

UC-NRLF



B 4 594 137

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

*Class* 927  
C384  
R44

UNIVERSITÉ DE GAND.

RECUEIL DE TRAVAUX

PUBLIÉS PAR

LA FACULTÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE ET LETTRES

26<sup>e</sup> FASCICULE

**The Language**  
of  
**Caxton's Reynard the Fox**

A STUDY

in Historical English Syntax

BY

**PAUL DE REUL**

DOCTOR OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY.



GAND  
LIBRAIRIE VUILSTEKE  
15 rue aux Vaches.

LONDON  
SWAN SONNENSCHEN & Co. Lim.

1901

711711

BERGEN OP ZOOMSCE  
BOEK-, COURANT- & HANDELSDRUKKERIJ

B 41, LIEVEVROUWESTRAAT, B 41.

(NEDERLAND).

THE LANGUAGE  
OF  
CAXTON'S REYNARD THE FOX  
A STUDY  
in Historical English Syntax.

RECUEIL DE TRAVAUX

PUBLIÉS PAR

LA FACULTÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE ET LETTRES  
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE GAND.

*Gand*  

---

*1911*

**EXTRAIT DU RÈGLEMENT**

Les travaux des professeurs et chargés de cours, anciens professeurs et anciens chargés de cours sont publiés sous la responsabilité personnelle de leurs auteurs.

Tous les autres le sont en vertu d'une décision de la Faculté.

---

*To Professor H. Logeman*

In thankful acknowledgment.

**P. D. R.**

## INTRODUCTION.

Historical syntax of the English as well as of other Teutonic languages and let us say, as well as the psychological side of Language on the whole have been, up to quite recent years, paid too little attention to, philological research being mainly engaged in other directions, such as Phonetics and Morphology. A striking instance is given by Paul's *Grundriss*, a work which ought to sum up our knowledge of Germanic tongues and yet does not enter into the syntax of most of the languages dealt with. To return to English, it is remarkable that in the long series of publications issued by the Early English Text Society, there is perhaps only one in which the syntax of a text is seriously examined, viz. Prof. Kellner's *Introduction* to Caxton's Blanchardyn and Englantyne, a study to which we have pleasure in immediately acknowledging our debt. It is true that we found a few standard-works for some authors who may be considered as landmarks in the development of the language. There is the recent look of Wülfing on the Syntax of Alfred the Great, giving us information about the Old English period, particularly the 9<sup>th</sup> century; passing on to Middle English, as represented by



Chaucer, we have the admirable although fragmentary *Streifzüge* of Prof. Einkenel; for Shakespeare, the well known *Grammar* of Abbott is at least a convenient means of ready reference.

Now, such helps as these are quite wanting for the wide period extending from Chaucer to Shakespeare; Caxton's *Reynard* (1481) stands roughly speaking in the middle of this period, if we take the years 1390 and 1590 respectively as the approximate date of the beginning of Shakespeare's dramatic career on the one hand, and of the *Canterbury Tales*, on the other. In devoting the present study to the Syntax, Style and Order of words in *Reynard*, and endeavouring to be, within these limits, as nearly exhaustive as possible, we hope that our work, taken in conjunction with that of Dr. Kellner and, as to Phonetics and Accidence, with H. Römstedt's Essay, <sup>1)</sup> may provide the student

<sup>1)</sup> The Phonology and Accidence in *Reynard the Fox* have been examined by H. Römstedt in his 'Englische Schriftsprache bei Caxton', — a study which if not neglecting other writings of Caxton, is mainly based on two of them, *the Book of Curtesye* and *Reynard*, which have both been submitted to a thorough investigation.

It was not considered necessary to again take up the subject of Römstedt's 'gekrönte Preisschrift'. To it we are indebted for a great deal of information, inasmuch as the facts it contains had often a close bearing on our own researches. Thus, to quote a single instance, we are warned not to mistake, in some cases, such Plural forms as *thys* (see 16/8), *thynge* (40/36), for a syntactical use of the Singular instead of the Plural. As we consulted the work, we had continual opportunities to find that, although some additions might here and there be made, the references to *Reynard* were, on the whole, accurate and exhaustive. It is true the work is mainly descriptive; forms and sounds in Caxton are simply summed up and set in parallel with forms and sounds in Chaucer and the texts Morsbach calls 'Urkunden' on one hand, and in Shakespeare on the other hand. But, seeing the number of facts one has to deal

of that period of the language intermediate between Chaucer and Shakespeare with a guide as reliable as those he already possesses for the study of these two classics.

Apart from belonging to a period of language the Syntax of which had been rather neglected, Caxton's work on various grounds deserves our especial attention.

William Caxton was, as everybody is aware, the father of English printing. It may be recalled that the first book he is said to have printed in England, *the Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* appeared in 1477; and from this time up to his death which occurred about 1491 he must have sent through the press not far from 10000 volumes. The question of the language of Caxton is therefore connected with

---

with in the matter of Phonetics and Morphology, it was difficult to do more, I mean, to enter into questions of origin and development. As far as Reynard was concerned, the work had indeed to be supplemented by an enquiry into the relations of the English text with its Dutch original. This has been already partly done in Muller and Logeman's edition of the *Hystorie van Reinaert die Vos*, in the Introduction of which Prof. Logeman treats of Caxton as a translator and points out traces of Dutch influence, especially in the *vocabulary* and *spelling*. We hope that the author may some day enlarge these notes, and have therefore considered the question from the point of view of *Syntax* alone.

