other hand, we do not lack the contrastive evidence of phrasal structures '[(P)]+*to*/*ne* +V' both of the adverbial and prepositional types: ... *doun to go* (Rose 6934), ...*vp ne sponne* (Pearl 35), ...*in to be laide* (St. Cuthb. 4653), ...*of to write* (Parl. of Fowls 167) (structures which will constitute our next objective), as against the prefixal order '*to*/*ne*+P—V' in fossilized units: ⁊ *þuruh ðet heo wuneð un'der ðe chirche. ase uorte understipren hire* (Anc. Riwle 63, 8) *þ tet wake ules | ne wursi neauer ni mod | swa þ ich slakie | to ofseruin heouenriche* (St. Katherine 2134), *Ac Wisdom and Wyt were aboute faste | To overcome the king with catel yif thei mighte* (Piers IV, 68). An interesting case is *þuruh seon* in the following example, where it appears with the prefixal order: *þ blake cloð also tekeþe bitocnunge deð lesse eile to þen eien ⁊ is þiccure azein þe wind. ⁊ wurse to þuruh seon* (Anc. Riwle 22, 6). The prepositional use of *þuruh*, which is fully attested, would require the order *þuruh to seon* in an infinitive-relative structure. As regards the distinction 'adverbial / prepositional', it is self-evident that there is nothing to add here to what I have already said in connection with the Old period.

GROUP-PATTERN B

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

The aspects of subcategorization of the present group-pattern, as well as one of the other aspects that interest us here, lie in the common determining factor of our previous pattern: the relegation of the verb to a final position (conditioned by the contextual circumstances exposed). That is to say, they essentially represent a complication of the same contextual circumstances by reason of additional restrictive factors which produce a sequence 'P/V'. In the absence of such factors, given that the other circumstances remain constant,

_____

[17] Note that a structure of the type ...⁊ *ge-ned to in-geonganne þte sie gefylled hus min* (Luke 14, 23 -Lindisfarne-) must in theory be regarded as prefixal by reason of the position of *to*, as against ...⁊ *gined in to gonganne* (ibid. -Rushworth-), but of course the '*to* P-V' structure may also be interpreted as an extreme case of Latin 'calque'. Similar is the case with *ge in ne eodun* ⁊ *ge forbudon þa þe in-eodun* (ibid. 11, 52 -Corpus-)/*gie ne in-foerdon l ne in-eodegie* (ibid. -Lindisfarne-), ⁊ *he l genein-foerdun...* (ibid. -Rushworth-). Cf. also ...⁊ *ne sona of-doeð hine doeg symbeles* (ibid. 14, 5 -Lindisfarne-)/⁊ *ne sona of of-doeð hine dæge symbles* (ibid. -Rushworth-), trans lating L. *extrahet*.

the most probable is that we should have an order 'PV'. The subcategorial factor par excellence is the presence of the infinitive particle *to* before an infinitive; less important is the existence of a string 'J' which frequently follows immediately P, and still less important, although not totally irrelevant, are the other modifiers, whether verbal or adverbial. The non-subcategorial factor which, like '*to*+infixitive' also operates in absolutely restrictive terms upon the contextual base of the previous pattern, is represented by the negative particle *ne* immediately before the verb. This I shall discuss in the appropriate place, that is, in section (b). The subcategorial interpretation is reduced to the restricting effect of *to* which naturally affects the contexts $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (10) (when we have an inflected infinitive), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11) (also when we have an inflected infinitive), and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15) (when we have an infinitive complementing a noun or when we have an inflected final infinitive). [18] As is well known, in Old English the non-inflected infinitive could not only complement *sceal*, *wille* and other V_{mod}, but also other verbs: *me geþuhte writan þe* (Luke 1, 3) instead of ... *to writenne*. Hence in contexts 10 and 11 we can have either a non-inflected infinitive without *to*, or an inflected infinitive with *to*. In context 15, in its final variety, we can also find other alternatives. Here we are logically concerned only with those cases in which the inflected variety appears. (See below in connection with the traces left after the struggle for survival between both infinitives).

We must bear in mind the fact that the infinitive particle *to* is a modifier more intimately associated with the verb (in the infinitive) than are the locative particles, for the simple reason that *to* is an integral constituent of the so-called inflected infinitive. According to this, the priority of its front-position with respect to the verb will be easily understood. In this way, the locative particles are left second from the front when the verb they would normally immediately precede is an inflected infinitive. This reminds us of the frequent mechanism in cases of confluence $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ in which the absolutely final position could be assumed by the non-finite form (V) immediately or almost immediately preceded by the infinitive or particle (V_s). The only remark to be made here is that in the present case the restriction is absolute. This amounts to the cut and dried distinction 'phrasal structure/prefixal structure' to which I have already referred: the infinitive particle *to* immediately precedes the verbal constituent, whether simplex or compounded of 'prefix+stem', but it does not precede the phrasal structure 'P V' (including the prepositional structures of the same form). The structure [(PV)] is broken both in the adverbial and in the prepositional structures when *to* is introduced into the only slot available. What is never broken, in Old English at least, is the unit '*to*+inflected infinit-

_____

[18] Cf. the case mentioned below: ...*ne onhagode utane forð to brenganne*... with *onhagian*.

ive' (see below the early evidence of the so-called split infinitive). So that we encounter phrasal adverbial structures of the type *Forðæmde ðæt ðætte hine ne onhagode utane forð to brenganne mid weorcun, innane he hit geðafode, & ðurhteah mid ðy weorce ðæs fulfremedan willan* (Cura Past. 417, 16) —B2— and likewise phrasal prepositional structures both of category 'a' and of category 'b'[19]: *Osweo þone cyning þæt he þær forgefe stowe mynster on to timbrenne þæm foresprecenan Godes þeowe Trumhere...* (Bede 238, 22), *ða hwile þe hie penengas hæbben mid to gieldanne* (Cura Past. 326, 18), *he wære æghwæðer ge arwurþlic ge ondrysenlic on to seonne* (Bede 519, 35), *þon wyrð heo swiðe hraðe ungladu, þeah heo ær gladu wære on to locienne* (Boethius 14, 13), *Ne sindon þa woruldsæl þa ana ymb to þercenne þe mon þon hæfð, ac ælc gleaw mod behealt hwelcne ende hi habbað* (ibid. 16, 19), *þeah he nu nanwuht elles næbbe ymbe to sorgienne, þ him mæg to sorge þæt he nat hwæt him toweard bið* (ibid. 24, 15). As I have already mentioned when discussing the previous pattern, the prefixal structures are those which maintain the order 'P—V'. Cf. ... *to oferfeohtanne* (Cura Past. 277, 24), *to oferbuganne* (ibid. 295, 20), ...*to anscunianne* (Boethius 41, 7).

After the subcategorial contextual restriction par excellence, we shall now proceed to the existence of a string 'J' immediately after P, that is, in the groups -J- of the subgroups 5 and 5_1 of the present group-pattern B. The context concerned is Σ (5b). An examination of the subgroups B with or without an intervening object (-I- or -J-), namely, B3, B4, B5 and $B5_1$, reveals that both the pronominal and the non-pronominal objects are generally missing from the material I have collected except for a poetical or otherwise isolated instance. The prepositional objects, however, are very frequent, in particular those which complement or specify the directional notion of P. This suggests that the elements P and J (above all when J is directional) tend to form a cohesive string which is particularly well manifested in cases of strong association 'P+P' such as *ut of→out of, in to→into*. The direct complementation of P by means of J immediately after P when P tends to precede the verb, obviously breaks the continuity PV. This, however, is only half way between contextual restriction proper and stylistic variation. Cf. *þa ge ascade se cyng þæt hie ut on hergað foron, þa sende he his fird ægðer ge of West Seaxum ge of Mercum* (O. E. Chron. a. 911, A 96, 10), ... *þa forget he þæt he in oðere stówe þæt geheolde; let forð in his bosme awunian* (Bede 156, 29), *Da ontynde se biscop þæt eaghþyrel þære cirican, mid his honda slóg tacen, swa swa his gewuna wæs, gif hwylc mon úte wære, þæt he in to him eode* (ibid. 264, 32), *Mid þy he ða þas word, þyses gemetes monig to him sprecende wæs, , heo onfongenre his bletsunge swiðe unrote ut from him eodon* (ibid. 266, 17), *Ic me on þisse gyrde beluce... wið eal þæt lað, þe in to land*

---

[19] Note that the latter category (the structures of category 'b') can be attributive or non-attributive.

fare (Charms VIII, 5), *Hwæþer ge nu eower hundas , eower net ut on þa sæ lædon, þon ge huntian willað?* (Boethius 73, 29), *þa nedde se ærcebiscop hine swiðe, þæt he ridan scolde, swa hwyder swa ðæs þearf wære, , efne æt nehstan mid his seolfes hondum up on hors hof* (Bede 262, 1). The following examples illustrate the same type of structure but in the passive, that is, with the external form of α or γ, although in reality what we have is a structure β or δ: *& mid ðy wyrð ðæt mod besuicen & genæt mid ðæra olicunga ðe him underðiedde beoð ðæt he bið up ofer hine selfne ahæfen on his mode* (Cura Past. 111, 6), *þa he þa se biscop geseah swapendum windum þone leg þæs fyres , þone réc up ofer þære burge wallas ahefenne...* (Bede 202, 13), *Mid þy þa se lichoma þære halgan fæmnan , þære Cristes brýde openre þære byrgenne wæs forð on leoht gelæded...* (ibid. 320, 14).

