

STUDIES IN ENGLISH MEDIEVAL LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Edited by Jacek Fisiak

20

Alexander Bergs/Janne Skaiffari (eds.)

The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle

This book is the first (linguistic) publication which exclusively focuses on one of the most famous and important documents in the history of English: the Early Middle English 'Peterborough Chronicle'. This book contains 10 original and hitherto unpublished papers which deal with phonological, orthographic, morphosyntactic and lexical aspects pertaining to this special manuscript. Moreover, one section is exclusively devoted to teaching the history of English on the basis of the Peterborough Chronicle.

Alexander Bergs is professor and chair of English Language and Linguistics at the University of Osnabrück.
Janne Skaiffari is senior lecturer (acting) at the University of Turku.
www.peterlang.de



PETER LANG

Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften

**STUDIES IN ENGLISH MEDIEVAL
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

Edited by Jacek Fisiak

Advisory Board:

John Anderson (Melthoni, Greece), Ulrich Busse (Halle),
Olga Fischer (Amsterdam), Richard Hogg (Manchester),
Dieter Kastovsky (Vienna), Marcin Krygier (Poznań),
Roger Lass (Cape Town), Peter Lucas (Cambridge),
Donka Minkova (Los Angeles), Ruta Nagucka (Cracow),
Akio Oizumi (Kyoto), Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe (Notre Dame, USA),
Matti Rissanen (Helsinki), Hans Sauer (Munich),
Liliana Sikorska (Poznań), Jeremy Smith (Glasgow),
Jerzy Welna (Warsaw)

Vol. 20

Alexander Bergs/Janne Skaiffari (eds.)

**The Language of the
Peterborough Chronicle**



PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien



PETER LANG

Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at <<http://www.d-nb.de>>.

ISSN 1436-7521
ISBN 978-3-631-56454-7

© Peter Lang GmbH
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
Frankfurt am Main 2007
All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Germany 1 2 3 4 5 7
www.peterlang.de

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ALEXANDER BERGS & JANNE SKAFFARI Invitation to the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> and its language	5
MALASREE HOME <i>The Peterborough Chronicle</i> in context	13
BETTY S. PHILLIPS Æ-raising in the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i>	29
ALEXANDER BERGS Spoilt for choice? <THE> problem <PE> in <DE> <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i>	45
AGNIESZKA PYSZ The usage of demonstratives in the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> against the background of the Old English paradigm	57
CYNTHIA L. ALLEN The case of the genitive in the <i>Peterborough Continuations</i>	77
ELLY VAN GELDEREN Accelerated grammaticalization in the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i>	93
LYNN SIMS Do the verb-movement patterns in the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> reflect the influence of a Northern dialect?	111
BRIDGET DRINKA The periphrastic perfect in early English: Evidence from the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i>	135
OLIVER M. TRAXEL Linking Old English and Middle English: The <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> as an introductory tool to the History of English	163
CAROL PERCY 'To HEL with PC': Teaching 'The History of the English Language' with the <i>Peterborough Chronicle</i> in North America	175
Index	193

INVITATION TO THE *PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE* AND ITS LANGUAGE

ALEXANDER BERGS & JANNE SKAFFARI

Universität Osnabrück University of Turku

1 "Everybody loves the *Peterborough Chronicle*"

The *Peterborough Chronicle* (PetC) is undoubtedly one of the best-known vernacular English texts dating from the centuries between *Beowulf* and the *Canterbury Tales*. The *Peterborough* manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is an extraordinary and invaluable example of English writing in the twelfth century – a period following the political and cultural watershed of the Norman Conquest (1066), during which very few new vernacular texts were produced in England. Many historical linguists and/or philologists, especially those interested in the transition from Old to Middle English, have found the PetC an excellent source of data. In fact, a prominent teacher and researcher of English historical linguistics said to one of the editors of the present volume in 2000, "Everybody loves the *Peterborough Chronicle*". The positive reactions prompted by mentioning the text to scholars connected with medieval English studies suggest that perhaps to know the PetC is to love the PetC. This volume is testament to the fact that the language of the PetC has not ceased to attract the attention of researchers.

The PetC is, moreover, familiar to virtually everyone teaching the history of English, for whom it provides a perfect illustration of the earliest Middle English. It is one of those texts that have an ever-growing audience at various institutions of higher education – and not just in English-speaking countries. A quick look at a few randomly selected textbooks of Middle English or the history of English reveals that the PetC is a popular sample text. Among the passages in the chronicle there is one entry that seems to be a particular favourite: 1137. When introducing the subject matter of this entry, Burrow and Turville-Petre (1996: 75) refer to "terrible years" and "cruelties [...]" so barbarous that men concluded that Christ was asleep". The reasons for the choice of this particular 'year' as teaching material by many textbook writers and teachers can be said to reflect the motivations for the overall interest in the PetC: the enticing content, which has great historical interest and a wealth of fascinating – and sometimes horrific – details, is interlaced with the lure of the language, which is clearly indicative of the onset of the Middle English period (but can also be used as an example of late Old English), and the attractive style, which is at times dramatic and personal to an extent that is extraordinary in the chronicle genre.

In this first chapter of *The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle* we shall introduce the PetC on a general level and, furthermore, the history and structure of this book. All the aspects of the PetC that are relevant and interesting – linguistic, textual, historical – cannot, however, be discussed in great detail here; such information is easily accessed in recent editions (see below) and other scholarly work, including the papers in this volume.

2 The Chronicle

As one of the seven surviving versions the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ASC), the PetC is an important part of the tradition of vernacular English historiography. It covers a huge range of topics from national – and sometimes international – politics and history to local events touching the lives of the scribes who wrote the text, even weather conditions. The ASC can only be described as a complex historical record, but a very brief overview of this medieval genre and the textual relationships of the English chronicles will suffice here, as such issues have already been thoroughly discussed elsewhere. Susan Irvine (2004: xxxii–ci) alone devotes seventy pages to the links between the PetC and the other versions of ASC as well as other medieval texts.

The ASC is the earliest national chronicle written in a western vernacular language (e.g. Swanton 1996: xx). 'Vernacular' is the key word here: there were such notable Latin chroniclers in the Anglo-Saxon period as Bede and Gildas (e.g. Matheson 1998: 184). While it has been proposed that the compilation of the first ASC was perhaps initiated by Alfred the Great (Plummer 1899: civ), or at least inspired by him, the initiator of the project remains unknown. The chronicle can nevertheless be said to be linked to this great king of Wessex through his late-ninth-century revival of English learning (Swanton 1996: xviii). The versions of the ASC, labelled with letters from A to G, grew out of this cultural and literary achievement.

The oldest surviving manuscript of the chronicle is 'A', the Parker Chronicle (e.g. Bately 1986). The E manuscript of the ASC is commonly called the Peterborough Chronicle; as it survives in Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 636, it is also known as the 'Laud manuscript'. The PetC is the version spanning furthest into the post-Conquest era; of the other manuscripts, C ends at 1066 and only A and D stretch somewhat beyond that (e.g. Whitelock 1954: 27–28). The complicated connections between all of these manuscripts can be exemplified by noting that G was copied from A, that there are textual links between B and C, that E (along with C) has connections with D and that F derives from A but is also related to the history of E (Irvine 2004: xxxii–xxxiii). A northern version of the ASC is the source of MSS. E and D (e.g. Cubbin 1996: xxvi).

The PetC itself can be divided into major sections in at least two different ways. Clark (1970: xv–xvii) does this palaeographically, accounting for three parts: (1) The annals until 1121 are homogeneous in writing. (2) The section

from 1122 to 1131 consists of six blocks, but the changes in the styles of writing are not definitive; Clark finds a single scribe more likely than a succession of writers here. (3) The entries from 1132 to 1154 are in a hand that differs from the one(s) of the preceding section. The 1122 to 1131 part of the PetC is traditionally referred to as the *First Continuation* (henceforth PetC-1), and the final part is known as the *Final Continuation* (PetC-2); they stand out from the part up to 1121, the copied Old English entries of the PetC (PetC-0), and as Matheson (1998:185) writes, "represent the conclusion of the vigorous OE tradition of prose chronicle writing". It is practical to consider the three sections of the manuscript separately in studies of the language of the PetC, although there are grounds for making a simpler division based on scribal criteria. Irvine (2004: xviii–xix) agrees with recent research that there were only two scribes who wrote the text of the Peterborough manuscript – the first one responsible for the majority of the entries (until 1131), the second one for PetC-2. The first scribe seems to have copied and updated the annals until 1121 and subsequently made new entries into the chronicle in the following years. The second scribe's output consists of a single block of text rather than separately added entries. Worth noting in the work of the first scribe is the material interpolated in the copied entries, known as the Peterborough Interpolations: included in the entries from 654 to 1116, there are altogether twenty passages that stand out from the Old English annals in terms of their language and content (Irvine 2004: xc–xcviii).

Be they narratives or year-by-year annals, medieval chronicles had in their day a utilitarian function as historical sources, and they now provide modern readers with information about history as well as the chroniclers' and their audiences' awareness about the world around them (Matheson 1998:184). This is very true of the PetC as well: its coverage of both local and national history also reveals some of the scribes' reactions to the events of their time. This applies particularly to the continuations: as Clark (1970: xxiv–xxvi) remarks, PetC-1 was apparently composed nearly contemporaneously with the events described in it – which would explain the flavour of topicality in the entries – and the annals making up PetC-2, probably entered into the chronicle right after the last year mentioned in the chronicle, were arranged more by topic than by date, which can be taken to suggest the writer's consciousness about the connections between the events he describes. The copied Old English annals of PetC-0 are less rich in this respect.