Prof. Kellner's Introduction to *Blanchardyn and Englantine* is a sketch of the Syntax of Caxton. However, of all the works of Caxton, Prof. Kellner has precisely disregarded *Reynard*. To show that the omission led the author into a few erroneous statements, let us refer to page LXXVI, where we are told that the Verbal Noun, when preceded by *in*, was never followed by *of*; if Dr. Kellner had but opened *Reynard* at the very first page, the statement and the theory founded on it would have been at once overthrown by such instances as *in redyng* or *heryng* of it 4/9 *in redyng* of it 4/17 (See, moreover, our chapter on the *Pres. Participle and Verbal Noun*.)

the question of the influence of printing on the language, at large. It might be surmised that printing had the effect of fixing the language, of holding in check its alterations so that the linguistic change between Shakespeare and Caxton should be less marked than between Caxton and Chaucer. Now, this is not so much the case as might be expected. Let it suffice to refer for the present to the short survey we give hereafter of the chief peculiarities of our text. Of course many of Caxton's constructions still occur in Spenser or in Shakespeare, but we must not forget that poetic language is nearly always archaic, and if we compare Reynard, with prose works alone, then it strikes us that the affinities of Caxton are closer with the preceding than with the following age: the conclusion was deemed curious enough to be stated at the outset of this study.

There is another side of our text which ought to make it an object of especial interest to the Dutch or Belgian philologist. The celebrated printer, who for a long time resided at Bruges, translated his *Reynard*, from a Dutch *Reynard*, viz. as is generally believed from the *Hystorie van Reinaert die Vos*, printed by Gerard Leeu, at Gouda in 1479; the comparison of both texts has been rendered convenient by Muller and Logeman's edition of the latter, and it has already been proved that Caxton's vocabulary is saturated with Dutch elements: the question therefore arises, in how far did the same influence penetrate his syntax? Attention has been paid to this question throughout. Besides the English examples, the corresponding Dutch passages have generally been quoted either to prove or to disprove Dutch influence. This reference is omitted, however, and we trust the omission is justified,

in cases where we were able to adduce such English parallel instances as rendered it unnecessary, to our mind, to resort to the Dutch; indeed we found we had often to be careful not to ascribe to this influence such idioms as seem foreign only on account of an inadequate knowledge of Middle English prose; thus several of the peculiarities pointed out in our chapter on Style, which we were at first tempted to explain by the slavishness of the translation, turned out, on further investigation, to be characteristic of all the writers contemporary of Caxton.<sup>1)</sup>

Although the Dutch element plays an important part in the language of our text, its influence remains, like that already observed in the vocabulary, of a sporadic, accidental nature; it does not follow definite tendencies, it does not consistently pervade any special portion of syntax<sup>2)</sup>; therefore, it escapes classification and as it would be very difficult to bring it under definite heads, I can only refer to the numerous instances scattered through this work.

We did not rest satisfied with merely tabulating facts, but entered into their explanation and the discussion of their origin, whenever the current views were not convincing to us. Thus about, conditional sentences, where we dissent from Mätzner (see Tense), about the Accusative + Infinitive-Subject, where

---

<sup>1)</sup> Let us quote, among cases where Dutch influence is only apparent, the Infinitive Absolute (See under Infinitive); the idioms *al be it* (See Conjunction); *alto longé* with the superlative sense (See Adverb).

<sup>2)</sup> Noteworthy cases of Dutch influence are: the indefinite use of *one = men* (See Indefinite Pron); — the use of the frequentative *all* before the Active Participle (See Active Pple); — the cases explained as 'Predicative function' of the Passive Pple (*q. v.*).

we contradict Stoffel (See Infinitive); about various uses of the Conjunctions *that, and, &c.* <sup>1)</sup> Special attention was given to the problem of the French or native origin of certain idioms, as this seems to us one of primary importance in English philology. We could not always agree, on this subject, with Prof. Einkenel who is, as a rule, somewhat hasty in the assumption of French influence: the results furnished by Wülfing in his *Syntax of the Works of Alfred* were often used as a test.

Before leading the reader along the by-paths of our enquiry, it will be useful to determine, in a very general way, the position occupied by our text in the development of English.

As may be expected, our results do not vary much, in the main lines, from those summed up by Kellner, on p.p. cix, cx of his work.

We must, however, take exception to the following statements made by this author:

1. „The Indefinite Pronoun *one* is not yet used: in its stead we find *men*”.

Several instances of the indefinite use of *one*, which are very likely due to Du. influence, will be found in our chapter on Indefinite Pronouns.

2. „Constructions like ‚we are banished the court’ are not yet in use; there seems to be still a rigid observance of the difference between Transitive and Intransitive Verbs, with regard to the Passive Voice”.

In our chapter on Reflexive and Passive Verbs, where some instances of a great freedom in the use of the Passive are adduced (‚ye be complained on’ —

---

<sup>1)</sup> Also about the idioms ‚strong theef that ye are’ (See Cases), ‚as who saith’ (Relat. Pron.), ‚the kyng hath do proclaimed his pees’ (Infinitive) &c.