The occurrence of other modifiers between P and V can be due to a similar attraction. In the case of generic locative modifiers or temporal modifiers we undoubtedly have a parallel complementation. Cf. *Sona swa he hit gedruncen hæfde, swa aras he instepe , þære ealdan untrumnesse getrumad wæs, , hiene gegyrede mid his hrægle , ut þonan eode* (Bede 398, 3), *Ah in dagunge he eft acuicode , semninga up heh asæt* (ibid. 422, 28), *Nāh ic rīcra feala | frēonda on foldan. Ac hie forð heonon | gewitan of worulde drēamum* (Dream of the Rood 131), *Geseah ðā be wealle, sē ðe worna fela | gum-cystum gōd, gūða gedīgde, | | hilde-hlemma, þonne hnitan fēðan, | sto[n]dan stān-bogan, strēam ūt þonan | brecan of beorge* (Beow. 2542), *Da hi ut agane wæron, ða yrsode Cain wið his broðor Abel, , ofsloh hine* (Ælfric, Genesis 4, 8). A rapprochement 'verbal modifier+discontinuous verb' can be seen in strings of the type '$V_{aux}+V_s$': *þa he þæt þa sumre tide dyde, þæt he forlet þæt hus þæs gebeorscipes, , ut wæs gongende to neata scipene, þara heord him wæs þære neahte beboden* (Bede 342, 24).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

There is a context where the restriction is absolute. This is context Σ (6b) where the judgement involves negation which is formally expressed by means of the particle *ne*. The close connection between this particle and the verb it modifies frequently results in cases of agglutination as is well known: *nabban, næron, nolde*, etc. The same happens in other circumstances: *ne+a → na, ne+ænig → nænig*. Independently of the reinforcement of the negation (two negations far from cancelling each other out; they do in fact reinforce each other) the particle *ne*, when it appears, inevitably precedes the verb. In such an event this is what conditions the existence of pattern B when all circumstances but this would determine that P appear immediately before the verb as in the previous pattern. P then cedes the order of priority of front-position to *ne*. The case is similar to that of the infinitive particle *to*. A space is opened

between P and V as the only possible slot for *ne*: *We eow ægleawum for-þam þe ge ætbrudun þæs ingehydes cæge. ge in ne eodun ⁊ ge forbudon þa þe in-eodun* (Luke 11, 52), *þonne fleoð on muntas þa ðe on iudea synt ⁊ nyðer ne astigað þa ðe on hyre middele synt* (ibid. 21, 21), *blod ut ne com, / heolfor of hre þe, þeah mec heard bite / stiðecg style* (Riddle 93, 16), *Ac ðæt nis nan ælmesse, for ðæm hio nanne swetne wæsðm forð ne bring(ð), ac sona on ðæm wyrtruman abiteriað ða bleda* (Cura Past. 341, 22), *Oft eac ða suiðe suigean, ðonne hie monige unnytte geðohtas innan habbað, ðonne weorðað hie him to ðy maran sare innan, gif hi ut ne sprecað* (ibid. 273, 17), *Forðæm geðence se lariow ðæt he unwærlice forð ne ræse on ða spræce* (ibid. 95, 8), *wacia þ ⁊ gebiddað eow þ ge in ne gán on costunge* (Math. 26, 41). It should be noted that in cases of confluence, such as the existence of the context Σ (5b)+Σ (6b), the priority corresponds to *ne*: *Aris ⁊ gong to cirican to þæs halgan Oswaldes lice, ⁊ site þær ⁊ stille wuna, ⁊ geseoh þæt þu ut þonon ne gonge, ær seo aðl from þe gewiten sy* (Bede 186, 26). The immediate precedence of *ne* acting as a wedge between P and V has a counterpart in the prepositional structures: *⁊ hi comon to him. ⁊ behæfdon hine. þ he him fram ne gewite* (Luke 4, 42)[20], *For þam sint ðas sceafta þus gesceapene þ ða unstyriendan hi ne ahebben ofer þa styriendan, ne him wið ne winnan, ne þa styriendan ofer þa men, ne þa men ofer þa englas, ne þa englas wið God* (Boethius 146, 10), *þæt hie him Sicilia to ne tugen* (Orosius 180, 12).

What we have seen up till now is no more than a replica of pattern A, except that it has been subjected to the restriction I have mentioned, whereby the structure acquires a discontinuous form and the particle achieves greater prominence. So, in a case like *God man of godum gold-hórde hys heortan. god forð-bringð. ⁊ yfel man of yfelum gold-horde yfel forð-bringþ* (Luke 6, 45), we have a mere counterpart (non-restricted) of our previous examples: *... forð to brenganne mid weorcun* (Cura Past. 417, 16) and *... forð ne bring(ð)* (ibid. 341, 22). Nevertheless, in addition to the subgroups B2 and B5, B5₁, I must mention subgroup B1. This type also serves the purpose of giving prominence to P, constituting a powerful resource for stylistic emphasis, with a pronominal subject which appears between the two basic constituents of the 'discontinuous structure': *⁊ ða ut he gan wolde, ða cwæð he þæt gewunelice word þæra frefrendra: Truma þec hræðe ⁊ wel* (Bede 396, 29) (see below in Middle English).

(ME.)

(a) *Subcategorial analysis.*

As in the case of the previous pattern, the aspects of subcategorization are here essentially the same as in the Old period. But I must make the following remark: the structures occur in direct proportion to the preservation

---

[20] This structure, however, could be interpreted as adverbial if we take *him* as a dative of interest.

of the Old English verb-position which defines pattern A, of which B is a variation by reason of an additional factor. To this must be added that the persistence of our group-pattern in Middle English mainly happens in poetry, in particular as far as the restriction of the infinitive particle *to* is concerned. This must be interpreted not only as a mere perpetuation with archaic flavour but also as a highly stylistic resource. Cf. the following cases of B2 in Chaucer's poetry: (context $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11)) *And for to maken hym doun to go, / With traison we wole hym defame* (Rose 6934), *I rede thee Love awey to dryve, / That makith thee recche not of thi lyve* (ibid. 3295), *That eggith folk, in many gise, / To take and yeve right nought ageyn, / And gret tresouris up to leyn* (ibid. 182), *Thanne shal Delit and Wel-Heelynge / Fonde Shame adown to brynge* (ibid. 5857)[21], (context $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15)) *A swete perell, in to droun; / An hevy birthen, lyght to bere; / A wikked wawe, awey to were* (ibid. 4710)[22], *That noon shulde hardy be ne bold, / Were he yong or were he old, / Ageyn hir will awey to bere / Botouns ne roses that there were* (ibid. 3061), *Wherfore to thee bettir is / From these folk awey to fare* (ibid. 3266).[23] The same applies to prepositional structures which are comparable from the point of view of their positional order, both of category 'a' and of category 'b': (a) *To the chymneye forth he goth / And caught a bronde him with to smyte* (Sowd. of Bab. 2009), *'For, gif he here wald duell, / Som worthy place in to be laide / his corse he walde haue puruayde, / And to vs som hostell* (St. Cuthb. 4653), (b) *And if thou haddest connyng for t'endite, / I shal the shewe mater of to wryte* (Parl. of Fowls 167), *A swete perell, in to droun* (Rose 4708).[24]

---

[21] I have already pointed out that in the Old period, except in the context $\Sigma - (\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (non-final), the infinitive may be non-inflected without *to* or inflected with *to*. The latter has been gaining ground and in contemporary English there is only a reduced group of verbs that have preserved the infinitive function without *to*, apart from the auxiliaries and modal auxiliaries: *bid, see, hear, feel, make*, etc. Note the use of simple infinitives nominalized without *to* in Middle English: *Rihten hire ⁊ smeðen hire! is of euch religiun. ⁊ of efrich ordre. þe god ⁊ alðe strengðe* (Anc. Riwle 2, 18), *Gon ⁊ iseon swuche ⁊ elnen ham ⁊ helpen mid fode of holi lore? þis is riht religiun he seið seint iame* (ibid. 4, 27). Cf. also the constructions of the type *I list not prophesy* (Wint. Tale IV, i, 25) beside *I would no more/Endure this wooden slavery than to suffer/The flesh-fly blow my mouth* (Tempest III, i, 62), in the Modern period. As can be seen, the 'to' infinitive came to be used for sometime even after the modal and other auxiliaries.

[22] Semiprepositional in the sense that we have an elliptical *from*.

[23] It should be observed that grammatically we have a subject-infinitive but, notionally, this infinitive complements *to thee bettir is*. Cf. the case of *onhagian* mentioned above.