The transmission of the chronicle and the connections between the PetC and other texts are topics discussed further in the next chapter (Home, this volume).

3 The Scholarship

It is almost impossible to imagine a research paper dealing with Early Middle English that would not make reference to the PetC. As the bibliographies in this volume testify, it has attracted considerable scholarly interest for more than one

hundred years (an early example is Behm 1884, essentially a list of phonological and inflectional forms found in the text), and the body of literature drawing from and based on the PetC is constantly growing. Much of the scholarship is based on editions of the text rather than the manuscript itself.

The latest edition of the PetC is by Susan Irvine, who in 2004 published Volume 7 in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, comprising at that time eight volumes published between 1983 and 2001. There is no doubt that Irvine (2004) is now the standard edition of the PetC, a title previously held by Clark (1970) and, for the whole text, Plummer (1892-99). Irvine's is a full edition of MS. E whereas Cecily Clark's work (1970) only covers the post-Conquest part from 1070 to the end of the PetC, i.e. approximately forty per cent of MS. E.

Clark's partial edition was preceded in 1954 by the facsimile of the manuscript, edited by Dorothy Whitelock, but the history of editing the PetC goes much beyond the last half-century. The text of MS. E was first included in an edition of the ASC in 1692, followed by three editions in the nineteenth century, most notably Plummer's parallel edition of MSS. A and E at the end of that century (Irvine 2004: xvii).

The PetC has also been translated into Present-Day English. The first translation of the E text was Rositzke (1951), which, however, contains some errors according to Whitelock (1954: 35). A selective translation of the ASC by Whitelock (1965) contains also material from the PetC. Similarly, the E text is well represented in a recent chronicle translation by Swanton (1996).

Discussing the scholarship continues below, with reference to the language of the PetC.

4 The Language

Some of the linguistic features of the PetC will now be briefly described. Generally speaking, much attention has been paid to the transitional character or 'modernity' (or not) of its words and structures. Of the different levels of language, the syntax of the PetC has been discussed by, for example, Mitchell (1964) and Shores (1971), vocabulary by Knieza (1993, 1994), and issues of orthography and phonology by Phillips (1995, 1997). For a fuller picture of the language of this text we refer to the chapters of this volume and their bibliographies as well as the introductions in the editions by Susan Irvine and Cecily Clark.

The dialect(s) of the PetC provide a natural starting point for a linguistic survey. Clark (1970: xli-lix) writes that PetC-0 is basically written in the standard written English of the late OE period and therefore hardly reflects current speech. The conservatism applies not only to spelling but also to grammar where dialectal indications are uncommon. The language of the continuations is not at all as conservative, although it has also been influenced by West Saxon: it is

clearly marked by the dialect of the East Midlands, in particular in its morphology. PetC-1 and PetC-2 were composed by monks at the Abbey of Peterborough, by men who are likely to have been locals (Clark 1970: xxxvii). Susan Irvine, the latest editor of the chronicle, does not disagree with Clark on the dialectal differences of the copied annals and the continuations.

The words contained in the PetC have attracted a fair amount of attention: particularly the late entries are rich in examples of fresh loans dating from the transition from Old to Middle English and have therefore provided a valuable source of material for many studies (for example, the classic Serjeantson 1935). In the newest edition of the PetC the topic of lexis (and proper nouns) is treated very concisely on a few lines of commentary followed by a short list of lexical differences between MS. E and the other versions of the ASC (Irvine 2004: clxiii-clxvi). Clark (1970: xlv, lxii-lix, lxviii-lix) points out the conservative character of the PetC-0 vocabulary and the great number of obsolescent OE words. In PetC-2, the number of Romance words increases and also many Scandinavian-derived words appear. Scandinavian loans occur to a lesser extent in PetC-1. Even before her first edition of the PetC, Cecily Clark published a detailed lexical study of the text (Clark 1952: 53), in which she observes that the number of loanwords is remarkable, particularly in PetC-1 and PetC-2. A large number of loans are what she calls Franco-Latin: it is likely that most loanwords referring to administration and church affairs were directly borrowed from the current Latin, which was a language of government and scholarship. Many feudal and social terms occurring in the PetC are loanwords from French. Some early Scandinavian loans appear also in the Old English PetC-0. A later quantitative study (Skaffari 2002) observes that in terms of the proportions of Latin, Scandinavian and French loans, PetC-1 bears a greater resemblance to the copied PetC-0 than to the subsequent PetC-2.

Many structural features of the PetC – ranging from phonology to syntax – are discussed in the chapters of the present volume. In earlier research, both remnants of Old English grammar and changes towards Middle English have typically been identified; it is particularly the language of PetC-2 that has been singled out as different from the earlier parts of the text. Clark's comment on the syntax of the continuations is worth citing: "Before our eyes English is beginning to change from a synthetic language to an analytic one" (Clark 1970: lxxiii). Syntax and morphology are intertwined in this type of change, affecting word order (verb-movement is discussed in the present volume by Sims). The morphological features of PetC-2 suggest a transition from Old English, which is nonetheless already visible – even if to a lesser extent – in PetC-0 and PetC-1, written by the first scribe who is more likely to exhibit contemporary practices (such as the loss of dative inflections in nouns) in PetC-1 and the interpolations than in the genuinely copied parts of his text (Irvine 2004: cxxxix- cxliii, cxliiv). In the present volume, Allen discusses another case, the genitive, and ar-

gues that it had not been lost as a case in the language of the second scribe, although it was becoming more restricted in use. Orthographically, both the work of the first scribe (the majority of the text) and that of the second scribe (PetC-2) mostly conform to the late West Saxon standard, with some variation in the forms (Irvine 2004:civ-cvii). Phillips (this volume) points out that certain spellings particular to the continuations reflect the scribes' East Midland dialect.

How are the three parts of the PetC then to be labelled diachronically? This question is worth asking even if it overlaps with the issue of dialect, discussed above. Irvine's (2004:ciii) linguistic description of the PetC starts from the observation that the copied PetC-0 is essentially late West Saxon (standard Old English) and the continuations are early Middle English of the East Midland variety. Clark's (1970: xli-xxiv) analysis is similar but goes further in suggesting a three-way division. PetC-0 is (late) Old English, but the language of PetC-1 is Middle rather than Old English: in unstressed syllables vowels are fairly often obscured, and the declensional system appears to be in the process of simplification. Following this "Early Middle English" part of the chronicle, PetC-2 is then "incontrovertibly Middle English" (Clark 1970: lii); it evidently displays the contemporary language usage at Peterborough. Its orthography has been influenced by French and Latin, which is implied by some new spelling variants; phonological and grammatical innovations continue as well. In this volume, Pysz shows that the differences in demonstrative pronouns between PetC-0, PetC-1 and PetC-2 neatly illustrate the stage-by-stage changes through the parts of the chronicle, and van Gelderen, looking at grammaticalization, finds proof for PetC-2 being clearly Middle English. However, scholars have not unanimously agreed with this type of diachronic classification of the language of the PetC: a case in point is the syntax of the continuations, which Mitchell (1964) regards as on the whole fairly conservative. It is nevertheless typical that at least the final entries of the PetC are regarded as (early) Middle English: for example, Laing (1992: 566) considers 1150 as the beginning of the ME period to be able to include these annals in the material for the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English*, and in the *Middle English Dictionary* the earliest citations of early ME words are not seldom from the PetC. PetC-2 has thus been seen as the first text written in Middle English.

5 This Volume

Most of the following chapters stem from the workshop on the PetC which the editors hosted at the 13th International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Vienna, 2004). In addition, contributions on topics that were not specifically addressed at the workshop (for example, the historical background) were invited in order to make the coverage more rounded. The objective of the book has been to bring together scholars working on various aspects of the PetC and to inform a broader audience about current issues in their work. In terms of scope, *The*

Language of the Peterborough Chronicle thus combines a single central subject – the PetC – and a variety of theoretical and practical approaches, methods and theories, which makes the volume diverse and focused at the same time: the basis for discussion remains the same for all chapters, while the questions asked and approaches used can be radically different.

The collection comprises ten individual papers as well as this introduction and a general index. The first chapter (by Malasree Home) provides an introduction to the historical and literary background of the chronicle, followed by papers on phonological (Betty S. Phillips), orthographical (Alexander Bergs), morphological (Agnieszka Pysz), syntactic (Cynthia L. Allen, Elly van Gelderen, Lynn Sims) and comparative issues (Bridget Drinka). There may seem to be a gap in the range covered by this volume in that no papers focusing on lexis are included here, but this level of language received more attention than any other individual level in the previous section, with references to some sources of further information (most importantly Cecily Clark's introduction and her classic study of the PetC words).

As the text under scrutiny is frequently used in higher education, two chapters are devoted to this topic: one discusses the use of the PetC in teaching the history of English at university-level in Europe (Oliver M. Traxel), the other in the United States (Carol Percy). Traxel shows that the PetC provides good material for teaching both Old and (early) Middle English as well as linguistic change. However, as Percy points out, the text – with all the variation and change it exhibits – may be too complex for shorter courses on the history of English, and it also competes with texts whose content is more familiar to the students and texts with a recognized literary rather than historical or linguistic value. More work can still be done to promote the use of the PetC in universities.