,he sholde *be done to'* &c.) the modern freedom to convert complements in the Dative, or prepositional complements into the subjects of a passive construction will be found represented by several instances. — For beginnings of the construction of the Infinitive Passive, see *Infinitive*.

3. „The Infinitive absolute is still in use”. It should be added at least that this use is very rare, since Kellner himself was only able to adduce two instances from Caxton (Introduction, LXIII). We found only one in *Reynard*. See *Infinitive*.

We can corroborate the following points:

1. *Ye* not *You* is still the Nominative of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. plur. of the Personal Pronoun.
2. Adjectives referring to preceding nouns are not yet followed by *one*.
3. The Personal Pronoun, when a subject, is still very often omitted.
4. *Self* is still considered an Adjective as seen by the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. plur. *themselfe*, never *themselves*.
5. *Who*, in the Nominative, as Relative Pronoun, is still unknown.
6. Agreement between tenses is not yet strictly observed.
7. The arrangement of words is much freer than in later times.

We should add a few remarks.

The Personal Pronouns *they*, *them*, &c. seem to retain something of their original demonstrative meaning, (see Pers. Pronoun).

The simple form of the Reflexive Pronoun is still more usual than the compound form with *self* (*contra*,

Kellner, *Outlines*, § 299); we find a plural *them selven* which is interesting for the history of the connection Pers. Pron. + *self* (See Reflexive and Emphatic Pronoun).

Possessive Pronouns are found preceded by the Article (See Posses. Pronoun).

The absence of the Relat. Pron. *the whiche* in *Reynard* is striking (see Relat. Pron.)

Simple forms of the Imperf. Subjunct. are usual besides compound forms with *should* or *would* and are frequently found in conditional sentences (see Tense).

Several Verbs are used in the Reflexive Voice which have since been converted into Intransitives (see Reflexive and Passive Verbs).

The simple Infinitive still interchanges with the Infinitive preceded by *to*, *for to*; in the struggle between these various forms, the Preposition *to* is sometimes introduced where we should now omit it; and whereas *for to* has often no more force than a formal element, we sometimes find the idea of purpose implied by the simple *to*.

The Infinitive construction had not a very wide range in Caxton; for, on one hand, the Infin. with an Accusative as *Subject* of the sentence and the Infinitive absolute were falling into disuse; on the other hand, the personal construction was still preferred in cases where Latin imitation, and, later on, the modern tendency towards shortness of expression, have since introduced the Infinitive (See *Infinitive*).

The adverbial and absolute use of the Present Pple as well as of the Past Pple seem hardly to have been developed. (See *Participle*).

There are several facts which point to a stage of the language where the way of thinking was, on the

whole, less abstract and less synthetic than now; note the 'before-putting' of *that* (See Demonstr. Pron.); various uses of the Conj. *and* and *that* (See *Conjunction* and also *Style*).

Other peculiarities of language worth noting are: cases of double Genitive and the use of the opposition instead of the Genitive (See *Genit.*);

the 'before-putting' of the Demonstr. *that* as Object (Demonstr. pron.);

*One* preceded by a Def. Article, a Demonstrative or a Possessive = one of two 'his one eye' (See Indef. Pron.);

the Past Participle instead of the Infinitive after *do*, 'the kyng hath *do proclaimed* his pees' (see *Infin.*), a case for which we find a few parallels in the Paston Letters;

the construction 'the wythholding you fro it' where the Verbal Noun, although preceded by the Article as a Substantive, is yet followed by a Direct Object (see *Noun*).

The Past Participle with active sense on the model of O. E. *forworht*, *forsworen*, &c.

To conclude, we can only repeat what has been stated above and say, with Kellner (*Introd. to Blanchardyn*, cix): „Caxton's Syntax, on the whole, is nearer Chaucer than Shakspeare; and there is a still greater kinship between his prose and that of the fourteenth century, than that of the Elizabethan age. In reading Caxton's books, the general impression resembles very much that received by reading *the Tale of Meliboeus* or even *Maundeville*; and the results of a minute analysis agrees with that impression”.

Besides being much more developed than Kellner's our study differs from the latter in method.

Whereas Kellner draws parallel instances chiefly



from authors contemporary or nearly contemporary of Caxton, we have tried by a systematic comparison with much earlier and later periods, to connect the facts with the entire history of the English tongue. An effort has been made that each chapter should form a whole and give an idea of the life of the language.

Perhaps the story of *Reynard*, the popularity of which gives a typical character to many an instance drawn from it, was not ill-chosen to be thus considered at length.

---

## List of Works quoted.

---

- ABBOTT, Shakespearian Grammar, 1894.
- ARBER's edition of *Reynard the Fox*, in Arber's 'English Scholar's Library', 1895.
- BACON, Advancement of Learning, ed. Aldis Wright, Clarendon Press, 1881.
- BOSWORTH, A Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary, 1888.
- BRÉAL, Essai de Sémantique, 1897.
- BLUME, Sprache der Paston Letters, Progr., Bremen, 1882.
- BRIGHT, Anglo-Saxon Reader, 1895.
- BUNYAN, Pilgrim's Progress, ed. Venables, Clar. Press., 1874.
- CHAUCER, the Student's', complete in one vol., by Skeat Oxford, 1895.
- CLÉDAT, Grammaire élémentaire du Vieux Français.
- CONSTANS, Chrestomatie de l'ancien Français, 1890.
- COSIJN, Altwestsächsische Grammatik, Haag, 1883.
- DARMESTETER, Cours de Gramm. historique de l'ancienne langue française, 4<sup>e</sup> Partie: Syntaxe, 1897.
- H. DÜRING, Die Pronomina bei Spenser, Halle, 1891.
- EINENKEL, Streifzüge durch die mittlengl. Syntax unter bes. Berücksichtigung der Spr. Chaucers, Münster, 1887.
- EINENKEL, Engl. Syntax, in Paul's Grundriss der germanischen Philologie vol. I, 1898.