[24] It should be noted that the impossibility of splitting the infinitive unit (*to*+infinitive) during the Old and early Middle periods gives way already in the 14th century in constructions of 'to' infinitive modified by adverbs of mood: *he louied þe lasse apper to longe lye or to longe sitte* (Gawain 33, 87). This is precisely the so-called 'split infinitive' which has attracted so much attention since last century. In the 14th century our pattern was already being relegated except in emphatic positions.

The examination of the subgroups B with object (-I-): B3, B4, (-J-): B5, B5$_j$, confirms in the Middle period what I have said with reference to the Old period: the strings -J-, especially 'J$_j$', are frequent, but the strings -I- are not. Except for not very frequent cases such as *Thanne tok I with myn hondis tweie | The arowe, and ful fast out it plighte* (Rose 1744) where we have an object -I- (B4), the structures B5$_{(j)}$ abound: *And eythir of hem gate their swerdys in their hondis, and oute at the pavylyon dore wente the knyght of the pavylyon, and sir Launcelot folowed hym* (Arthur 259, 34), *He streight up to his ere drough | |The stronge bowe, that was so tough* (Rose 1725), *Hir heer doun to hir helis wente* (ibid. 1218). Cf. also the sequence 'ut of' in *he was an hæðene gume, ut of Saxlonde icume* (Laȝ 1099).

As in the Old period, in Middle English there are other modifiers than can appear between P and V: (non-verbal) *Leif brother, say not so, | bot let vs furth together go* (Town. Plays II, 130)[25], *And toward God have no memorie, | But forth as ypocrites trace, | And to her soules deth purchace* (Rose 5752), (verbal) *Whiche causen hir to mourne in woo | That Youthe hath hir bigiled so, | Which sodeynly awey is hasted* (Rose 5007), *What! will ye no forther, mare? | War! let me se how down will draw* (Town. Plays II, 28), *Thise thoners and levyn | downe gar fall ffull stout, | Both halles and bowers | Castels and towres* (ibid. III, 347). Both types of modifiers can of course appear in mixed patterns, co-existing with other intervening elements. Cf. *heo is of de briddes ðet ure louerd spekeð of; ðe mid hore lustes ne holieð no-ut aduneward ase doð de uoxes. ðet beoð false ancren. auh habbeð up an heih ase briddes of heouene iset hore nest* (Anc. Riwle 57, 18) -B5+B2-[26], *That thou away ne shalt not wynde* (Rose 2056) -B2 (nonverbal, gram.) +B2 (verbal)-, *ȝaru wes hes ferde, and forð heo gon fusen, | Swa longe þat heo comen þer læien Brutes on* (Laȝ 940) -B1+B2-.

(b) Other contextual aspects.

As in Old English, the context Σ (6b) implies strict restriction with regard to the only possible position of particle *ne* as the immediate modifier of the verb, whereby the order 'P V' is split in order to allow *ne* in. The normal expression of negation by means of the particle *not* (OE. *nawiht*, ME. *nought*, etc.) and the auxiliary *do* (like the use of the latter in direct questions), is not properly established until well into the Modern period after a process of effervescence in which these new procedures struggle, without order or regularity of any kind, to crystallize and establish themselves. There is also the post-verbal negation with *not* (see below the inverted order in group-pattern D) which is not only used on its own, but also as reinforcement of the pre-verbal negation with

---

[25] The validity of this illustration depends on the colligational interpretation of the particles *furth* and *together*. Here we take *furth* as P and *together* as modifier.

[26] A clause of comparison is to all effects equivalent to a non-verbal modifier.

ne, as can be seen in *For thee so sore I whole now bynde | That thou away ne shalt not wynde* (Rose 2055). This reinforcement is very marked during the period that precedes the crystallization of the negation with *do*. The fact is that as long as the tendency to the front-position of P with respect to V persists, because of the circumstances I have been discussing, the normal negation in Middle English will produce our pattern B2: *So semly a sede moȝt fayly not, | þat spryngande spyceȝ vp ne sponne | Of þat precios perle wythouten spotte* (Pearl 34).

As I have already said, this pattern does eventually constitute a powerful stylistic tool when the intervening element is a pronominal subject. The evidence afforded by Middle English is abundant: *þe lorde ful erly vp he ros | To hyre werkmen to hys vyne* (Pearl 506), *And up I roos, and gan me clothe. | Anoon I wissh myn hondis bothe* (Rose 95), *Unto the welle than wente I me, | And doun I loutede for to see | The clere water in the stoon* (ibid. 1553), *But up it stert, and armes tok | Ayens this fals horrible bok* (ibid. 7131), *And than sir Launcelot cnocked at the gate with the pomell of his swerde; and with that come his oste, and in they entyrd, he and sir Kay* (Arthur 274, 15), *And therewyth awoke sir Beawmaynes, and up he lepte lyghtly and sawe where the blak knyght rode his way wyth the dwarff* (ibid. 328, 30), *So forth they wente with the kynge, tho knyghtes of the Round Table* (ibid. 221, 19), *... and forth they flynged a faste tro⟨tt⟩e and the folke of the bestes dryvys* (ibid. 236, 6), *And than sir Phelot laysshed at hym egerly to have slayne hym, but sir Launcelot put away the stroke with the rowgh spyke, and therewith toke hym on the hede, that downe he felle in a sowghe to the grounde* (ibid. 283, 33), *Hir tresses yelowe, and longe straughten, | Unto hir helys doun they raughten* (Rose 2021), *To the chymneye forth he goth* (Sowd. of Bab. 2009), *A sylvre nedle forth y drough | Out of an aguler queynt ynough* (Rose 97). As can be seen, the intervening pronominal subject frequently has an anaphoric or anticipatory value with respect to the nominal subject.

PATTERN C

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

Here we have the properly unmarked pattern as against pattern A and the group-pattern B and D. Pattern C is the specifically neutral pattern with no reason for its existence other than the fact that it constitutes the normal order as long as this is not prevented by the specific circumstances determining the other patterns. In Old and early Middle English, the factors which are negative to A and B define C. At all periods of the language (with only very limited and specific deviations) we have an important factor which, when negative to D, defines C: the presence of a pronominal object which in normal order assumes an

intervening position between V and P, so defining the group-pattern D as against our pattern C. In Old English, where all the determining factors of patterns A and B are fully operative, we observe that pattern C does not occur in the contexts Σ (1), Σ (2b), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (12), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (13), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ (15). In our corpus, of those contexts containing a non-finite verbal form complementing a finite one, it is only in the following that pattern C occurs: $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (10) and, in both cases, P is modified by a string 'J'. Cf. *Đa stód se man-fulla feorran ⁊ nolde furðun his eagan ahebban úp. to þam heofone ac he beot his breost ⁊ cwæþ; God beo þu milde me syn-fullum* (Luke 18, 13), *þa ongunnon þa Francan steppan in to þære cyricean* (Dial. Greg. 65, 20), *þa com þær gan in to me heofencund Wisdom* (Boethius 8, 16). In the case of patterns A and B we saw a certain amount of evidence in Middle English, although their diminished frequency indicated to us the competence of alternative structures. However, the Old English evidence of pattern C is very rare in contexts in which it is firmly established in Middle English. The frequent lack of patterns C and D in Old English and of patterns A and B in Middle English is self-evident in certain contexts. If we examine the various contextual frames, we find that in Σ (1) we do not have C nor D in the Old period, nor B in the Middle period, but we do have C in the Middle period; in Σ (2b) we do not find B in the Old and Middle periods, nor A in the Middle period, but we find C in the Middle period; in $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (12) we do not find C nor D in the Old period, nor A in the Middle period, but at least in $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11) (according to our data) we find C in the Middle period; in $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (13) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) we do not find C nor D in the Old period but at least in $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) we find C in the Middle period; in $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2b}$ we do not find B, C, nor D in the Old period, but we do find C in the Middle period (see below). Where both Old English and Middle English agree is in the non-existence of the sequence V P O when O is pronominal. The post-position of the object (whether immediately after P or with one or more elements between it and P) can only occur when the object is non-pronominal: *Đa sceolde se ealdorman Ælfric lædan þa fyrde, ac he teah forð þa his ealdan wrenceas* (O. E. Chron. a. 1003, E, 135, 10). In Old English there are other alternatives (in the case of a pronominal object) in addition to V O P, namely, pattern A and group-pattern B (see above). In Middle English, notwithstanding the relics of the order 'P (/) V' it is the alternative 'V O P' that firmly establishes itself. Let me add here that the existence of a preceding object is evidently a contributory factor to the configuration of pattern C: *Todældu wæeteru we lætað ut of urum eagum, ðonne we for synderlecum synnum synderleca hreoswunga doð* (Cura Past. 413, 27). In Middle English we have other factors which decisively contribute to the configuration of this pattern (see below).