Whether you are interested in historical or general linguistics, philology, medieval literature, history or pedagogy, we are pleased to invite you to explore the following chapters – and the language of the Peterborough Chronicle.

References

- Bately, Janet (ed.). 1986. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS A*. Brewer.
 Behn, O.P. 1884. *The Language of the Later Part of the Peterborough Chronicle*. Ph.D. diss. Gothenburg.
 Burrow, J. A. and Thorlac Turville-Petre. 1996. *A Book of Middle English*. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
 Clark, Cecily. 1952-53. *Studies in the Vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle*, 1070-1154. *English and Germanic Studies* V: 67-89.
 Clark, Cecily (ed.). 1970. *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [First edition published in 1958.]
 Cubbin, Geoffrey P. (ed.). 1996. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS D*. Cambridge: Brewer.
 Irvine, Susan (ed.). 2004. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS E*. Cambridge: Brewer.
 Kaizsa, Veronika. 1993. The post-conquest lexical elements in the *Peterborough Chronicle*. *Vienna English Working Papers* 2(2): 82-90.

- Knieza, Veronika. 1994. The Scandinavian elements in the vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle. *English Historical Linguistics* 1992: *Papers from the 7th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 113), ed. by Francisco Fernández, Miguel Fuster and Juan José Calvo (eds.), 235-245. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Laing, Margaret. 1992. A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English: The value of texts surviving in more than one version. *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics* (Topics in English Linguistics, 10, ed. by Matti Rissanen, Ossi Ihalaainen, Terttu Nevalainen and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.)), 566-581. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matheson, Lister M. 1998. Chronicles. In Szarmach, Paul E., M. Teresa Tavormina & Joel T. Rosenthal (eds.), *Medieval England: An Encyclopedia* (Garland Encyclopedias of the Middle Ages, 3). New York & London: Garland, 184-186.
- Middle English Dictionary*. 1956-2001. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1964. Syntax and word-order in the *Peterborough Chronicle* 1122-1154. Reprinted in Mitchell, Bruce. 1988. *On Old English: Selected Papers*. Oxford: Blackwell, 221-242.
- Rositzke, Harry A. (transl.). 1951. *The Peterborough Chronicle*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Phillips, Betty S. 1995. Lexical diffusion as a guide to scribal intent: A comparison of ME <eo> vs. <e> spellings in the *Peterborough Chronicle* and the *Ormulum*. *Historical Linguistics* 1993: *Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Henning Andersen, (ed.), 379-386. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Phillips, Betty S. 1997. *The Peterborough Chronicle* Diphthongs. *Studies in Middle English Linguistics* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 103.), ed. by Fisiak, Jacek (ed.), 429-438. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Plummer, Charles (ed.). 1892-1899. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others: A Revised Text on the Basis of an Edition by John Earle*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1935. *A History of Foreign Words in English*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Shores, David L. 1971. *A Descriptive Syntax of the Peterborough Chronicle from 1122 to 1154*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Skaffari, Janne. 2002. The Non-Native Vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle. *Middle English from Tongue to Text. Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English: Language and Text, held at Dublin, Ireland, 1-4 July 1999* (Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 4), ed. by Peter J. Lucas and Angela M. Lucas (eds.), 235-246. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Swanton, Michael J. (transl.). 1996. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London: J.M. Dent.
- Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.). 1954. *The Peterborough Chronicle (The Bodleian Manuscript Laud Misc. 636)*, with an Appendix by Cecily Clark (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, 4). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.
- Whitelock, Dorothy with David C. Douglas and Susie I. Tucker (eds.). 1965. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation*. Second (corrected) impression. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. [Originally published 1961.]

THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE IN CONTEXT

MALASREE HOME

Trinity College Cambridge

1 Introduction

The Peterborough Chronicle or the E version of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* is perhaps best known because of its 'lateness'. It was compiled at Peterborough Abbey around 1121, by which time all the other *Chronicle* versions had ceased to be actively maintained. Around 1075 the A text had already changed its linguistic identity and was written into as the Latin *Acta Lanfranci*. During the late eleventh or early twelfth century, the B version is consulted and insertions made in the list of popes appended to this version, but the *Chronicle* text itself remains untouched (Taylor 1983: xxi). Version C shows evidence of conscious compilation and is perhaps written into in the twelfth century in an effort to preserve the manuscript when eight lines of text are written in the hand of a twelfth-century scribe s.a. 1066 (Conner 1996: xxix-xxx). There is no definite evidence that it was actively continued by inserting post-Conquest annals around that time. D seems to be a compilation which is sporadically kept up. At around 1130, only one entry is added, and if there were any efforts to continue D, they are not apparent (Cubbin 1996). The compiler of the bilingual F-text accessed and modified a version of the proto-E which subsequently became the base text of the extant E version (Baker 2000). How far F was actively maintained is not known as it ends mutilated in 1058.

The *Chronicle* version obtained by Peterborough Abbey was modified by means of interpolations, it was further continued at Peterborough in two distinct phases: the First Continuation, which was written till 1131, and the Second Continuation, written about twenty years or so after the First Continuation, around 1154/55 (Irvine 2004: xviii-xxiii). However, the importance of *The Peterborough Chronicle* lies not only in the fact that it extends its narrative beyond the other *Chronicle* narratives, but specifically because it can be located in a culturally significant zone of transitions. From the linguistic point of view, the language of the E text demonstrates features which characterise it as belonging to a stage moving towards the forms and syntax of Middle English. From the point of view of its genre, it is written at a time when historiographical texts are written more commonly in Latin than in the vernacular. As noted by Brett (1981: 101-26), Simeon of Durham wrote his history between 1104 and 1108, and Eadmer's *Historia Novorum* was written between 1095 and 1123. By 1129,

THE CASE OF THE GENITIVE IN THE PETERBOROUGH CONTINUATIONS

CYNTHIA L. ALLEN

Australian National University

1 Introduction

This paper looks at the evidence for genitive case as an inflectional category in the 'non-copied' parts of the PC, i.e. the Interpolations (the text which Irvine 2004 sets off in smaller print), PetC-1 and PetC-2. These texts are extremely valuable for any study of the mechanisms of the shift of English from a language marking grammatical relations morphologically to one relying on constituent order, as they represent temporally close stages in the decline of case morphology in the same dialect of EME.

To date there is no systematic study of these texts which will furnish the sort of data needed to test current linguistic theories concerning the relationship between morphology and syntax, specifically the question of how the **forms** used reflect underlying case **categories**. Irvine's (2004: cxxxix-cli) discussion of the case morphology of the PC catalogues the forms found for the definite determiner in the Interpolations and PetC-1, but presents the forms as representatives of the OE case and gender categories, a treatment which Jones (1988: 129-170), Clark (1970), Allen (1995: 169-177) and Millar (2000) agree is no longer the system commanded by these scribes, although they do not agree on what the underlying system really is. Clark (1970: lix-lxi) makes insightful comments about how the apparently chaotic forms can be made sense of by assuming that the scribe's own language extensively used the uninflected form, but it cannot be expected that a grammatical introduction to an edition of a text will go into the detail needed to determine the status of the genitive case. Thomas' (1931) pioneering study is still the mainstay of discussions of the decline of genitive inflection, and it remains useful in giving a broad picture of developments with adnominal possessives, such as the increase in the use of 'periphrastic genitives', i.e. *of* phrases at the expense of the prenominal genitive, but is of little use in giving a detailed picture of genitive inflection in the PC. First, Thomas does not differentiate PetC-1 from PetC-2, although he treats the Interpolations separately. Second, in his discussion of the loss of inflection on the definite determiner in genitives, Thomas lumps prenominal and periphrastic genitives together. This means that he treats *togeanes þe muneces of þe mynstre* 'against the monks of the monastery' at 1123 (quoted by Thomas p. 55) as an instance of loss of inflection of a determiner in the 'genitive'. Since the determiner of the

latter example would have dative case if any case were marked, such examples must be excluded from a study of genitive forms. Thomas' basic point was of course that the loss of inflection on determiners generally may have contributed to the replacement of pronominal genitives by periphrastic ones such as this one, but that question simply cannot be settled by a study which does not distinguish between pronominal and periphrastic genitives. The results of my own investigations, discussed below, indicate that inflection on the determiners of pronominal genitives was more carefully maintained by writers than inflection of the determiner in the periphrastic genitive, where the use of a preposition made dative inflection of the following determiner redundant.

Studies in which the focus is on the underlying system of case categories include Jones (1988), Allen (1995: 169-177), McFadden (2002), Millar (2000) and Polo (2002), but these studies are concerned more with the evidence for the retention of the dative/accusative distinction than the morphological status of the genitive case. This focus reflects the importance of the relationship between the loss of these categories and the fixing of the order of the direct and indirect object. However, we will not have an integrated picture of how the case marking system of English changed until the results of such studies are combined with a systematic investigation of the history of the genitive case.