- FRANZ, Zur Syntax des alteren neuenglischen, in *Englische Studien*, vols. xvii, xviii, &c.
- F. GRIMM, Der syntactische Gebrauch der Präpositionen bei Wycliffe and Purvey, Marburg, 1891.
- GOSPELS (Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe and Tyndale) in parallel columns, by Bosworth and Waring, 1888.
- JESPERSEN, Progress in Language, with special reference to English, 1894.
- KELLNER, Historical Outlines of Engl. Syntax, 1892.
- KELLNER, Introduction to the edition of Caxton's *Blanchardyn and Englantyne* for the Early English Text Society, 1890, reprinted in the transactions of the Philological Society, 1888—90, Part. II, under the title 'Caxton's Syntax and Style'.
- KELLNER, Abwechselung und Tautologie, *Engl. Studien*, xx.
- KOCH, Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache, 2<sup>te</sup> Aufl., bes. von Zupitza, II, Satzlehre, 1878.
- KRICKAU, Der Accusativ mit dem Infinitiv in der Engl. Sprache, Göttingen, 1877.
- LANGLAND, Piers the Plowman, ed. Skeat, Clar. Press.
- LOHMANN, Auslassung des englischen Relativ pronomens, in *Anglia*, III.
- MÄTZNER, Englische Grammatik, 2<sup>te</sup> Ausg., Berlin 1873—75.
- MORRIS, Historical Outlines of English Accidence, revised by KELLNER & BRADLEY, 1896.
- MORRIS, Specimens of Early English, Clar. Press.
- MULLER & LOGEMAN, Die Hystorie van Reynaert die Vos, naar den Druk van 1479, vergeleken met Will. Caxton's Engelsehe Vertaling, Zwolle, 1892.
- P. NOACK, Geschichte der relativen Pronomina in der Engl. Sprache, Göttingen, 1882.
- KINGTON OLIPHANT, The new English, 1886.

- RIESE, Etude syntaxique sur la langue de Froissart, Halle, 1880.
- A. ROHS, Syntaktische Untersuchungen in Bacon's Essays, Marburg, 1889.
- H. RÖMSTEDT, Die englische Schriftsprache bei Caxton, gekrönte Preisschrift, Göttingen, 1891.
- SATTLER, Präpositionslehre, in *Anglia*.
- SCHULZE, Beiträge zur englische Grammatik in *Englische Studien*.
- SKEAT, Specimens of Early English, Parts II, III.
- SKEAT, The complete works of G. Chaucer, Vol. VI: Introduction and Glossary, 1894.
- SKEAT, Principles of English Etymology.
- SKEAT, Etymological Dictionary of the English language.
- STOETT, Proeve eener beknopte Middelnederlandsche Syntaxis.
- STOFFEL, Studies in English, Zutphen 1894.
- STORM, Englische Philologie, I, Leipzig 1896.
- SWEET, A New English Grammar, 1892.
- TEN BRINK, Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst, Leipzig, 1884.
- VERCOULLIE, Etymologisch Woordenboek der nederl. Taal, Gent, 1890.
- WANDSCHNEIDER, Syntax des Verbs in Langley, Leipzig, 1887.
- WENDT, Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in Englischen, Progr. 1887.
- WYCLIFFE AND PURVEY, New Testament, Clar. Press. 1879.
- WÜLFING, Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds der Grossen, 1896.



## ARTICLE.

### Definite Article.

,The' was originally a Demonstrative, O. E. *se* (*þe*), *séo*, *þæt*. We must bear the fact in mind, not only in this chapter, but when we shall speak of the demonstrative *that*, which is sometimes used as an article.

WITH PROPER NAMES. With regard to names of rivers, usage varies in Gaxton, as in Chaucer (Einkenel, *Streifzüge*, 4). Thus besides

,the lande between *the* elve and *the* somme' 39/16.

we find:

,wene ye that I wille lede yow to flomme yordyn' 42/10.

Last case is interesting, as a noun in apposition is placed before the name; this seems to have been usual with „Jordan" cp. Mätz. III, 174.

In O. E., names of rivers were used either alone, without article, or with an apposition *ea*, river, and then, often with article: *ea Danai*, *Donua seo ea*, and (Wülfing, *Synt. Alfreds* I, 280).

With proper nouns preceded by some attribute, the article may be expressed:

,thenne spacke the rede reynaert 13/30,

or omitted:

,Art not thou one of the possessors of *grete troye* 48/8, that have ye of *almyghty god* by inheritaunce of your noble progenytours' 91/25.

This omission is frequent in Chaucer. In O. E. on the contrary the article was expressed: *se wisa Plato*, *se eadiga Job* (Wülfing, op. cit. 278). The omission has been developed in modern times. Cp. Mätz, III, 109 &c

for more instances from contemporary literature, Ellinger in E. St. xx, 397.