Needless to say, the prepositional structures 'V P O$_{pron}$' (with normal order) such as *feoht wið ða ðe wið me feohtað* (Paris Ps. 34, 1), and *ælc acsiende &*

frinende æfter his friend (Orosius 166, 12), must not be confused with our pattern C. Nor must we confuse with our pattern C cases such as *se here him fleah beforan* (O. E. Chron. a. 1016, E, 151, 1)[27].

(b) Other contextual aspects.

As with subcategorization, the other contextual aspects do not determine the configuration of pattern C either. At most they could only define pattern C negatively. There is no verifiable correlation between pattern C and the contexts Σ (6b) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8) in *ne gewat on bec heorte ur* (Vesp. Ps. 43, 19) and *Gá geond þas wegas... ⁊ nyd hig þ hig gán in. þ min hus si gefylled* (Luke 14, 23), for instance, though we should never lose sight of the possibility of additional factors. Cf. a context Σ (5a) with the string 'J' at the beginning of the sentence and with a long subject: *On þyssum eálande com upp se Godes þeow Agustinus ⁊ his geferan* (Bede 58, 1).

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

In the Middle period pattern C continues to be an essentially neutral pattern. The only difference is that this pattern is gaining ground all the time. Its extension to areas previously dominated by the patterns of the order 'P (/) V' is fully documented in our data, but the majority of the subcategorization points do not show any of the peculiarities which are proper to pattern A and to group-pattern B. Cf. the context Σ (1) which implies $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) —see below (passive)—; $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (9) —*nullich nout longe riden. auh ich chulle wenden anon ouer awei... nule he nout he seið wenden ouer* (Anc. Riwle 119, 14), *The sterres... ne mowen yeten adoun no lyght* (Boece L. I. M. 7, 1), *for I xal takyn a-wey fro þe thy criyng* (Kempe 155, 29)—; $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (10) —*And therfore I... desired to putten forth in execucion...* (Boece L. I, Pr. 4, 39), *I trowe thou seeke to dryve awey nede...* (ibid. L. II, Pr. 5, 114)—; $\Sigma(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (11) —*Seynt Iohn wolde a don hym comyn in* (Kempe 195, 27), *Than Bewmaynes bade the Rede Knyght to stonde up* (Arthur 310, 9)—; $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) —*Sithyn, whan þis creatur was comyn down of þe Mount...* (Kempe 74, 33) ... *yowr eldres coveyteden to han don awey that dignyte for the pride of the consulers* (Boece L. II, Pr. 6, 13)—.

There is a context, however, worthy of special mention: Σ (5b). I have already made reference to the contributory factor represented by the string 'J' heading the sentence, in connection with Old English. In the Middle period we also have similar structures (with 'J' heading the sentence and post-position of the subject): *But wiltow that we joynen togidres thilke same resouns, for para-*

---

[27] Cf. note 20.

venture of swiche conjunccioun may sterten som fair sparcle of soth? (Boece L. III, Pr. 12, 137). Nevertheless, we observe a very marked preponderance of sequences 'V P+J' as opposed to the order 'J+V P'. What undoubtedly contributes to the configuration of our pattern C in Middle English is the heading of the sentence not by a string 'J' but by a simple indefinite adverbial modifier with the post-position of a non-pronominal subject (post-position with respect to the phrasal unit should be understood). In contrast to *And ye look well abowte | nawther more nor myn, | So gose youre wyttys owte | evyn as It com In* (Town. Plays XII, 172), the normal is that the patterns D be reserved for the structures with a (light) pronominal subject, and our pattern C for those containing a non-pronominal subject: ₇ *nu cumeð forð a feble mon.* ₇ *halt him þauh heihliche ʒif haueð enne widne hod* ₇ *one ilokene cope.* ₇ *wule iseon ʒunge ancren* (Anc. Riwle 24, 17), *than com forth dame Lyones arayde lyke a prynces, and there she made hym passyng good chere and he hir agayne* (Arthur 331, 16), *And than there lepe oute many knyghtes oute of their tentys and pavylyons, and they within the castell loked ovir the wallys and oute at wyndowis* (ibid. 321, 10), *And than com in sir Palomydes oute of the castell; and there encountyrd with hym sir Gawayne* (ibid. 346, 9).

Other contributory factors to pattern C in this period are the following: (1) absence of an object, (2) existence of a preceding object, (3) existence of a long object even though not preceding, (4) the passive. There is naturally no direct object with intransitive verbs. Cf. *Fals and Favel farith forth togidere, | And Mede in the myddis, and al the meyne aftir* (Piers II, 145), *To yelde thee so redily, | And to leve of is gret maistry* (Rose 3293), *Io furth, greyn-horne! and war oute, gryme!* (Town. Plays II, 25), *For, whan þe ale was as fayr standyng vndyr berm as any man myght se, sodenly þe berm wold fallyn down þar alle þe ale was lost euery brewyng aftyr o þer* (Kempe 9, 35), *And than they fruyshed forth all at onys, of the bourelyest knyghtes that ever brake* (Arthur 214, 33), *And to com off and to breff this tale, when she com to knyge Arthure she was nobly resseyved* (ibid. 341, 26). The existence of a preceding object is illustrated in cases like *þe ðet his wepnen worpeð awei! him luste beon iwunded* (Anc. Riwle 107, 24), *The whiche famylieres, certes, the real power of kynges, in hool estat and in estaut abated, ful ofte throweth adoun* (Boece L. III, Pr. 5, 44), *and so Ulphuns and Brastias othir two smote downe* (Arthur 21, 12), *he iseih hu ueole ðe grimme wrastlare of helle breid up on his hupe* (Anc. Riwle 125, 36). (See below in section (b) in connection with the relative clauses). The existence of a non-preceding long object may also determine a rapprochement 'V P', on being excluded from the phrasal unit proper, that is, the frame 'V (...) P': *Het up of hire hird hwuch as ha walde* ₇ *wende hire þiderward* (St. Katherine 156), *And bringen forth bestes that bastardis ben holden* (Piers VIII, 74), *and as of wil it chaseth out thynges that to it ben contrarie* (Boece L. II, Pr. 6, 100), ... *and sawen that they scholden putten adoun the filthes of hir vices by the tormentz of peynes* (Boece L. IV, Pr. 4, 277),

sche wolde but ʒeue awey swech good as þer was (Kempe 8, 32), ... *he put of his horse brydyll and his sadyll* (Arthur 423, 18).[28] The passive does not only rule out the order 'P V' of the Old period, but also the order 'V / P' with an intervening object (D3 and D4). For this reason, the cases of pattern C which are due to the passive are numerous: *þis beoð godes wordes. ðet euerich idel word bið ðer ibrouh forð* (Anc. Riwle 64, 6), ... *and doon yowr name for to be born forth?* (Boece L. II, Pr. 7, 44), *When it comys on assay | is kesten downe wyde* (Town. Plays XII, 13), *As hys name is now, it xal ben throwyn down & þin schal ben reysed up* (Kempe 156, 19), *for all his oste was borne up by hys hondys* (Arthur 77, 12). It must be borne in mind, however, that the passive does not rule out the order 'V / P'. Cf. *bute ʒif ðe o þre holden hire! heo bið ikest sone adun* (Anc. Riwle 101, 28).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

The context that concerns us here is $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_1$ (8). Evidently, in the subordinate clause there is less and less tendency towards the relegation of the verb to the end of the phrase and the subsequently typical (though not exclusive) configuration 'P V'. Cf. *heo is bitocned bi þeo. þ unwrieð þene put. þe put is hire veire neb.* ₇ *hire hwite sweore.* ₇ *hire liht eie.* ₇ *hire hond ʒif heo halt forð in his eihsihðe* (Anc. Riwle 25, 12), *A sory gest, in goode fay, | Thou herberedest than in thyn inn, | The God of love whanne thou let inn!* (Rose 5106) —note in these two examples the precedence of an object—, *And durst not auntre thee to saye | Somthyng, er thou cam awaye* (ibid. 2495), *So gose youre wyttys owte | evyn as It com In* (Town. Plays XII, 173), *For yif that thei myghten writhen awey in othere manere than thei ben purveyed, thanne ne sholde ther be no stedefast prescience of thing to comen* (Boece L. V, Pr. 3, 19), *And whan Gryfflet saw rescowis he smote a knyght on the templis, that hede and helme wente of to the erthe* (Arthur 30, 1), *and than he smote sir Gáhalantyne on the helme, that his nose, erys and mowthe braste oute on bloode* (ibid. 263, 16), *I þe messe hwon þe preost hefð up godes licome siggeð þeos uers stondinde...* (Anc. Riwle 13, 33). In the following cases we can see a confluence of the contexts Σ (1), $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)_{2a}$ (14) and $\Sigma-(\Sigma_s)$ (8), that is, we have passive structures in subordinate clauses: *þis beoð godes wordes. ðet euerich idel word bið ðer ibrouh forð.* ₇ *ideles þouhtes ðet neren er ibette* (Anc. Riwle 64, 6), *so that, aftir that the derknesse of desceyvynge desyrynges is doon away, thow mowe knowe the schynynge of verray light* (Boece L. II, Pr. 6, 100), *For the matere of it is swich, that whan o doute is determined and kut awey, ther waxen othere doutes withoute nombre* (ibid. L. IV, Pr. 6, 16), *"Dowtyr, it is mor plesyng vn-to me þat þu suffyr despitys & scornys... þan ʒif þin hed wer smet of thr*

---

[28] Cf. *How ofte eek have I put of or cast out hym Trygwille ... bothe of the wronges that he hadde bygunne to doon, and ek fully performed!* (Boece L. I, P. 4, 58).

tymes on þe day euery day in sevyn ʒer" (Kempe 131, 16), *hwuch schendlac ̚ hwuch seoruwe þer bið. hwon alle ðe lea-ues schulen beon towarpled. ̚ al þet fule wrusum scheaweð him. ̚ wringed ut! biuoren al ðe wide worl-de. eorðe ware! ̚ heouene ware* (Anc. Riwle 145, 20), *And so they fell oute at that tyme, that it was put of tyll Candelmas* (Arthur 15, 25), *ase þauh he seide. hwat god so ich do ʒif hit were ut of mine boseme i upped ̚ i drawen uorð! al min hope we're etslopen* (Anc. Riwle 65, 30), *But the soules of men moten nedes be more fre whan… and yit lasse fre whan thei ben gadrid togidre and comprehended in erthli membres* (Boece L. V, Pr. 2, 26).