The possessive marker in English is of particular interest to historical linguists because, as pointed out by Otto Jespersen (1894: 247, 1942: §17.1), the modern possessive *-s* is a different sort of morpheme from the Old English (OE) genitive inflection *-es*, which was uncontroversially a case inflection. The OE morpheme was highly selective in its phonological host, attaching only to the possessor N, and it displayed a high degree of morphophonemic idiosyncrasy, having several grammatically conditioned allomorphs. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) identify these as characteristics typical of inflections, not clitics. However, in the history of English the possessive marker became much less selective in its (phonological) host, appearing in what is usually called the 'group genitive,' e.g. *the king of France's daughter*, with the possessive marker at the end of the syntactic group containing the possessor rather than on the possessor N itself. This host need not even be a noun, in speech at least, as in *the man I saw yesterday's daughter*.¹ The modern morpheme is also clitic-like in its lack of idiosyncratic variation in form.² This change has attracted a great deal of interest by linguists. It appears to pose a problem for the widely assumed unidirectionality of

¹ The modern possessive marker is more restricted in its use than the OE genitive case, as discussed in various places below, but the uses of a morphological formative is a separate question from whether it is an inflection or a clitic.

² However, Zwicky (1987) argues that the Modern English POSS morpheme is an edge-located inflectional affix, rather than a clitic.

grammaticalisation if we regard a clitic as 'less grammatical' than an inflection; the more usual development is from more clitic-like to more inflection-like.

Another important development is the loss of the ability of verbs to select genitive objects. The genitive case was also used in other circumstances, such as the complement of adjectives or 'adverbially', in ways which became impossible in ME. Some current linguistic theories link these developments to the loss of case inflection ('deflexion') in very specific ways which will be discussed in section 3.³ Also of importance is the relationship between the loss of these uses of the genitive and the loss of the other 'inherent' case, the dative.

In this paper I present the results of an investigation into genitive case in the non-copied annals of the PC as a contribution towards the empirical base necessary for evaluating various theories concerning these developments. I focus on adnominal genitives, but will make some observations on other types and how they bear on the question of the nature of the genitive case in the non-copied annals in these texts. Section 2 is a brief discussion of forms and categories in the texts, and section 3 looks at genitives in detail. Since the Interpolations and PetC-1 were penned by a single scribe, it will be convenient to use the term 'Hand 1 additions' to refer to them together, but I will also address the question of how similar they were with respect to their use of genitives. The conclusions and some implications of the findings are discussed in section 4.

2 Forms and Categories in the non-copied annals

As has frequently been noted, the Hand 1 additions show great variation of forms, particularly in the definite determiner. There is disagreement on the case categories which these forms represent; see Clark's and Irvine's introductions and Millar (2000) on the non-historical uses as well as Allen (1995: 169-177) and Jones (1988: 129-170). Briefly, there is general agreement that *se* and *seo* can be treated as variants of the same form, as can *þa* and *þe*. Clark (1970: lxi) and Allen (1995: 172) treat *se(o)* as a hypercorrect substitution for the unflected form which would have been usual in the scribe's own speech. *Se(o)* is found where we would expect accusative, dative, or genitive forms, in addition to nominative contexts, and so *se*, *seo*, *þa*, and *þe* can all be regarded as forms which do not convey case information. The forms *þone*, *þam*, *þon*, *þan*, and *þere* seem to convey some case information because their appearance in contexts which historically called for either the dative or accusative case is too regular to be simply random (despite the existence of three examples of *þone* where nominative case would be expected). The use of these forms gives little evidence for the maintenance of a dative/accusative distinction (as opposed to a general object case; see Allen 1995: 173-175 and Millar 2000). Allen (1995: 176) suggests that the near restriction of *hine* to old accusative contexts indicates some feeling for a distinction between two types of (non-prepositional) objects on the part of the scribe, although there are a couple of 'mistaken' uses of *hine*

in old dative contexts (and also an instance of the plural accusative form *hi* in a dative context in *ic gife hi min curs* 'I give them my curse' at 675.59). It is likely that such a distinction was fairly archaic, rather like the attempt to use *whom* by some speakers of Modern English who do not use this form quite 'correctly' from a historical point of view but nevertheless are far from random in their usage.

Fortunately for our purposes, the forms used with genitive nouns do not present us with such problems. In the parts written by Hand 1, discussed in the next section, the genitive-marked forms are the least open to dispute of the case forms of the definite determiner. In PetC-2, the definite determiner shows no case information at all, and there is no evidence whatsoever for a dative/accusative distinction, although there are some remnants of case marking on the objects of prepositions.

Let us turn now to a closer scrutiny of genitive case in the three parts.

3 Genitive case in the non-copied annals

3.1 *Adnominal* genitives

For a discussion of the status of the possessive marker, which is never separated from the possessor N in any of the three parts, see section 4. There is no indication of a general move towards uninflected genitive nouns in these texts (such as is found in some northern dialects; see Klemola 1997 and Allen 1998), although there are some examples such as *On þes ilca Offa dæi* 'in this same Offa's day' at 777.12, where the lack of inflection can be attributed to the loss of final *-n*. Examples such as these as well as *Sancte Marie wefod* 'Saint Mary's altar' at 1123.12, where lack of inflection is inherited from OE, show that allomorphy is still alive in the genitive in the Hand 1 additions, although there is also a generalisation of *-es* to nouns which would earlier have been otherwise inflected in the singular, e.g. *cwenes* 'queen's' at 1123.65. This allomorphy is important because it is a characteristic associated with inflections rather than clitics. Unfortunately, in the all too brief PetC-2, there are no nouns in genitive functions which would show whether allomorphy is still present; *on midwintre dæi* 'on midwinter's day' at 1135.16 is likely to contain a fixed expression.

Allomorphy in the Hand 1 additions is evident in genitive plurals, such as *muneke* 'monks' at 777.5 and *fela oðre godre cnilite* 'many other good knights' at 1124.7-8. However, the extension of a single plural morpheme to the genitive is well advanced. Although *be al his gewiten ræd* 'by the advice of all his counsellors' at 656.7 fails to show the old genitive plural inflection, it can be treated as such an instance, since *gewiten* is a general plural form. Much more usually, it is *-es* which is so extended, e.g. *of peostas wifes* 'of priests' wives' at 1137.45-46. No genitive plural nouns are to be found in PetC-2, but this fact does not indicate a significant change from the Hand 1 additions, since there happen to be no examples in this short text, where a genitive plural noun would

be expected, apart from *Ne hi ne forbaren biscepes land ne abotes, ne preostas* 'nor did they spare the land of bishops, or of abbots, or of priests' at 1137.45-46.

Although most of the prenominal genitives found in these texts belong to semantic types which are still found in English, we find in both the Hand 1 additions some types which were possible in OE but disappeared later in ME. For example, *nanes cinneres deudom* 'no kind of service' or 'service of no kind' at 675.17-18 illustrates an obsolete construction with a preposed genitive. This construction is found frequently in the Hand 1 additions. It is not found in PetC-2, but neither is the more modern construction with *kind* as the head. Other examples of interest from Hand 1 include *for ðes mynstres holdscipe* 'out of loyalty to the monastery' at 1070.39, as well as *munchades man* 'a man of monastic degree, a monk' at 1123.21. Generally, we find fewer types of morphological genitives (as opposed to *of* phrases) in PetC-2, but the 'objective' genitive is found in all three parts, e.g. *ealle for þes biscepes luuen* 'all for the love of the bishop' at 1123.70-1 and *for ure Drihtines luue* 'for the love of our Lord' at 1137.75. However, replacement of these genitives by *of* phrases was underway, e.g. *for þe micel eie of him* 'for the great fear of him' at 1154.4.

The only other type of pre-head genitive found in PetC-2 which has disappeared from English is the partitive genitive with a pronoun, which is found in all three parts, but only once in each part; we have *here ealre* 'of all of them' at 675.54, *here elces riht hand* 'the right hand of each of them' at 1125.4, and *her nouþer* 'neither of them' at 1140.32. The use of adjectives in (pre-head) partitive constructions is found in the Hand 1 additions at *littles hwæt* 'of little value' at 1070.14, but is not found in PetC-2.

Postposition of genitives was declining in OE, and in our three parts, they are infrequent and severely limited as to type. There are only twelve examples in the Interpolations (a cluster of them in the 852 annal), three in PetC-1 and the single example *abuton nontid dætes* 'about the noon of the day' in PetC-2 at 1140.4. With the exception of *þas gewinnesse mines gifes* 'these witnesses of my gift' at 656.92, the examples all involve a part-whole or partitive relationship, as in the PetC-2 example just given and *xl marc goldes* 'forty marks of gold' at 1066.38 and *micel ungerime folces* 'a countless number of people' at 1123.82.

3.2 *Definite determiners*³

Case agreement of the definite determiner with a genitive noun is generally retained in the singular in both the Hand 1 additions. There are not enough examples of plural nouns modified by a definite determiner to make any definite statement about the frequency of specific genitive forms, as Table 1 shows.

³ I will use the term 'definite determiner' without implying that the form is to be treated as an article rather than the demonstrative. I will use the term 'proximal demonstrative' for *þes* 'this'.