Note that *panther* is always used like *Reynart* as a Proper Noun:

,Thenne spak panther . . . 6/32.

In the same way ,*cony* lapreel' is found once instead of *the cony* (rabbit) 54/27.

Nouns of countries are generally used without article note however :

,A clene noble beest named Panthera whiche fedeth hym bytwene *the grete Inde* and *erthly paradyse* 83/13 &c.

Note the omission before *erthly paradyse*, while the Dutch has

,ende voedet tusschen dat grote India ende den aertschen paradyse' 108/29.

I may add a case where an Abstract Noun is personified, and consequently treated as a Proper Noun : . . . (the frogs) muste obeye to *strenghte their kynge* 37/38 (\*)

WITH ABSTRACT NOUNS, the article is often omitted espec. in adverbial expressions, with nouns preceded by Prepositions.

,But that was by *counseyl* of evyl and foule beestis 90/16, *deceyved by wymmens counseyl* 56/31.

The omission of the article is esp. frequent before a noun preceded or followed by a Genitive. Eienenk. p. 14, al. 2.

The omission also occurs with abstract nouns used as Object, Predicate, &c., sometimes giving the latter the appearance of an adjective or of an Adverb. Note especially the word *trouthe* :

(\*) In Dutch: en moeten den *oudevaer horen coninck* onderdanich sijn 48/30. I believe we have here an interesting instance of slipshod translation. Caxton probably did not know the word *oudevaer* which he mistook for some abstract word. Note that a few lines before, he does not translate it: Dutch: seynde hem enen storcke ofte een *oudevaer* 48/25. English: sente to them a storcke 37/34.

,I felt wel *it was throuthe* 37/25, Alas my lord *is this very throuthe* 81/6, *Is that throuthe* that you telle me 63/16, *ye saye throuthe* 7/17, *saye ye me throuthe* 21/4, what shold it avaylle me *yf I saide now other wyse than throuthe* 38/7, my lady here hath *saide* to you *trouthe* and gyven yow good counseyl 57/20, I have ofte herde men *saye throuthe and rightfully* 64/26.

It is probable there was some confusion between ,trouthe' and the adjective *soth* which had the same sense (to saye soth, &c).

Late us praye the the kynge that he wille doe to reynart *ryght* of the lande, 79/26.

atte laste came he *in lyknes* of an heremyte 10/13; ther came olde wymen that *for age* (= because of their age) had not one tooth in their heed; god yeue *grace* that I may wel achieve it 19/34.

Moreover we find: gyve counseyl 43/14, gyue leue 47/21, have nede 12/11 &c. But the article is also found expressed, even in adverbial connections, with a preposition. Thus besides *bryng to deth* 40/9, *judged to deth* 31/9, we find: he was *beten almost to the deth* 26/18, ,though I were *dampned to the deth* yet ought ye to here my wordes out' 67/24, me thynketh he *is hurte unto the deth* 18/31.

Besides *al day*, adverbial accusative absolute: ,yf ye abyde to morow *al day* ther may no mercy helpe you' 24/17, we find:

(1) counseyle you that ye reste you a lytyl for *it is by the daye* 104/10 (Du: *dat is biden daghe* 137/2); Me ought not to preyse to moche *the daye* tyl *euen* be come 75/8.

In Chaucer, with *day*, *night*, &c the article was also used or omitted, espec. after all (Einenk. 5, 22, al. 2).

Alle your enemyes shal *abide in the shame* 12/26;

There ben many that complayne on other and *ben in the defaute* them self.

The definite article is even found in sentences of a pro-

verbial character, before nouns used as subjects.

*The connyng goth to fore strenghte* 104/1. *The nede of hongre breketh oth alway* 76/16. There is none thyng byloured . . . nowadays but money) *the money* is better byloured than god 118/6.

In the next instance the def. art. is used in an adverbial expression and has the value of a Possessive :  
,for I aduyse you *for the leste hurte* that ye and my lady goo bothe thyder 41/24 (Du: voer *uwen* minsten scade).

Einkenkel quotes a few analogous cases from Chaucer: (*Streifzüge*, 19, al. 2, 3.)

The Omission of the def. art. occurs before Collective Nouns: ,mertyn myn eme . . . whiche is wiser *in clergie* than somme preest' 68/14.

With Concrete Nouns: - before a Superlative used absolutely:

,Thenne parys gaf to her th(e) apple and said that she was *fayrest* 84/22. Ysegryn and Bruyn ben now *most preuy* of counseyll aboute the kynge 39/38. Think ye it *best* to be don 40/29.

In Chaucer with adjectives in the Superlative used as nouns, the article was expressed or omitted (Einkenkel, 28); -

Before a Noun used as Predicate:

,Ye be *heed* of alle our lygnage 58/27.

Especially in adverbial locutions:

I wente never *to scole* 62/22, the wulf was had *to kychen* (Du: ter koeken) 90/30.

Usage varies with *court*:

The kynge *come to court* 12/16, but: *goo to the court* 15/22.

Note the omission of article with religious terms:

Sir bellijn ye shal *do masse* to fore Reynard 46/23 *receyue sacramente* 71/1, *Sette penaunce*, *receyve penaunce* (cp. O. Fr. ,ouir messe' and ,aller à vèpres', &c.)