There are, however, subordinate clauses which, in addition to illustrating the new order 'V P' as against 'P V', rule out the possibility of pattern D—'V / P'—, subgroups D3 and D4. I refer to the transitive relative clauses intoduced by the direct object followed by the relative. [29]There we have a preceding obligatory object: *The fruyt that thei bringe forth arn manye foule wordis* (Town. Plays X, 186), *Than kynge Pellynore armed hym and mounted uppon hys horse, and rode more than a pace after the lady that the knyght lad away* (Arthur 113, 36), *… al kresules weole. and absalones schene wlite. þet ase ofte ase euesede him. me solde his euesunge ðeo her þet me ker of! uor two hundred sicles of seol-ure* (Anc. Riwle 182, 1), *… the debonere wynd, bryngeth ayen in the first somer sesoun the leeves that the wynd that hyghte Boreas hath reft awey in autumpne* (Boece L. I, M. V, 22), *Thai ar so long taryyng / the fowles that we / Cast out in the mornyng* (Town. Plays III, 497). In a case like *The yerde of a tree, that is haled adoun by myghty strengthe, bowetk redily the crop adown* (Boece L. III, M. II, 32) we obviously have a 'passive+relative' confluence: both the passive and the relative features contribute to the configuration of our pattern. It should be noted that the relative structures 'O+relative (+S)+V$_{tr}$' in which O is the direct object of V$_{tr}$ which is obligatorily preceded by O, must not be confused with other relative structures such as *þe þ swuch fulde speteð ut in eni an'cre eare. me schulde dutten his muð. nout mid schearpe wordes. auh mid herde fustes* (Anc. Riwle 35, 29), which could have the object in a post-verbal position: *speteð O ut* instead of *speteð ut O*. We might mention another type of relative which, although outside the scope of the above frame, nonetheless implies the precedence of the object which is preceded this time by the relative: *al be it so that, certes, thilke wrytynges profiten litel, the whiche writynges long and dirk eelde doth awey, bothe hem and ek hir auctours* (Boece L. II, Pr. 7, 87).

We see the same order 'VP' in prepositional structures of category 'b' not only in ordinary clauses but also in (1) relative clauses: *þe eppel þ ich loke on is forbode me to etene ̚ nout forto bihol-den* (Anc. Riwle 23, 16), *þis beoð nu þe þreo wittes þ ich habbe ispeken of* (ibid. 45, 28), *luue is his chaum'berleing. ̚ his kunsiler. ̚ his spuse! þet he ne mei nout helien wið* (ibid. 187, 5); (2) infinit-

ive clauses (to all effects equivalent to the relative-infinitive structures except when between O and *to* we have either (a) 'copula+predicate' or (b) 'for (+O -another object-)': *for swetter place / To pleyen ynne he may not fynde, / Although he sought oon in-tyl Ynde* (Rose 622) as against (a) *And for to passe the tyme thys book shal be plesaunte to rede in, but or to gyve fayth and byleve that al is trewe that is conteyned herin, ye be at your lyberté* (Arthur Preface cxiv, 8), and as against (b) *and, whan Ihesu was born, sche ordeyned beddyng for owyr Lady to lyg in wyth hir blyssed Sone* (Kempe 19, 15), *Also þis cumpany whech had putt þe forseyd creatur fro her tabyl þat sche xulde no lengar etyn a-mong hem ordeynd a schip for hem-self to seylyn in* (ibid. 66, 18), *And also þu hast thowt þat þu woldist, ʒyf þu haddist had good a-now, a made many abbeys for my lofe for religiows men & women to dwellyn in* (ibid. 203, 29); (3) ordinary passive clauses (a new development from Middle English onwards): *Feld his legges al naked / & feled al so bi her þi, / þat sche was yleyen bi* (Arth. & Merlin 850), *Lift vp thine eyes vnto the high places and see where thou hast not bene lien with* (Jeremiah 3, 2). Needless to say, the prepositional structures of category 'a' also exhibit the order 'VP' in relative clauses introduced by the direct object (not when they are introduced by the object of the preposition), as well as in ordinary passive clauses. Let me mention, however, the order 'VP' in the passive-infinitive clauses of category 'a': *… & how owyr Lord ʒaf hir contrycyon & compunccyon wyth gret plente of teerys, & how sche desired to be howseld euery Sonday ʒyf sche myth & sche had no preste to schrevyn to* (Kempe 80, 33), *& sche had no bed to lyn in ne no clothys to be cured wyth saf hir owyn mentyl. & þan was sche ful of vermyn & suffyrd gret peyn þerwyth* (ibid. 85, 37). Cf. also a relative clause of the type *also ase ure vet bereð us! also ure lustes bereð us ofte to þinge ðet us lust efter* (Anc. Riwle 123, 13).

I shall finally add that this same order naturally appears in structures whose particles are a prepositional development of adverbs (during the Middle period): *Pyʒt in perle, þat precios pyece / On wy þer half water com doun þe schore* (Pearl 229), *But anone Gotelake, a good man of armys, for Chastelayne the chylde he chongyd his mode, that the wete watir wente doune his chykys* (Arthur 239, 21), *þan sche preyd to our Lord þat hir husbond myth leuyn a ʒer & sche to be deliueryd owt slawndyr ʒyf it wer hys plesawns* (Kempe 180, 17), etc.

GROUP—PATTERN D

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

As I have already pointed out, this group-pattern is characterized, like the previous pattern, by its marked absence in Old English when V$_ß$ is a finite form. The evidence of our corpus pertaining to that period does not

---

[29] Note that this relative is optional in Modern English as against the relative of the intransitive structures: *the workers that came out.*

exhibit it in the contexts Σ (1), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ₐ (10), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ₐ (11), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ₐ (12), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ₐ (13), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ₐ (14), Σ—(Σ₈)₂ᵦ (15), all of which, except no. 13 are perfectly well established in Middle English. We have, however, a well defined restriction already in the Old period when in the normal order (S+V+...) there exists a pronominal object. Should such an order be required, the pronominal object must occupy an intervening position between V and P, its post-position with respect to the particle being normally avoided. This is the context Σ (2) with O_pron.. This object can be (a) non-reflexive and (b) reflexive: (a) *Se cyng ða soðlice ne mihte aræfnian his dohtor tearas, ac arærde hi up and hire to cwæð...* (Apollonius 34, 20), (b) *Ond æfter þon he hine gereste medmicel fæc, ða ahof hine up ⁊ ongan aweg gan* (Bede 326, 9). Of course the non-pronominal objects may also assume an intervening position: cf. *⁊ wurp þinne angel ut ⁊ nim þone ærestan fisc ⁊ hys muþ ge-opena þu fintst ænne wecg on him* (Math. 17, 27) as against *Se forlæt ut ðæt wæter, se ðe his tungan stemne on unnyttum wordum læt toflowan* (Cura Past. 279, 13). What is not normal is the order 'V P O_pron.'. It is quite a different thing when we have two objects, one non-pronominal and the other pronominal (normally a dative of interest) in which case we can indeed have at least an order 'O_pron. (...) V O_non-pron. P': *⁊ siþ þan him mon slog þa handa of, þa þæt heafod* (Orosius 168, 4).