	Def Det inflected for genitive	Def Det not inflected for genitive	Total
Interpolations	2	1	3
First Continuation	0	0	0

Table 1: Genitive inflection of plural definite determiners in PetC-1 and the Interpolations

The two genitive-inflected examples both have *þære*, while the single non-genitive form is *þa* (*þurh ealle þa muneke red* 'through the advice of the all monks' at 777), which is best treated as a form not marked for case, as discussed above.⁴ Irvine's comment (p. cl) that the form *þære* is used only as the adverb 'there' and not as a demonstrative in PetC-1 is correct, but this does not demonstrate a significant difference with the Interpolations. Given the complete lack of examples in PetC-1 in which a demonstrative modifies a plural genitive noun, it is impossible to say what the form of the demonstrative would be in such examples. The picture is clearer with the singular forms. Irvine (2004: cxlviii, cl) notes that the singular definite determiner is usually marked for genitive case when modifying a genitive noun in the Hand 1 additions, but as she does not indicate the number of instances of genitive-marked forms, it is not possible from her discussion either to determine the percentage of genitive forms in either text or to compare the two texts. Irvine comments (p. cl) that PetC-1 shows "more extensive loss of differentiation between the various genders and cases" than the Interpolations, but Clark (1970: footnote 1, p. xlv) defends her decision to treat the language of PetC-1 and of the Interpolations together on the basis that the two texts in general show similar developments, and Millar (1997: 163) notes that the use of *þe* in some of the Interpolations seems to be more advanced than in PetC-1, echoing Jones' (1988: 130) comment that a more innovative grammatical rule system underlies the Interpolations. It is therefore of some interest to compare the frequency of definite determiners modifying singular genitive nouns which are inflected for genitive case with those in the same function which are not so marked. This is done in Table 2.

	Def Det inflected for genitive	Def Det not inflected for genitive	Total
Interpolations	19 (83%)	4 (17%)	23
First Continuation	28 (93%)	2 (7%)	30

Table 2: Genitive inflection of singular def. Det in PetC-1 and the Interpolations

⁴ I have not included *seo myrcene biscop* (675.88) in these statistics because *seo* is more plausibly construed as modifying 'bishop' than as modifying the genitive plural *myrcene*; cf. *seo wurðfulle Æþelred Myrcene kying* at 675.10. Similarly with *ealle þa munece husas* at 1070.19. See the discussion of 'genitive reinterpretation' below.

The figures of Table 2 show that if anything, PetC-1 uses genitive determiners more conservatively than the Interpolations, but the difference is not statistically significant; a chi-square test gives a total chi-square of 1.492, with $p=222$, and with the continuity correction, chi square=.615, $p=.4331$.

The evidence strongly supports the conclusion that the scribe truly commanded a genitive form, which he used in preference to the uninflected determiner, also a possibility for him with genitive nouns. The singular genitive form was always some variant of the reflex of the old masculine and neuter singular form *þæs*; it is usually *þes*, sometimes *þæs*, and *þeos* is found once (at 656.75). There is unfortunately only one example of an adnominal genitive involving a definite determiner with a historically feminine noun in these two texts, *þes cwenes canceler* 'the queen's chancellor' at 1123.65, but this example suggests that *þæs/þes* was at least in the process of generalizing as the sole genitive form in the singular.

The lack of 'mistakes' that the scribe made with the genitive form contrasts with the non-historical forms that he used in other case contexts. We find plenty of instances where *þone* is used in non-historical situations, for example, but no instances where a reflex of an old genitive is used in the 'wrong' function.

In the Interpolations, the non-genitive forms are *se* (*be se ærcebiscepes red* 'by the archbishop's advice' at 656.7), *seo* (*seo kyinges Æðelredes geornunge* 'the request of King Athelred' at 675.13), and *þe* (*to þe cynges toll* 'to the king's toll' at 963.40-41 and *on þe cininges tune* at 777.19) and in PetC-1 we find *þa* ([...] *þær ða eorles sunu of Normandi & þes eorles dohter of Angeow wæron totwende* 'where the duke of Normandy's son and the count of Anjou's daughter were separated' at 1127.49-50) and *þone* (& *se kyng of France brohte þone eorles sunu Willelm of Normandi* 'and the king of France put forward William, the son of the duke of Normandy' at 1127.15). The only one of these which cannot be treated as simply unmarked for case is the last.⁵ Here *þone* appears to be agreeing with the head N, rather than with the genitive/N. Millar (2000: 239-246) treats such examples as instances of what he dubs "genitive reinterpretation," proposing an alternative to the usual view of the loss of genitive inflection of determiners as "the replacement of one form (*þæs*) by another (*þe*) in a number of genitive (particularly possessive) contexts" (p. 239). He suggests that this replacement does not in fact represent the use of different forms in the same syntactic context. Rather, most instances of *þe* in what appear to be genitive contexts represent a reanalysis in which the determiner is "no longer treated as

⁵ As an anonymous reviewer points out, the fact that *þone* is occasionally used in nominative contexts in this text, as mentioned above, suggests the possibility that it is indeed to be treated as an unmarked form. However, this use is so unusual (only three examples) that it seems better to me to assume that the object role of the larger phrase is behind the *þone* form in some way.

genitive." Following Mitchell (1985: §1323), Millar notes that there were two possible structures for a string consisting of a determiner followed by a noun in the genitive case followed by another noun:

- (1) [demonstrative [noun in genitive] noun] (Millar's 4-65, p. 242)
- (2) [[demonstrative in genitive noun in genitive] noun] (Millar's 4-65, p. 242)

Structure (2), in which the demonstrative agreed with the genitive noun, was by far the more common structure in OE, as Millar notes. Structure (1), where the demonstrative agrees with the head noun, was much less common except in expressions in which the genitive refers to the deity, e.g. *se godes engel* 'the angel of God.' For more details, see Mitchell's discussion. Millar claims (p. 244) that there was a reversal of these frequencies in ME, but does not support this claim with data.

PC is an ideal document for testing Millar's hypothesis that agreement with the head (henceforth head-agr) was more common than agreement with the genitive noun (gen-agr) in EME as an intermediate stage between majority gen-agr and no agreement at all, because PetC-2 represents the stage where the caseless form has completely taken over while PetC-1 represents the stage just before this, in the same dialect. The fact that there is only one instance of head-agr with a singular definite determiner in the Hand 1 additions compared with 47 examples of gen-agr (and five examples of no agreement with either) lends no support to the idea of genitive reinterpretation. The evidence suggests that in Peterborough at least, speakers went from a stage where gen-agr was the rule to a stage where gen-agr varied with an uninflected form (represented by the Hand 1 additions) to a stage where the uninflected form was the only possibility. I know of no evidence that things were different elsewhere. I know of only two examples of head-agr in the thirteenth century *Vices and Virtues* (edited by Holthausen 1889, 1921), for example, where forms inflected for both gender and genitive case are still the norm for determiners modifying a genitive noun.⁶

Unfortunately, no statistics are available, so far as I know, to compare the ratios of head-agr to gen-agr in OE and EME. Thomas (1931: 139-168) has a thorough discussion of head-agr patterns in OE and EME, and it is clear from his examples that head-agr is not in fact so unusual with nouns other than names of the deity in OE that it could be called rare. Unfortunately for us, while Thomas presents statistics for his head-agr types, he gives no figures for gen-agr

⁶ These examples were identified by Thomas (1931) in his Appendix II. Unfortunately Thomas' lumping together of pronominal and *af*-genitives obscures the near-obligatory nature of genitive case marking in the *Vices and Virtues* in the statistics which he gives p. 71, which show 49 per cent loss of inflection on the definite article in genitives in this text. The regular use of genitive forms is particularly striking in contrast with the common use of uninflected *þe* in non-genitive contexts; see Allen (1995: 190-1).

which would provide a comparison. If we combine Thomas' figures (pp. 133-148) for his types 1, 9, and 11 (the types relevant to us here), we find 107 examples of head-agr in the pre-1100 texts, and 61 examples in the post-1100 texts. These figures do not necessarily represent a decline of head-agr in EME, because the OE examples are taken from a larger corpus, but they certainly do not support the claim that there was an increase of head-agr in EME. More research is needed into the question of whether there was a change in the frequency or nature of head-agr in EME. It is worth noting that the bracketing of (1) need not be assumed to represent the phrase structure of examples like *þone eorles sunu*, even if we assume that the case marking in this example is not simply an error. Another possibility is to assume the phrase structure suggested by (2), with the additional assumption that genitive NPs could be 'transparent' to the case of the higher NP, so that the case assigned to the head noun could somehow percolate down to the determiner of the genitive NP to give a clearer marking of the grammatical function of the larger NP. However we analyse such phrases, it appears that the Hand 1 additions were by no means unusual in showing a preference for genitive marking on definite determiners modifying genitive nouns in EME.

To summarise, two important results stand out. First, no significant difference suggesting different underlying rule systems can be found between the Interpolations and PetC-1 where definite determiners modifying genitive nouns are concerned. The Hand 1 additions form a sharp contrast in this respect with PetC-2, where the definite determiner is incapable of agreeing in case with the noun it modifies. Second, the results strongly support the view that the genitive was retained as a morphological case by the Hand 1 scribe. The system that appears to be used in the Hand 1 additions is that while an uninflected form could be used to modify genitive nouns, a specifically genitive form was favoured; in the singular this was some variant of the reflex of *þæs*, while in the plural it was *þære*. It was also possible for the determiner to agree with the head N, rather than the genitive N, but this was highly unusual and not a change from OE.

3.3 Other modifiers

The near-regular inflection of the definite determiner for agreement with singular genitive nouns is enough to indicate that the genitive is still maintained as a morphological case in the Hand 1 additions. Further confirmatory evidence for the status of the genitive case comes from an examination of forms of modifiers other than definite determiners in these additions. While non-agreement with a genitive noun is the usual situation, we find examples in both PetC-1 and the Interpolations of agreement. As with the definite determiners, it does not seem possible to demonstrate a significant difference between the Interpolations and PetC-1 in this matter. Quantifiers with special genitive forms are illustrated by *ealre biscope curs* 'the curse of all bishops' at 675.53, *nanes cines ðeudom* 'no

kind of service' at 675.17-18, and the examples of *elces* from 1125.4 quoted above, while *fela oðre godre cnihite* at 1124.8 illustrates genitive inflection of a plural adjective, and *eall Cristenes folces* 'of all Christian folk' at 1131.38-9 shows that it was possible for an uninflected quantifier to co-occur with a genitive-inflected adjective. The only instance in which a possessive shows agreement with a genitive noun is *þas gewinnesse mines gifes* (656.92), given above as the sole example of a postpositioned non-partitive or part-whole genitive.