The use of the def. art. is, on the contrary, re-



markable in the following cases; — with a plural noun, used in a general sense:

Thus *the unkynde men* now adayes rewarde them that doo them good 89/1 (Du: Aldus soe loenen *die scalcke*... 116/27;

— with a noun of substance, also used in a general way:

Is it thenne earnest that ye love so wel *the hony* 13/31 (Du: dat honich 17/28; (Cleomedes) ... rood upon that hors made of *the tree of hebenus* 85/14 (*tree* = 'wood' as is shown by a preceding passage: 'Kynge salomon seelyd his temple with the same wode ... hit is like to tre of hebenus of whiche wode kynge crompart made his hors of tree' 84/38);

— in adverbial expressions:

A croked staf wel leded on th(e) ende for to playe *at the balle* 16/21 (not so in Dutch: 21/15). Cp. in Chaucer: to playe *at the chesse*, besides *at ches* (Einenkel, 19).

### Indefinite Article.

*A* before consonants; *an* before vowels, — occasionally before *y*: *an Yongling* 89/37 and very consistently before *h*:

*an high* 12/7, *an herte* 63/11, *an hole* 38/25, *hawe* 49/16, *hound* 63/2, *hedche* 75/15, *hande* 115/8, *hynde* 99/23, *herty* 68/27, *hevy* 45/36, *halter* 32/13, *hete* 96/10, *hony* 20/34, *hardyer* 26/36, and for *an*: upon *and heth* 88/15.

OMISSION OF INDEFINITE ARTICLE. — This is frequent, as it is now, with Abstract Nouns, in standing phrases, e. g. with a Noun object: *had knowledche* 58/31, *sette daye* 102/10, *gyve me respyte* 75/35. Such phrases are treated, to a certain extent as compound words, thus besides 'gyve respyte', used absolutely, we find *gyve me respyte of viii dayes*. — With a noun in adverbial

function: delyvered *fro peryl of deth* 75/11; — With a Noun-Predicate, which has then the character of an adjective:

*it is reson*: . . . 8/30 it is reson that he abyte it 53/11, it were wel reson that ye herde my words alle out 67/23, it is good reson and it ought so to be 109/22. — *It is wonder*: is it wonder that I hate hym 74/27. Cf. *was thaet micel wundor*, Alfr. Oros, 118/6.

(Wülfing, Synt. Alfr. I 290 ;

— *mervayl*: thynketh me mervayl of a kynge 89/34.

The omission of the article is also frequent before an adjective, as if the latter was considered a sufficient determinative for the noun, e. g. before determinative adjectives:

hier behoveth other counseyl herto 31/22, he hath told the kynge of *certain tresour* 57/35;

— espec. before adjectives of current meaning such as good, evil, great, long:

I have *good avaantage* 102/12, he oweth me *evyl wyl* 99/40, a graunte hym *long lyf* 38/15; I shold *do grete synne* 70/8 (Du: ic soude sondighen); a triew frende . . . fyndeth ofte *better counseyl* than he that the charge resteth on 68/21, it is *grete shame* 28/1, ther was thenne *grete feste* 112/29. (\*)

The omission is striking where a particular object is meant:

I thold hym that ther was *grete tresour* in krekennyt 49/27 (Du: *enen schat*); ther was *grete tresour* in hulsterlo 61/31. (N.B. *tresour* is, to a certain extent, a *Collective* noun); and also I have forgotten an thyng . . . and it was of *grete deceyte* that I dyde whiche I new wyll telle yow 61/40 (in Du: differently: *een alten groten hoersscheyt* 79/24); he was in better caas 94/7 (Not Du: dat was hem bet vergaen).

Omission before a Noun, without adjective:

---

(\*) We are reminded by these instances of the French „*c'est grand dommage* — avoir *grand peur*, *grand faim*.” — It is interesting to find that in the instances of omission of the Indef. Art. collected from Alfrid by Wülfing (*op. cit.*, 290), there are several cases of a noun preceded by *mycel*.

he is so lusty fayr and *of colour* that ther is no colour under the heven, but somme lyknes is in hym 83/15.

(The Du: has a different constraction: Hij is also lusteliken schoen van verwen, 108/30).

After *never* the Art. may be omitted: ,I sawe never fowler beest' 98/21, or expressed: ,I sawe never a fowler meyne' 98/28. (The omission is frequent in Chaucer: Einken. p. 6, refers to the same use in O. Fr. after *oncques*).

PRESENCE OF THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE is worth noticing in proverbial phrases:

it is a common Proverbe: *An enemyes Mouth saith seeld wel* 7/25 — In Du: on thy contrary = *Vyants mont seit seldom goet* 9/27); —

with Abstract Nouns in adverbial locutions such as *with a good wille* in affirmative reply:

I spack out and saide ye(a) my lorde with a good will 91/36, I saide my lord wyth a good wyl 92/19, I wente to her in a *grete hevynesse* 95/5. Tho cam reyn. *in a grete angre* 106/7, Isegrym . . . thought he was *at an afterdele* 106/7 (In Du: differently: . . . dat hij 't te quaet hadde 140/33); —

Abstract Nouns used alone, are individualized by *a*; *devyse alesyng . . . that men take it for a throuthe* 64/37 ye be good to sende forth *in a nede* 92/17.

(Du: *ter noot* 121/19);

the Indef. Art. is unusual before *part* (Einken., 8): *helpe me that I may have a parte* of this hony 13/23.