We have another context which, while not defining group-pattern D, at least contributes in some measure to its configuration. I refer to the context Σ (5b). The adverb *þa*, above all, frequently introduces the subgroup D1, that is, structures with inverted order: *þa eodon hig út þ hig gesawon þ ðar geworden wæs* (Luke 8, 35), *þa gewat se dæg forð* (ibid. 9, 12), *þa eode his fæder út ⁊ ongan hine biddan* (ibid. 15, 28), *Da eode petrus út ⁊ biterlice weop* (ibid. 22, 62), *⁊ þa se fird stemn fór hám, þa fór oþer út, ⁊ ge fór þa burg æt Huntan dune* (O. E. Chron. a. 921, A, 103, 5), *þa arn he beforan ⁊ stah up on án treow. sicomorum þ he hine gesawe* (Luke 19, 4). *þa geðafodon þæt uneaðe þa his gesacan, þa lædde mon forð sumne blinde mon of Ongolcynne* (Bede 100, 2), *þa teah heora oðer forð fægre boc ⁊ swiðe medmicle ⁊ me sealde to rædanne* (ibid. 438, 23), *þa teah he forð boc ongryslicre gesihðe ⁊ unmættre micelnisse ⁊ lytesne unabeorendlic byrdenne* (ibid. 438, 32), *Da Ceadwalla se cyning mid þy here in þæt ealond for, þa flugon þa cneohtas út of þæm ealonde, ⁊ wæron gelædde in þa neahmægðe, seo is gecegd Eota lond* (ibid. 308, 8), *þa eodon hie ut to ðæm monnum þe on east healfe þære é wicodon, ⁊ him wiþ gefuhton, ⁊ þa Cristnan hæfdon sige* (O. E. Chron. a. 894, A, 87, 25), *⁊ þa sæton hie ute on þam iglande æt Bradan Relice* (ibid. a. 918, A, 98, 31), *⁊ þa foran þa men út ongean þe þær binnan wæron* (ibid. a. 921, A, 101, 20), *Da eodon þa þeowas út on þa wegas* (Math. 22, 10). The same happens with other adverbs such as *ðonne, ðær*, etc.: *Ðonne gæð Dine ut sceawian ða elðiodigan wif, ðonne hwelces monnes mod forlæt his ægne tilunga, & sorgað ymb oðerra monna wisan...* (Cura Past. 415, 19), *Wiþ þon ilcan ʒenim ele, ʒenim eac ʒose rysele ʒeot on*

þonne ʒewit þ sar aweʒ (Leechdoms II, 40, 11), *þær scyt se ende up of þam garsecge betuh þan twam beorgum eastward, þær Ercoles syla standað* (Orosius 26, 22). All these adverbs also introduce with relative frequency other subgroups of D, in particular D2: *Ða him ða ðæt sáed broht wæs ofer ealle tíde to sawenne ⁊ ofer ealne hiht wæsm to berenne he in ðæm ilcan lande seow, þa georn ðær sona upp genihtsumlic yrð ⁊ wæstm* (Bede 366, 30), *þa hie ge fengon micle here hyð, ⁊ þa woldon ferian norþ weardes ofer Temese in on East Seaxe ongean þa scipu* (O. E. Chron. a. 894, A, 85, 16), *Oþer wearþ on Tarentan þære byrig æt anre feorne: þonne mon þa hlafas wrat to þicgeanne, þonne orn þær blod ut* (Orosius 234, 3), *⁊ þonon eode gehwyder ymb, ⁊ þær godcunde lare bodade ⁊ lærde* (Bede 202, 27). As can be seen, many of the instances given illustrate the well known correlations *þa* (... *þa*) ... *þa, þonne... þonne*, etc. It should be noted that these adverbs may be the intervening element between V and P. Cf. the cases of D2 in which the intervening modifier is *ða*: *Hi gewendon þa aweg, ⁊ gewicodon wið ðone munt* (Ælfric, Numbers 20, 21), *Eode ða ut and beseah to Apollonio and cwæð* (Apollonius 34, 23), *⁊ teah þa úp his segl ⁊ his lið ⁊ ge wendon heom þa west on an to Wiht* (O. E. Chron. an. 1052, E, 177, 25), *⁊ wendon þa up andlang Medewægan to Hrofe ceastre* (ibid. a. 999, E, 131, 19). Undoubtedly, this does not exhaust all the possibilities. A case which is different from the previous ones is: *seo hand þa gewende mid þære rode up to heofonum* (Guthlac 8, 22).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

The aspect that concerns us now is represented by context Σ (6b). I have already referred to the immediate precedence of *ne* with regard to the verb, when discussing group-pattern B. In the present group-pattern such a precedence goes together with the inverted order, which is typical of negative structures when specific reasons do not prevent it, such as for instance in the case of group-pattern B, where the verb is frequently relegated to a final position. As in the case of *þa* and other adverbs frequently introducing the inverted order, the obvious position for the locative particle is the fourth place, above all when we have a (light) pronominal subject: *⁊ seþe ys uppan hys huse ne ga he nyþyr* (Math. 24, 17), *on ðam dæge se ðe bið on þécene. ⁊ his fatu on húse. ne stihð he nyðer þ he hig nime; And se ðe bið on æcere. ne went he on-bæc* (Luke 17, 31), *Ac ðonne hwa on ða leasunga befehð, ðonne ne mæg he óf, ac sceal ðonne niede ðencean hu he hie gelicettan mæge* (Cura Past. 239, 11) —note also the presence of *ðonne*—. Needless to say, we also have this inverted order and consequently the present group-pattern, in direct questions, whether negative or non-negative.

In the prepositional domain are the cases of category 'b' in inverted order such as *þa eode he to him* (Bede 128, 17) or in direct anastrophe like *adumba ⁊ ga him of* (Luke 4, 35), *hig læddon him to* (ibid. 4, 40) which, together with the

ordinary structures of category 'a', resemble our group-pattern D. The ordinary relative and infinitive structures, that is, non-passive, introduced by the object of the preposition (category 'b' and the pseudo-adverbial transformation of category 'a') show, however, an order 'P (/) V', as we have seen when discussing pattern A and group-pattern B. In Middle English, nonetheless, the pseudo-adverbial transformation of category 'a' is relevant to the configuration of the order 'V / P' (see below).

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

Parallel to the extension of pattern C in Middle English, the evidence of the data of our corpus fully supports the extension of pattern D in the same contexts. As in Old English, we have a defining restriction of group-pattern D in context Σ (2) with $O_{pron.}$, both when this pronominal object is reflexive and when it is not. This is the subgroup D4: (non-reflexive) *vnderstondeð ðet god wolde a su-me wise scheawen ham to men i þisse worlde! bi world-liche pinen. ٦ worldliche wunnen. and scheawede ham uorð! as þauh hit were a scheadewe* (Anc. Riwle 108, 3), (reflexive) *þa, ʒet, ne mahte ha na mare; / ah dude hire adun swiðe, / ٦ forð, wiðuten fearlac, / ouer þiderwardes* (St. Katherine 2027), *and so put his horse to pasture and sette hymselff downe at the gate* (Arthur 423, 19). As in the Old period, we also have non-pronominal objects in an intervening position: *hwon hit so biualleð ðet me asaileð buruhwes oðer castles. þeo ðet beoð wiðinnen heldeð schaldin-de water ut! ٦ werieð so de walles* (Anc. Riwle 109, 26). But, whereas in Old English we can have a pronominal string I (see above: O_{pron} V... O P), in Middle English 'I' is only constituted by non-pronominal objects, as against the group -I- typical of the pronominal objects: *vor hwo so is siker of sukurs ðet him schal sone kumen ٦ ʒelt tauh up his kastel to his wi þeruines! he is swuðe to blamen* (Anc. Riwle 104, 3). As can be seen, from the point of view of the object, this reminds us of pattern C, subpattern β1: *She, cruel Fortune, casteth adoun kynges that whilom weren ydradd; and sche, desceyvable, enhaunceth up the humble chere of hym that is discounfited* (Boece L. II, M. I, 7). So that, if there is a pronominal object, such an object determines the subgroup D4, the determination of the subpattern being effected by the non-pronominal object. Note that when we have two objects, one within the frame 'V P' and another outside such a frame (subgroups D3 or D4 other than with α or γ), the object outside the frame is normally a direct object specificatory of the one inside the frame (which is normally a pronominal object and also direct) or else a direct object in connection with an indirect object which is inside the frame (possibly pronominal). A specificatory object may follow the pronominal object it specifies, or else it may constitute the base for an anaphoric pronoun to refer back to. So we have cases like *٦ hot*

him ut hetterliche. ðe fule kur dogge. ٦ li þere to him! lu þerliche mid te holie rode steue (Anc. Riwle 130, 26), *'A', sayde the kyng, 'syn ye knowe of youre evil adventure, purvey for hit, and putt hit away by youre crauftes, that mysseadveniure'* (Arthur 125, 20), *So they encountred, and sir Launcelot bare hym downe horse and man so that his sholdir wente oute of joynte* (ibid. 262, 34)[30] or like *Thy nailes blak if thou maist see, / Voide it awey delyverly* (Rose 2282), or else like... *& þus to comown wyth myn husbond... for it is to þe ra þar mede & meryte, & þow xalt haue newyr þe lesse grace, for I wyl þat þow bryng me forth mor frwte* (Kempe 48, 30). A case like *How ofte eek have I put of or cast out hym Trygwille, provost of the kyngis hous, bothe of the wronges that he hadde bygunne to doon, and ek fully performed!* (Boece L. I, Pr. 4, 58) is truly exceptional. Note that we have a co-ordination of two phrasal structures.