Such relics of the OE non-nominal genitive forms are not found in PetC-2, except for *alre fyrst* 'first of all' at 1135.17, which could be treated as a fixed expression. However, there is one respect in which PetC-2 is surprisingly conservative. There are three nouns in apposition with genitive nouns in PetC-2 in which the second noun is extraposed, e.g. *þe kinges sune Henries* 'the son of King Henry' at 1140.2. Rather surprisingly, no extraposed noun in apposition with a genitive clearly lacks genitive marking in PetC-2,⁷ making this text look more conservative than the Hand 1 additions, which have some clearly non-agreeing extraposed appositives, e.g. *þurh þes biscopes bene Aðelwolve*, 'through the prayer of Bishop Æthelwold' at 963.31-32, although agreement is more usual in this situation in these parts also. The non-agreeing examples are characteristic of later ME; for further discussion see Allen (2002). The small number of relevant examples makes it unclear whether such agreement was really the usual usage for the scribe of PetC-2, but the examples demonstrate that agreement was at least a possibility and thus provide evidence suggesting that the genitive was still a morphological case despite the disappearance of other sorts of agreement in PetC-2.

3.4 Other genitives

In OE, the genitive case was used in a number of non-adnominal situations. These uses have an important place in the discussion of the loss of the genitive as a morphological case, as will be discussed in section 4. In OE, verbs could govern genitive objects. Even in PetC-0, however, we find a trend towards replacement of genitive objects either by accusative objects or prepositional phrases ('genitive replacement'), although genitive objects remained possible in the early twelfth century; one is found as late as the 1120 annal. The difference with the Hand 1 additions is striking but is more likely to be due to a dialect difference between Hand 1 and whoever composed the 1120 annal than a sudden change in the Peterborough district. In these additions, there are no certain examples of genitive objects, and plenty of evidence of genitive replacement with the verbs *beniman*, *geornen*, *tyhtan*, and other verbs which either required or al-

⁷ In *Henri þe kinges brother Stephnes* 'Henry, the brother of King Stephen' at 1140.21, *nes* is indicated by an abbreviation, as Whitelock's (1954) facsimile shows. The abbreviation is ambiguous as to case.

lowed a genitive object in OE. There is one example, & *wile þes geornen þet* 'will ask for this, that [...]' at 656.57, which might have a genitive object. It is possible that *þes* is to be construed as the proximal demonstrative rather than as a genitive form. However, in Hand 1, *þes* is (otherwise) restricted to the determiner functions (i.e. it is always followed by N); the pronominal form is always *þis*. It thus seems possible that the scribe marginally had genitive objects as part of his grammar. There can be no doubt that genitive objects were at best moribund, however. It is tempting to link this fact to the fact that verbs no longer selected for dative objects in the Hand 1 additions either. However, it must be noted that even texts which preserved the selection of dative objects in EME lacked genitive objects (see Allen 1995: 217-19).

The genitive was also used in OE in the complements of quantifiers, in particular constructions. Some of the examples given above to illustrate other points also demonstrate that such uses were still found in the non-copied annals. In OE, it was usual for the genitive phrase to be positioned after the quantifier except for pronouns, which were normally in pre-position. This basic split is still found in the small number of relevant examples in the non-copied annals.⁸

Even in PetC-2, there are a few examples of genitives used 'adverbially,' e.g. *here þankes* 'willingly' and *here unþankes* 'unwillingly' at 1140.46. Here we have fixed expressions which historically consist of a noun meaning 'good will' or 'ill will' in the genitive case, modified by a possessive, meaning 'with their good/ill will.' In PetC-2, however, the adverbial use of genitives is limited to phrases that can be considered fixed expressions, as in the examples just discussed and in *alre fyrst* 'first of all' at 1135.17 and also *be nihtes & be dæies* 'by night and by day' at 1137.17. This contrasts with the Hand 1 additions, where there is frequent use of genitives in temporal phrases, e.g. in *þes ylces gearas* 'that same year' at 1123.82, where we also have a genitive inflection of the adjective (which differs from normal OE usage in having 'strong' inflection). Genitive inflection is not found in temporal expressions in PetC-2, and in the Hand 1 additions we often find a preposition supplementing the genitive inflection, as noted by Mitchell (1964: 143), e.g. *On þes ylces gearas forðferde se eadig biscop Ernulf* 'In the same year the blessed Bishop Ernulf died' at 1124.32.⁹ Nor is the genitive case the only case used in this situation; contrast the example just given with the dative inflection in & *on þisum ilcan geara forðferde Brand* 'and Brand died in this same year' at 1069. It is of interest to

⁸ Mitchell (1964: 116) contrasts *sune here þankes* at 1140.46 with *her nouþer* in the same annal to illustrate 'variation in the position of a pronoun in the genitive,' but it seems more likely that *here* is not the complement of *sune* but is the preposed complement of *þankes*. There are no indisputable examples of a postposed genitive pronoun in the texts under consideration.

⁹ Due to ambiguity of form, it is possible that the form *þes* represents the (uninflected) proximal determiner used with a noun and adjective which are inflected for the genitive.

kind of service' at 675.17-18, and the examples of *elces* from 1125.4 quoted above, while *fela oðre godre cnihte* at 1124.8 illustrates genitive inflection of a plural adjective, and *eall Cristenes folces* 'of all Christian folk' at 1131.38-9 shows that it was possible for an uninflected quantifier to co-occur with a genitive-inflected adjective. The only instance in which a possessive shows agreement with a genitive noun is *þas gewitnesse mines gifes* (656.92), given above as the sole example of a postpositioned non-partitive or part-whole genitive.

Such relics of the OE non-nominal genitive forms are not found in PetC-2, except for *alre fyrst* 'first of all' at 1135.17, which could be treated as a fixed expression. However, there is one respect in which PetC-2 is surprisingly conservative. There are three nouns in apposition with genitive nouns in PetC-2 in which the second noun is extraposed, e.g. *þe kinges sune Henrius* 'the son of King Henry' at 1140.2. Rather surprisingly, no extraposed noun in apposition with a genitive clearly lacks genitive marking in PetC-2,⁷ making this text look more conservative than the Hand 1 additions, which have some clearly non-agreeing extraposed appositives, e.g. *þurh þes biscepes bene Aðelwolve*, 'through the prayer of Bishop Æthelwold' at 963.31-32, although agreement is more usual in this situation in these parts also. The non-agreeing examples are characteristic of later ME; for further discussion see Allen (2002). The small number of relevant examples makes it unclear whether such agreement was really the usual usage for the scribe of PetC-2, but the examples demonstrate that agreement was at least a possibility and thus provide evidence suggesting that the genitive was still a morphological case despite the disappearance of other sorts of agreement in PetC-2.

3.4 Other genitives

In OE, the genitive case was used in a number of non-adnominal situations. These uses have an important place in the discussion of the loss of the genitive as a morphological case, as will be discussed in section 4. In OE, verbs could govern genitive objects. Even in PetC-0, however, we find a trend towards replacement of genitive objects either by accusative objects or prepositional phrases ('genitive replacement'), although genitive objects remained possible in the early twelfth century; one is found as late as the 1120 annal. The difference with the Hand 1 additions is striking but is more likely to be due to a dialect difference between Hand 1 and whoever composed the 1120 annal than a sudden change in the Peterborough district. In these additions, there are no certain examples of genitive objects, and plenty of evidence of genitive replacement with the verbs *beniman*, *geornen*, *tyþian*, and other verbs which either required or al-

lowed a genitive object in OE. There is one example, & *wile þes geornen þet* 'will ask for this, that [...]' at 656.57, which might have a genitive object. It is possible that *þes* is to be construed as the proximal demonstrative rather than as a genitive form. However, in Hand 1, *þes* is (otherwise) restricted to the determiner functions (i.e. it is always followed by N); the pronominal form is always *þis*. It thus seems possible that the scribe marginally had genitive objects as part of his grammar. There can be no doubt that genitive objects were at best moribund, however. It is tempting to link this fact to the fact that verbs no longer selected for dative objects in the Hand 1 additions either. However, it must be noted that even texts which preserved the selection of dative objects in EME lacked genitive objects (see Allen 1995: 217-19).