*A* is found before nouns used as second objects:

the foure sworn . . . that they sholde *make bruin a kinge and a lorde*; . . . whan a covetous man of lowe byrthe *is made a lorde* 91/4.

Note also . . .

so that he myght wyne as moche as *a legge* (= the legge) of a fat henne 6/36, she gaf me a grete hen of *an hynde* 98/28; his visage was alle *on a blood* 101/4. In the last instance *a* probably = *one* and is due to influence of the Du

text: Sijn aensicht en was anders niet dan met *enen* bloede overloepen.

Indefinite article preceding a cardinal number:

he droof in the stream wel *a ij* or *iiij myle* 17/14 (Differently in Du: *wel een mile* 22/21).

This use is rare in O. E.: *an fiftig* sealmas Aethelst, 3,8 (Koch § 127). It is found in Chaucer (Einenk., 15), is frequent in Berner's Huon, according to Kellner (Outlines, p. 141) is rare in Shakespeare (Abbott § 87) and still occurs in N. E. (instances from Carlyle in Mätzner III, 196). The origin is probably some case where the numeral was treated as a collective noun. Note also the use of the Def. Art. *the* before *one* = one of two:

*blynde an the one eye* 23/23 *The one* half . . . *that other* half 92/20.

But before *one*, *other* the Def. Art. is nearly altogether replaced by the Demonstrative *that*, q. v.

INVERSION AND OMISSION OF ARTICLE AFTER *so*, *such*, *many*.

The construction 'good a man' which was usual in Layamon, was already quite obsolete in Chaucer (Einenk. 19). The inversion of the article occurs:

1°. when the attributive adjective is preceded by an adverb expressing degree, such as *so*, *as*, *how*:

told them in *how* grete a venture he had be 39/20.

But the omission of the Art. in this case is not rare, e. g.:

after *how*: god how swete eyer is there 49/25, how grete drede he had 85/13 (*grete drede* may be regarded as forming, to some extent, one group):

after *so*:

I have so grette scatte and good of sylver . . . that seven waynes shold not conne carrye it away 35/14; they have so grete fordele 65/3 (In Du: somewhat differently: dat desen

aldus groet vordel geschiet); who shold luste to do that game to *one so* stedfast a wyf beyng in *so* grete peryll of deth 96/28; note the tautological construction *one . . . a* (the Du. has simply: aen *eenre* ghestandenre vrouwen in *sulcker* sterfliker noot 127/8); after *as*: and hadde to fore hym *as* fatte capone as a man myght fynde 26/31 (Du: ende hadde *enen* vetten capoen . . . als men vinden mocht 34/22).

The omission of the article also occurs in Chaucer, espec. with Abstract Nouns (Einenk. 19).

2°. After *such*, *many*, but usage varies.

I am in *suche* caas now that I muste nedes deye 35/34.  
Art. expressed:

I am thenne in *suche a* thought 64/8

Many a dwelling-place 12/9, *many a* Chapel 23/9, gone to rome to parys and to *many an other* place 118/14 —

thus hath he brought me *many tyme* in scathe and hurte 97/21 (Not from the Du., which has: ‚dicke’).

I knowe *so many an invencion* I shal come to myn above 33/29 (Du: ic weet soe menighen vont 43/15).

With *so many a*, cp. *full many a*: ‚The plain song cuckoo gray, whose note full many a man doth mark’ Shakespeare (Mids. N. Dr. 3, 1).

In Chaucer the omission of the Art. after *many* is rare, (Einenk., 20).

*Many* + article occurs as early as Layamon. In Ormulum as wel as in O. E. *monig* is not followed by the article (Mätz. III, 203).

#### OMISSION OF ARTICLE IN ENUMERATIONS.

The Art. is often altogether omitted when two or several objects are enumerated, compared, opposed, &c and may be regarded as forming groups.

I desire of your grace that I may have *male and staff* blessyd 46/20, I gaf hym *male and palster* and made of hym a pylgrym 56/27, *galowes and rocke* 24/19, — in the counseylls of *lordes and prelates* 4/6; — It is your part to doo

Justyse on *theft* and *murdre* whiche bothe ben in this caas 93/38 (In Du: likewise; roef ende moert 123/20).

The Article, when expressed once, need not be repeated with each particular Noun, no matter whether they are of the same gender, number, or not:

In this historye ben wreton the parables (good lerynge) and dyverse poyntes to be merkyd 4/2, the kyng and quene 35/28, *the wulf and bere* 47/14, — ye reysed and accompanyed yourself with *a cursyd and persone agravate* 43/23; — he knewe . . . alle *the herbes and nature of them* whiche were viscose or laxatyf 90/1.

A special mention is due, again, to the 'doublets' or couples of synonyms. Here the two Nouns denote the same thing and form almost one word, so that the second follows the construction of the first and we cannot properly speak of an omission of the article . . .

*the promyse and oth* that he to fore made to hym 77/37, reynart is a *shrewe and felle* 11/30, *the shrewes and false deceyvers* ben borne up for to doo . . . alle the harme 30/63.

The same phenomenon occurs after an Art. + Adjective:

and yf I might see the serpent in *the same paryl and nede* that he was in — 77/23;

or after Possessive Pronouns:

above *his oth and promyse* he wold have devoured hym 77/2.