Context Σ (5b) is also relevant in Middle English. The indefinite adverbs of the type *þeonne, so, nu, þus, more... þen,* etc., frequently introduce the inverted order: *uor ʒif ei etwit ham þeonne siggeð heo anonriht. mesire þeo deð also. þeo is betere þen ich am ٦ wot betere þen ich wot* (Anc. Riwle 22, 24), *so duden iobes freond þ we'ren i cumen to urouren him. seten stille alle seoueniht* (idib. 31, 21), *Nu aski ʒe hwat riwle ʒe ancren schullen holden* (ibid. 2, 6), *þus eode sihðe biuoren ٦ makede wei to vuel lust. ٦ com þe deað þer efter! þ al monkun iueleð* (ibid. 23, 8), *More beoð ðe gode þet beoð i clum-ben an heih i tempted! þen beon ðe woke* (ibid. 78, 22).[31] Hence the fact that in such circumstances the phrasal structures should crystallize into subgroup D1. Cf. the following cases: *luue! is iesu cristes fur... and þe deouel bloweð forto puffen hit ut. and hwon his blowinge ne gei-neð nout: þeonne bringeð he up sum luðer word. oðer sum o þer nouhtunge* (Anc. Riwle 194, 8), *þenne verez ho vp her fayre frount, / Hyr vysayge whyt as playn yuore* (Pearl 77), *Thanne sat Sleuthe up, and seynide hym faste* (Piers V, 221), *þan went sche forth wyth owyr Lady & wyth Iosep...* (Kempe 18, 33), *þan went þei forth to Elysabeth, Seynt Iohn Baptystys modir* (ibid. 18, 35), *So droʒ þay forth wyth gret delyt* (Pearl 1115), *Now yede this mery thought away!* (Rose 2585), *'Now go ye forthe', seyde sir Torre, 'and God spede you and me'* (Arthur 109, 34), *Sythyn ʒed sche forth to Leycetyr, & a good man also, Thomas Marchale of whom is wretyn be-forn* (Kempe 111, 3). In these illustrations we doubtless note a preponderance of *light* pronominal subjects between V and P. This intervening position, which originates our subgroup D2, can be assumed by all kinds of adverbs. In the following two cases we have, in addition, an indirect inverted order with a subject which is post-posed to

---

[30] *horse and man* is equivalent to an adverbial expression.

[31] Inversion is of course not exclusive to the circumstances mentioned. It also occurs with the negative particle *ne*, as well as in cases of simple co-ordination (cf. the penultimate example given: ... ٦ *com þe deað þer efter...*) or in cases of mere precedence of the object: *ðis ma'keð ðe leafdi riwle. ðe riwleð ٦ rihteð ٦ smeðeð ðe heorte! ٦ tet inwit of sunne* (Anc. Riwle 2, 15).

the phrasal structure: *But goth now rather awey, ye mermaydenes, whiche that ben swete til it be at the laste* (Boece L. I, Pr. 1, 67), *Come now forth, therfore, the suasyoun of swetnesse rethorien* (ibid. L. II, Pr. 1, 40). (In our corpus we can see structures of subgroup D2 with the following adverbs between V and P: *lihtliche, anon, sone, altogedere, (all)* [32], *(not) so, well, yonder, (foull), (fast), euer, (clene), feor suð, tauh*). Although this immediate modification of P is quite common, we also have every kind of adverb in other circumstances, that is, neither introducing an inverted order nor in an intervening position, but simply pre-posed or post-posed (whether immediately or not) to the phrasal structure. Cf. the normal order introduced by indefinite adverbs like *than*: *Than she lette the drawbrygge downe* (Arthur 353, 31).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

We must also examine here context Σ (6b). In Middle English we still have the particle *ne* which, as I have pointed out, may introduce the inverted order, according to the same model I have illustrated with the adverbs *þeonne, so*, etc., in the preceding section (a): *Ne wene non of heie liue ðet heo ne beo itented* (Anc. Riwle 78, 22). As in the Old period, given a structure of the type 'V P' and the immediate precedence of the particle *ne* with regard to V, the frequent existence of the inverted order will be easily understood. This accounts for the configuration of subgroup D1 in discontinuous structures. Nevertheless, negation by means of *ne* tends to be reinforced in Middle English through a second particle (*nought → not*) in post-verbal position. For this reason we often encounter mixed patterns of the type *þe kerneaus of þe castle. beo þ hire huses þurles. ne aboutie heo nout vt et ham* (Anc. Riwle 26, 36) —D1+D2—, *vor þi ase ȝe wulleð holden wi þinnen ou hope... ne blo-we ȝe hire nout ut mid maðelinde muðe. ne mid ȝeoniinde tuteles* (ibid. 35, 3) —D1+D4+D2—. The post-verbal negation with *not* is the one that eventually establishes itself on its own as the normal procedure with every class of verb until the 17th century crystallization of the use of *do+not* before 'V'. It should be noted that post-verbal *not* on its own without pre-verbal *ne*, determines in normal order the existence of subgroup D2. Cf. *"Nay", quath the king, "so God yive me blisse! / Wrong wendith not so awey, er I wyte more"* (Piers IV, 91), where we also have a second intervening modifier. To some extent a parallel situation and development can be observed in direct interrogative structures (context Σ (7)) with or without an introductory interrogative adverb: the norm is the inverted order in a configuration D1 until the

---

crystallization, also in the 17th century, of the use of *do+'S'+'V'*. *ȝ hwar etbrec heo ut urom dauid þe holi king godes prophete? hwar?* (Anc. Riwle 21, 20).

Evidently, in Middle English the ordinary prepositional structures of category 'a', as well as the anastrophic constructions of category 'b', resemble (as in the Old period) the structures of group-pattern D (subgroups D3, D4). The latter constitute an archaic trait in the later poetical language, but are very well documented in the Middle texts, both in poetry and in prose: *Mekely I rede thou go hym to* (Rose 3382), *And sir Borce turned hym to and bare hym thorow the brode of his breste* (Arthur 208, 17), *But the raynke Rycharde of the Rounde Table on a rede stede rode hym agaynste and threste hym thorow the shylde evyn to the herte* (ibid. 236, 27), *and strayte all his retynew folowed hym aftyr oute of the woode* (ibid. 238, 25). Note that the anastrophe may also produce a sequence 'V O P' in non-ordinary structures of category 'a', such as, for example, in the passive: *'I shall never se my lorde Arthure but yf I reskew hem that so lyghtly ar ledde us fro'* (ibid. 210, 15). However, the non-ordinary prepositional structures which in a special way exemplify in Middle English the order 'V O P' are the relative and infinitive (non-passive) structures of category 'a'. The infinitive structures in particular are very well documented: *... & seyd ful cursydly to hir in þis maner, "I wold þu wer in Smythfield, & I wold beryn a fagot to bren þe wyth; it is pety þat þow leuyst"* (Kempe 36, 13), *The preste, trustyng it xuld be as þis ȝong man told hym, lent hym syluer wyth good wyl to helpyn hym wyth* (ibid. 57, 4), *... seyd to þe Meyr, "Ser, I haue non hows to put hir inne les þan I putte hir a-mong men"* (ibid. 112, 10) [33]. There are of course other circumstances which can determine an order '[(V / P)]' in both phrasal categories, for instance the presence of an intervening adverbial modifier. This can be seen in the following structure of category 'b': *& so dede o man whech sche trostyd gretly on & proferyd hym-self to gon wyth hir in-to þe contre...* (Kempe 32, 32) [34]. The same may happen in the structures whose particles correspond to a prepositional development of adverbs: *þat*

---

[32] The elements which are not exclusively adverbial appear in brackets. It should be noted, however, that the fact that they are not exclusively adverbial does not affect their modifying function in our examples.

[33] Cf. the prepositional redundancy, at times with the occurrence of a second preposition totally different, in relative structures introduced by the preposition followed by the relative: *in what order ... hath bound ye to* (Audelay Poems, p. 5). This redundancy can also be seen with identical or different particles in structures 'VP', whether of category 'a' in the passive or of category 'b' in the active: (a) *from whom any of the said Goodes... were take fro* (Rymer, Foedera XI, 275), *in the whiche ... was honged onne* (Mandev. 6, 8), (b) *to wich psonys I haue spoke to* (Bury Wills 27, 5).

[34] The structures of the type *& ful falsy þei accusyd hir thorw temptacyon of þe Deuyl of thyngys þat sche was neuyr gylty in* (Kempe 32, 30) are of course very different. Evidently, *gylty* is part of a 'be+predicate' structure which can be discontinued, as in the present case, by the intervening presence of an adverb like *neuyr*. Cf. also the type 'make much of': *So anone within a whyle the kynge and the quene and all the courte undirstood that hit was sir Tramtryste that smote downe sir Palamydes, and than was he muche made of, more than he was tofore* (Arthur 389, 9). It is obvious that this structure could not be handled as *fill the glass with water*, for example.

such folc was ariued. as me sede vp his londe (Robert of Gloucester 362), *Efter þe messecos hwon þe preost sacreð þer uorziteð al þene world ꓘ þer beoð al vt bodi. þer in sperclinde luue bicluppeð oure leofmon* (Anc. Riwle 14, 31).