The genitive was also used in OE in the complements of quantifiers, in partitive constructions. Some of the examples given above to illustrate other points also demonstrate that such uses were still found in the non-copied annals. In OE, it was usual for the genitive phrase to be positioned after the quantifier except for pronouns, which were normally in pre-position. This basic split is still found in the small number of relevant examples in the non-copied annals.⁸

Even in PetC-2, there are a few examples of genitives used 'adverbially', e.g. *here þankes* 'willingly' and *here unþankes* 'unwillingly' at 1140.46. Here we have fixed expressions which historically consist of a noun meaning 'good will' or 'ill will' in the genitive case, modified by a possessive, meaning 'with their good/ill will.' In PetC-2, however, the adverbial use of genitives is limited to phrases that can be considered fixed expressions, as in the examples just discussed and in *alre fyrst* 'first of all' at 1135.17 and also *be nihtes & be dætes* 'by night and by day' at 1137.17. This contrasts with the Hand 1 additions, where there is frequent use of genitives in temporal phrases, e.g. in *þes ylces gearas* 'that same year' at 1123.82, where we also have a genitive inflection of the adjective (which differs from normal OE usage in having 'strong' inflection). Genitive inflection is not found in temporal expressions in PetC-2, and in the Hand 1 additions we often find a preposition supplementing the genitive inflection, as noted by Mitchell (1964: 143), e.g. *On þes ilces gearas forðferde se eadig bisceop Ernulf* 'In the same year the blessed Bishop Ernulf died' at 1124.32.⁹ Nor is the genitive case the only case used in this situation; contrast the example just given with the dative inflection in & *on þisum ilcan geara forðferde Brand* 'and Brand died in this same year' at 1069. It is of interest to

⁸ Mitchell (1964: 116) contrasts *sune here þankes* at 1140.46 with *her nouþer* in the same annal to illustrate 'variation in the position of a pronoun in the genitive,' but it seems more likely that *here* is not the complement of *sune* but is the proposed complement of *þankes*. There are no indisputable examples of a postposed genitive pronoun in the texts under consideration.

⁹ Due to ambiguity of form, it is possible that the form *þes* represents the (uninflected) proximal determiner used with a noun and adjective which are inflected for the genitive.

⁷ In *Henri þe kinges brother Stephnes* 'Henry, the brother of King Stephen' at 1140.21, *nes* is indicated by an abbreviation, as Whitelock's (1954) facsimile shows. The abbreviation is ambiguous as to case.

note that inflection of the noun for the genitive in a temporal expression and agreement with the determiner go together. When the proximal demonstrative is used, genitive inflection is unusual in the Hand 1 additions in any construction, even with a genitive adjective, e.g. *Dis ilces geares* 'this same year' at 1129.36-7. But when a definite article is used it is always inflected for the genitive in a temporal expression if the noun is inflected as well, yielding numerous examples to swell the number of genitive determiner forms which are used 'correctly' as far as case agreement goes.¹⁰ For further discussion of adverbial genitives in PC and other manuscripts of the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle*, see Kniezsa (1986, 1991). We may finally mention the genitive determiner in *pes þe heom þuhte* 'as it seemed to them' at 1127.67.

4 Summary, Discussion, and Conclusions

The Interpolations and PetC-1 show no differences with respect to genitive forms and grammar/ necessitating the assumption of different underlying systems, at least where genitive case is concerned, supporting Clark's belief that these two parts were written by the same scribe. These Hand 1 additions show a shift towards a 'more clitic-like' genitive inflection in that the morphological idiosyncrasies of the possessive marker have been considerably reduced; the *-es* allomorph has generalised to most nouns. However, allomorphy has not disappeared and the morpheme is as selective of its phonological host as in OE.

This evidence strongly suggests that the genitive case was still a morphological category for the Hand 1 scribe, a fact of considerable importance to a widely-held hypothesis concerning why the English possessive marker developed into a clitic. Janda (1980; 1981), argued that once the dative/accusative distinction was lost in English (due mainly to phonological erosion of the suffixes which distinguished these cases), it was impossible for English to maintain the genitive as a morphological case. Following Janda's idea, Weerman and de Wit (1999) and Lightfoot (1999: 117-25) and others assume that the genitive marker was reanalysed as something other than an inflection. It is widely assumed that the so-called *his* genitive which is found in a number of ME texts (e.g. *biforn ðat touerd is for* 'before the lord's foot' in *Genesis and Exodus* 2272) is a manifestation of this reanalysis, and served as a bridge between the old inflection and the new clitic, with an independent word *his* being reanalysed as a bound morpheme *-(e)s*. Such a view is commonly accepted in the literature on grammaticalisation, e.g. Lehmann (1995: 18-19), but for a criticism of this view see Allen (2003).

¹⁰ The converse is not true, however, e.g. *Siddon þes ðei vi idus Septembris*, 'afterwards, on the day of 8 September' at 1122.13, with an uninflected noun but a genitive definite determiner.

The facts from the PC are a problem for this sort of approach. The continued existence of a distinction between two types of object cases in the internalized grammar of the Hand 1 scribe is far from clear. If the Hand 1 additions reflect a grammar with a dative/accusative distinction, however, the retention of genitive case in these texts is not problematic. PetC-2 is problematic, however, because here the morphology does not support any assumption of a dative/accusative distinction at all; if there is such a distinction, it is an abstract one not reflected in case forms. If we assume that the disappearance of all distinctive forms for the dative and accusative cases indicates the disappearance of the category distinction, we would hope to find evidence for a change in the nature of the possessive morpheme in PetC-2 compared with OE. However, the change which is found, the loss of agreement morphology on modifiers of possessives, does not require a clitic analysis. If we found *his* genitives in PetC-2, that would be highly suggestive of a change in the status of the possessive morpheme, but no *his* genitives are to be found in any part of PC. Since *his* genitives are found in the letters of monarchs and aristocrats in later periods, there is no reason to assume that they existed in the speech of Peterborough but were considered too colloquial for a document which is at any rate written in what might be considered the 'plain English' of the day. There is similarly no reason to assume that the PetC-2 scribe would avoid the group genitive, if it existed, but instead we find only extraposition of the PP away from the possessor so that the possessor will be adjacent to the head N, e.g. & *nam þe kinges suster of France to wife* 'and took the king of France's sister as his wife' at 1140.48, as in the Hand 1 additions. There is thus no evidence of a relaxation of the selectivity of the host, and the continued existence of extraposed appositives showing genitive case causes difficulties for any analysis that assumes that genitive case was not available to this scribe, since a clitic analysis is not possible for these appositives.

Of course, the fact that an inflectional genitive still clearly existed in the language of the Hand 1 scribe does not necessarily mean that the same scribe did not also have a new clitic possessive marker at his command. A 'competing grammars' approach to morphosyntactic change (outlined in Kroch 2001) in which a new grammar and an older one may be in competition within the language of a single speaker is favoured by many historical syntacticians. By such an approach, it would be possible to deal with the modifiers which show agreement with a genitive noun and the irregular genitives as instances where the scribe used an older grammar with inflection, while assuming that *-es* is a clitic when there is not positive evidence that it is inflectional. But while such an approach is possible, there is no compelling evidence for the assumption that the scribe of Hand 1 ever used *-es* as a clitic, since all the examples he has left us are capable of a treatment as an inflection. At any rate, it seems better to assume, as argued by Carstairs (1987: 155) and Allen (1997, 2003), that the shift towards a more clitic-like morpheme was simply made **possible** by the generalisation of

the -es allomorph of the genitive case ending combined with the loss of agreement morphology, rather than compelled by these changes.

It is widely assumed that the disappearance of the types of genitives which have become obsolete is due to the loss of the genitive as a case. That is, once the genitive became a clitic generated in the syntax, it was restricted to a position within an NP, provided by the phrase structure. It was therefore no longer possible for verbs to select for the genitive, or for the genitive to be used 'adverbially.' This position is expressed by Lightfoot (1999: 125-136), and Maling (1983) attributes the loss of adjectives taking a (genitive or dative) complement to the loss of case inflection in English. If, as argued in this paper, the genitive was still a case in PetC-2, then the near-complete absence in PetC-2 of these types of genitives cannot be explained as a result simply of the loss of genitive case. This is not really problematic, because the existence of genitive case in a grammar may be a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for these types of genitives. All of these genitives underwent a gradual decline which began well before the disappearance of agreement morphology, as did postnominal genitives, whose disappearance has also been attributed to deflexion. Rather than seeing the obsolescence of these types as a **result** of the loss of the genitive case, it may be better to see the increasing restriction of this case to its core function of marking possession as another factor which combined with the loss of agreement to make possible the reinterpretation of the possessive morpheme as more clitic-like.

Systematic studies of texts are needed to give an empirical base for the evaluation of competing hypotheses concerning how case marking systems change. A hypothesis which appears appealing when only a very broad outline of changes is available may turn out to be less than completely satisfactory when such studies reveal systematic patterns which the hypothesis does not predict – the devil is often in the details! This study of the genitive case in the non-copied annals of the PC has been made as a small contribution towards this empirical base.