TABLE OF CONTEXT-PATTERN CORRELATION[85]

OE.	ME.
1. A	1. A, (C), /C/
2. D (upon the base SVO)	2. (C) preceding object or non-preceding long object), D (upon the base SVO)
3. (Ø)	3. (C)
4. (Ø)	4. (Ø)
5a. (C)	5a. (Ø)
6a. (Ø)	6a. (Ø)
6b. B, D (upon the base VP)	6b. B, D (upon the base VP)
7. (D) (direct questions, whether non-negative or negative)	7. (D) (direct questions, whether non-negative or negative)
8. A	8. A, (C) (relative clauses)
9. A, /C/	9. A
10. A, B (in the case of an inflected infinitive), /C/	10. A, B (in the case of an inflected infinitive)
11. A, B (in the case of an inflected infinitive)	11. A, B (in the case of an inflected infinitive), /C/
12. A	12. A
13. A	13. A
14. A(¹)	14. A, /C/
15. A (in the case of a finite form), B (in the case of an infinitive complementing a noun or in the case of a final inflected infinitive)	15. A (in the case of a finite form), B (in the case of an infinitive complementing a noun or in the case of a final inflected infinitive)

TEXT REFERENCES[86]

Ælfric, Genesis=Crawford, S. J. 1922. *The Old English Heptateuch*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 160.

Ælfric, Homs.=Thorpe, B. 1844 - 46. *The homilies of the Anglo-Saxon church; the first part containing the homiles of Ælfric or "Sermones Catholici"*. Vols. 1 and 2. London: Ælfric Society.

Ælfric, Lives of Saints=Skeat, W. W. 1881, 1890. *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 76, 94.

Ælfric, Numbers=Crawford (1922).

Anc. Riwle=Day, M. 1952. *The English text of the Ancrene Riwle*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 225.

Anglo-Saxon Gospels=Skeat, W. W. 1871 - 87. *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Apollonius=Goolden, P. 1958. *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Arth. & Merlin=Kölbing, E. 1968. *Arthour and Merlin*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Arthur (Morte Darthur)=Vinaver, E. 1947. *The works of Sir Thomas Malory*. Vols. 1 and 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Audelay Poems=Whiting, E. K. 1930. *The poems of John Audelay*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 184.

Bede=Miller, T. 1890, 1891. *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical history of the English people*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 95, 96.

Beow.=Wrenn, C. L. 1958. *Beowulf with the Finnesburg fragment*. London: Harrap.

Blick. Homs.=Morris, R. 1874. *The Blickling homilies*. Part 1. London; Oxford University Press, EETS 58.

Boece=Robinson, F. N. 1957. *The works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. London: Oxford University Press. L=Liber, M=Metrum, P=Prosa.

Boethius=Sedgefield, W. J. 1899. *King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius' De consolatione philosophiae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bury Wills=Tymms, S. 1850. *Wills and inventories from the registers of the commissary of Bury St. Edmunds and the Archdeacon of Sudbury*. London: Camden Society 49.

Charms=Grein, C. W. M. and R. P. Wülcker. 1883. *Das Beowulfslied nebst den kleineren epischen, lyrischen, didaktischen und geschichtlichen stücken*. Kassel: Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie 1.

Cura Past.=Sweet, H. 1871. *King Alfred's West-Saxon version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 45.

Dial. Greg.=Hecht, H. 1900. *Bischofs Waerferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Leipzig: Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 5.

Dream of the Rood=Swanton, M. 1970. *The dream of the rood*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

EEPs=*Anglo-Saxon and Early English psalter*. Vols. 16 and 19. 1843. London: Surtees Society.

Gawain=Waldron, R. A. 1970. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. London: Edward Arnold.

Guth.=Goodwin, Ch. W. 1848. *The Anglo-Saxon version of the Life of St. Guthlac, hermit of Crowland*. London: John Russel Smith.

Hampole Ps.=Bramley, H. R. 1844. *Hampole psalter, psalms and canticles with a commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jeremiah=Pollard, A. W. 1911. *The Holy Bible: an exact reprint in Roman type, page for page of the Authorized Version published in the year 1611*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kempe=Meech, S. B. and H. E. Allen. 1940. *The book of Margery Kempe*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 212.

Laȝ.=Madden, F. 1947. *Lazamons Brut, or Chronicle of Britain*. London: Society of Antiquaries of London.

---

[85] Note that ( )=half-way between contextual restriction and stylistic variation, (__)=a relative determining factor without acquiring full restrictive force, //=the only cases recorded in the corpus although not necessarily the only possibilities, (Ø)=no clear determination. (1) This does not necessarily imply Σ (1). (2) We could still formulate the transformational capacity from context to context, but such an analysis is not absolutely verifiable when we deal with past states of language.

[86] The numbers of the quotations refer to line in verse texts and to page and line in prose texts. In the case of the *Towneley Plays* the Roman numerals indicate the number of the play. The *O. E. Chronicle* is quoted by year and page.

Leechdoms=Cockayne, O. 1864 - 66. *Leechdoms, wortcunning, and starcraft of early England*. Vol. 2. London: Rolls Series 35.

O. E. Chron.=Plummer, C. 1892. *Two of the Saxon chronicles parallel with supplementary extracts from the others on the basis of an edition by John Earle*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (a.=anno).

Orosius=Sweet, H. 1883. *King Alfred's Orosius*. London: OUP, EETS 79.

Paris Ps. (Paris Psalter)=Bright, J. W. and R. L. Ramsay. 1907. *Liber psalmorum, the West-Saxon psalms*. Boston: D. C. Heath Company.

Parl. of Fowls (The parliament of fowls)=Robinson (1957).

Pearl=Gordon, E. V. 1953. *Pearl*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Piers=Knott, T. A. and D. C. Fowler. 1952. *Piers the Plowman, a critical edition of the A-version*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Riddle=Tupper, F. 1968. *The riddles of the Exeter Book*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Rose (The romaunt of the rose)=Robinson (1957).

Rymer, Foedera=Rymer, Th. and R. Sanderson. 1704 - 35. *Foedera, conventiones, literae et cujuscunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis imperatores, reges, pontifices, principes vel communitates (1101 - 1654)*. London.

Sowd. of Bab.=Hausknecht, E. 1881. *Charlemagne romances: 5. The Sowdone of Babylone*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 38.

St. Cuthb.=Fowler, J. T. 1891. *The life of saint Cuthbert in English verse*. London and Durham: Surtees Society 87.

St. Katherine=Einenkel, E. 1884. *The life of saint Katherine*. London: OUP, EETS 80.

Tempest (The tempest)=Harbage, A. 1969. *William Shakespeare, the complete works*. London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press.

Town. Plays=England, G. and A. W. Pollard. 1897. *The Towneley plays*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 71.

Troilus (Troilus and Criseyde)=Robinson (1957).

Vesp. Ps. (Vespasian psalter and hymns)=Sweet, H. 1885. *The oldest English texts*. London: Oxford University Press, EETS 83.

Wint. Tale (The winter's tale)=Harbage (1969).

Wyclif=Forshall, J. and F. Madden. 1850. *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the earliest English versions ... by John Wycliffe and his followers*. London: McMillan and Co.

Delbrück, B. 1919. *Germanische Syntax*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: B. C. Teuhner.

Gardner, F. F. 1972. *An analysis of syntactic patterns of Old English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Huchon, R. 1923. *Histoire de la langue anglaise*. Vol. 1. Paris: A. Colin.

Kunsmann, P. 1973. *Verbale Gefüge. Transformationsgrammatische Untersuchungen im Deutschen und im Englischen*. Munich: M. Huober.

McCawley, J. 1970. "English as a VSO language". *Language 46*. 286 - 299.

Mitchell, B. 1964. "Syntax and word-order in 'The Peterborough Chronicle' 1122 - 1154". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 65*. 113 - 144.

REFERENCES

Bacquot, P. 1962. *La structure de la phrase verbale à l'époque alfrédienne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

de la Cruz, J. M. 1970. "Nota sobre el diverso grado de adverbialización en las partículas del verbo preposicional inglés". *Filología Moderna 39*. 339 - 340.

de la Cruz, J. M. 1972a. "The Latin influence on the Germanic development of the English phrasal verb". *English philological studies 13*. 1 - 42.

de la Cruz, J. M. 1972b. "The origins of the Germanic phrasal verb". *Indogermanische Forschungen 77/1*. 73 9 96.

de la Cruz, J. M. 1973a. "A late 13th century change in English structure". *Orbis 22/1*. 161 - 176.

de la Cruz, J. M. 1973b. "Notas para el estudio del desarrollo angloescandinavo de los verbos preposicionales. Los datos del inglés antiguo y medio". *Revista española de lingüística 3/2*. 369 - 413.