References

- Allen, Cynthia L. 1995. *Case marking and reanalysis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Allen, Cynthia L. 1997. The origins of the 'group genitive' in English. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95: 111-31.
- Allen, Cynthia L. 1998. Genitives and the 'creolization' hypothesis (1998). *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 129-35.
- Allen, Cynthia L. 2002. Case and Middle English noun phrases. *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, ed. by David Lightfoot (ed.), 57-77. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, Cynthia L. 2003. Deflexion and the development of the genitive in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 7: 1-28.
- Carstairs, Andrew. 1987. Diachronic evidence and the affix-clitic distinction. *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Onofrio Carruba and Giuliano Bernini (eds.), 151-62. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Clark, Cecily (ed.). 1970. *The Peterborough chronicle 1070-1154*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Holthausen, Ferdinand (ed.). 1889. 1921. *Vices and Virtues*. London: N. Trübner and Co. [Early English Text Society O.S. 89, 159].
- Irvine, Susan (ed.). 2004. *The Anglo-Saxon chronicle: A collaborative edition. Volume 7: MS E*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer [The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 3].
- Janda, Richard D. 1980. On the decline of declensional systems: the loss of OE nominal case and the ME reanalysis of -es as his. *Papers from the fourth international conference on historical linguistics*, ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott, Rebecca Labrum and Susan Shepard (eds.), 243-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Janda, Richard D. 1981. A case of liberation from morphology into syntax: The fate of the English genitive-marker -(e)s. *Syntactic change*, ed. by Brenda B. Johns and David R. Strong (eds.), 60-114. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Department of Linguistics, University of Michigan.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1894. *Progress in language. With special reference to English*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A modern English grammar on historical principles. Volume 6: Morphology*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Jones, Charles. 1988. *Grammatical gender in English, 950 to 1250*. New York: Croom Helm.
- Klemola, Juhani. 1997. Dialect evidence for the loss of the genitive inflection in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 1: 349-153.
- Knieza, Veronika. 1986. The progress of the expression of temporal relationships from Old English to Early Middle English. *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and A. J. Szwedek (eds.), 423-36. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Knieza, Veronika. 1991. Prepositional phrases expressing adverbs of time from Late Old English to Early Middle English. *Historical English syntax*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky (ed.), 221-31. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroch, Anthony. 2001. Syntactic change. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark R. Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), 699-729. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. München: LINCOM Europa [LINCOM Studies in Theoretical Linguistics].
- Lightfoot, David. 1999. *The development of language: acquisition, change and evolution*. Oxford and Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell [Blackwell/Maryland Lectures in Language and Cognition 1].
- Maling, Joan. 1983. Transitive adjectives: A case of categorial reanalysis. *Linguistic categories: Auxiliaries and related puzzles*, ed. by Frank Heny and Barry Richards (eds.), 253-89. Boston and Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2002. The rise of the to-dative in Middle English. *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, ed. by David W. Lightfoot (ed.), 107-23. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Millar, Robert McColl. 1997. Some patterns in the non-historical demonstrative usage of the *Peterborough Chronicle* annals 1070-1121 [June 1997]. *Notes and Queries* N.S. 44: 161-64.
- Millar, Robert McColl. 2000. *System collapse, system rebirth: The demonstrative pronouns of English, 900-1350 and the birth of the definite article*. Oxford and New York: Peter Lang.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1964. Syntax and word-order in *The Peterborough Chronicle* 1122-1154. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 65: 113-44.

- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Polo, Chiara. 2002. Double objects and morphological triggers for syntactic case. *Syntactic effects of morphological change*, ed. by David W. Lightfoot (ed.), 124-42. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Russell. 1931. Statistical processes involved in the development of the adnominal periphrastic genitive in the English language. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- Weerman, Fred and Petra de Wit. 1999. The decline of the genitive in Dutch. *Linguistics* 37: 1155-92.
- Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.) 1954. *The Peterborough Chronicle (The Bodleian Manuscript Laud Misc. 636)*. Copenhagen [Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 4].
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1987. Suppressing the Zs. *Journal of Linguistics* 23: 133-48.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59: 502-13.

ACCELERATED GRAMMATICALIZATION IN THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE

ELLY VAN GELDEREN

Arizona State University

1 Introduction

It has often been said that the Peterborough Chronicle is the beginning of Middle English (e.g. Clark 1970: lii). In this paper, I examine aspects of this change by looking at two kinds of grammaticalization, namely prepositions becoming complementizers (i.e. *for*, *till* and *at*) and adverbs being reanalyzed as aspectual markers. In the last part of the Peterborough Chronicle, there is a tremendous increase of complementizers (and sentence embeddings). There is also a fast loss of verbal *ge-* and an increase of other aspectual markers. The grammaticalization of *for* accelerates between 1135 and 1154, and *ge-* virtually disappears after 1130. This symbolizes the true start of ME.

The aspectual changes around *ge-* and the introduction of the complementizers *for* and *till* both involve grammaticalizations resulting in 'higher' position in the tree: P to C, inner to outer aspect, verbs to auxiliaries. I will argue that an Economy Principle 'Late Merge', as in van Gelderen (2004), accounts for both developments.

The outline is as follows. In section one, I provide some background on the general dialect of the Peterborough in comparison with another version of the Chronicle, namely the Parker Chronicle. In section two, the increase in complementizers is discussed, and in section three the loss of aspectual *ge-* is discussed as well as strengthening by adverbs. Section four is a conclusion.

2 The Peterborough's Linguistic Character

In this section, I will briefly compare the Peterborough Chronicle, which originates in the Danelaw area, with the more southern (West Saxon) Parker. As we will see, established dialect differences do not neatly differentiate these two versions. This is relevant to the accelerated grammaticalization that is my focus since grammaticalization could be due to language contact (see Heine & Kuteva 2005). I will first look at the phonology and then the syntax (see Clark 1970 and Bately 1983 for more) and show that there is not much evidence for a radically different language, even though the final continuation has a few northern characteristics.

Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature

Edited by Jacek Fisiak

- Vol. 1 Dieter Kastovsky / Arthur Mettinger (eds.): Language Contact in the History of English. 2nd, revised edition. 2003.
- Vol. 2 Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology. A Festschrift for Akio Ozumi. Edited by Jacek Fisiak. 2002.
- Vol. 3 Liliana Sikorska: *In a Manner Moral Plays: Social Ideologies in English Moralities and Interludes* (1350-1517). 2002.
- Vol. 4 Peter J. Lucas / Angela M. Lucas (eds.): Middle English from Tongue to Text. Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English: Language and Text, held at Dublin, Ireland, 1-4 July 1999. 2002.
- Vol. 5 Chaucer and the Challenges of Medievalism. Studies in Honor of H. A. Kelly. Edited by Donka Minkova and Theresa Tinkle. 2003.
- Vol. 6 Hanna Rutkowska: Graphemics and Morphosyntax in the *Cely Letters* (1472-88). 2003.
- Vol. 7 The *Ancrene Wisse*. A Four-Manuscript Parallel Text. Preface and Parts 1-4. Edited by Tadao Kubouchi and Keiko Ikegami with John Seahill, Shoko Ono, Harumi Tanabe, Yoshiko Ota, Ayako Kobayashi and Koichi Nakamura. 2003.
- Vol. 8 Joanna Bugaj: Middle Scots Inflectional System in the South-west of Scotland. 2004.
- Vol. 9 Rafał Boryslawski: The Old English Riddles and the Riddlic Elements of Old English Poetry. 2004.
- Vol. 10 Nikolaus Flitt / Herbert Schendl (eds.): Rethinking Middle English. Linguistic and Literary Approaches. 2005.
- Vol. 11 The *Ancrene Wisse*. A Four-Manuscript Parallel Text. Parts 5-8 with Wordlists. Edited by Tadao Kubouchi and Keiko Ikegami with John Seahill, Shoko Ono, Harumi Tanabe, Yoshiko Ota, Ayako Kobayashi, Koichi Nakamura. 2005.
- Vol. 12 Text and Language in Medieval English Prose. A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi. Edited by Akio Ozumi, Jacek Fisiak and John Seahill. 2005.
- Vol. 13 Michiko Ogura (ed.): Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English. Towards the Reunion of Linguistics and Philology. 2006.
- Vol. 14 Keiko Hamaguchi: Non-European Women in Chaucer. A Postcolonial Study. 2006.
- Vol. 15 Ursula Schaefer (ed.): The Beginnings of Standardization. Language and Culture in Fourteenth-Century England. 2006.
- Vol. 16 Nikolaus Flitt / Herbert Schendl / Christiane Dalton-Puffer / Dieter Kastovsky (eds): Medieval English and its Heritage. Structure, Meaning and Mechanisms of Change. 2006.
- Vol. 17 Matylda Włodarczyk: Pragmatic Aspects of Reported Speech. The Case of Early Modern English Courtroom Discourse. 2007.
- Vol. 18 Hans Sauer / Renate Bauer (eds.): *Beowulf* and Beyond. 2007.
- Vol. 19 Gabriella Mazzon (ed.): Studies in Middle English Forms and Meanings. 2007.
- Vol. 20 Alexander Bergs / Janne Skaffari (eds.): The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle. 2007.

www.peterlang.de



Gabriella Mazzon (ed.)

Studies in Middle English Forms and Meanings

Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien, 2007.
292 pp., num. tab. and graph.

Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature. Edited by Jacek Fisiak.
Vol. 19

ISBN 978-3-631-55951-2 · pb. € 49.80*

The Volume contains written versions of some contributions to the Fifth International Conference on Middle English (ICOME 5), held at the University of Naples in 2005. Most of the papers concentrate on individual aspects of grammar and semantics, although some focus on dialectal fragmentation, and others adopt a pragmatic perspective. There is still a lot to be done in the study of the Middle English lexicon, in the same way as there are many aspects of grammar that have not been fully studied yet. The volume aims at providing contributions that can further the knowledge of these subfields of English historical linguistics, through state-of-the-art case studies that also exploit all modern resources such as computerised corpora and electronically tagged texts.

Contents: Morphology · Word formation · Semantics · Pragmatics · Text types ·
Dialectal distribution of forms · Document sources

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien
Distribution: Verlag Peter Lang AG
Moosstr. 1, CH-2542 Pösterlen
Telefax 0041 (0) 32/376 17 27

*The €-price includes German tax rate
Prices are subject to change without notice
Homepage <http://www.peterlang.de>