I should explain in a similar way the case where, after a Possessive Pronoun has been expressed once, a Defin. Art. is omitted before some following Noun; two Nouns although not quite synonymous are considered as forming a 'doublet', — which gives rise to an anacoluthia:

Have pyte on myn grete and unresonable *damage and losse* of my fayre chydren 10/41 (the Def. Art. *the* is here

omitted before *losse* in consequence of its being assimilated to *damage*); — after this the kinge sente ffor *his lordes and wysest* of his counseyl 11/21 —

On the other hand, the Article is found repeated before several Nouns referring to the same object:

He is *a* very murderer, *a* rouer and *a* theef 6/34; which of *a* chorle and *a* traytour and worse than *a* theef wolde make *a* lorde and *a* king 38/12; *a* glasse or *a* mirror 83/8.

— before several Adjectives referring to the same Noun:

myn Eme is *a* gentil and *a* trewe man 8/39.

As to the origin of the 'non-repetition' of the article in enumerations, Einkenkel (p. 23) refers to a similar construction in O. Fr. espec. in Froissart. But the beginnings of this use may be found in O. E. Cp. Mätz. III, 193.

## NUMBER AND GENDER.

Some hesitation seems to be felt by Caxton about the Number of collective nouns, and manifests itself in the personal pronouns he uses in reference to them. For instances, see Pers. Pronouns.

Caxton has some plurals without *s*, e. g. *myle*, *marke*, *yere*, *thyng*, &c (cp. Römstedt, Engl. Schriftsprache bei Caxton, p.p. 37, 38), which must not be mistaken for singulars. Perhaps we have a case of Singular, instead of Plural in :

I have made pees wyth hym and I gyve to hym his lyf and *membre* frely agayn 44/8 (Du: syn lyf ende syn leede 56/25. *Membrys* is the usual plural form but Caxton may have taken Du. *leede* for a singular.

The Plural for the Singular is found in the word *condicions* :

Ye be of good *condicions* and goostly of your lyvyug 48/12; he muste be a noble gentle man and have no chorles *condicions* 82/41; Thus shewde he his *condicions* and nature 92/1.

*Alms*, O. E. *aelmesse* Gr. *ἐλεημοσύνη* is still spelt *almesse* 9/3, 28/24, as in the whole M. E. period (Stratmann, *i. v.* *elmesse*).

The next passage shows hesitation as to the Gender of *lesyng* :

The *lesyng* oftymes cometh unavysed and falleth in the mater unwetyngly. And so whan *she* is well cladde it goth forth thurgh with that other 60/30. The Du. has the feminine *si*, *se*.



Remember that in O. E. *séo léasung* as well as *séo leornung* and all abstracts in *ung, nis, &c.*, were feminine.

Names of animals are, as a rule, considered masculine, and the word *beest* is referred to by *he* (not *hit*):

Ther was no beest in al his lande . . . but *he* was there 54/18; ther is no beest so fiers ne stronge but he can dompte hym 81/39.

## C A S E S.

### Nominative.

The Nominative stands for an original Dative in *he was woo* 44/31, cp. Kellner, Outlines § 151; Einkenkel, 113. The confusion of case has brought about changes of syntactical relations, viz., the impersonal verb has become personal & the substantive *woo*, has become an adjective. We probably have an adjective in: that shal make *hym so woo* 103/35, Reynard *was woo* 118/16. But *woo* is still substantive in: *woo begon* 107/5, for *woo* and payne he must creye 111/8, this payne dyde hym more sorow *woo* 111/16; Substantive used as a quasi-Interjection in: *woo to me* 81/6; *O woo be to that lande* 92/31.

### Dative.

A Dative, reminding us of the *datives incommodi* is found in: yf he be *me to myghty* 50/17. The Dative with *to* occurs very regularly after *like*: hit is *like to tree of hebenus* 84/38, cf 64/27, 17/19, 78/23, 115/36; after

*nigh, nere, to* is often omitted, e. g. *yf this were trewe it shold go to nyghe myn honour and worship* 95/26.

See moreover under Prepos. *to* and *for* and our chapter on Transitive & Intransitive Verbs. It will be found that the distinction between mediate (indirect) and immediate (direct) object was not yet clearly defined. The Dative was used in cases where we now prefer the accusative, e. g. after *pray* (‘pray to God...’) and vice-versa.

### Accusative.

The use of the Accusative absolute was very developed (as in Chaucer, *cf.* Einkenel, 50 &c). It gave rise to many adverbial locutions and will be therefore mostly treated of in the chapter on Adverbs. The Accusative absolute may apply to time:

The kyng dyde forth wyth his courte and feste(d) lengthe XIJ dayes lenger 54/5,6 (\*) In this passage ‘XIJ dayes’ is the usual Accusative of duration, but the pleonastic use of the abstract noun *lengthe* is strange and I have vainly looked for a parallel case.

The Accusative may also apply to space and distance: *yf he wold he shold be within lesse than on hour an hondred myle thens* 85/3; He was gone *more ten myle awaye* 85/10.

(Du: over tien mijlen 111/26).

Note in the last passage the omission of *than* after the Comparative. Perhaps a survival of the O. E. construction, *me is a snaegl swiftra*?

The Accusative of measure may originate compound Substantives:

(\*) The (d) after *feste* is erroneously inserted by the editor, *cf.* ‘courte and feste’ on title p. 5; on the other hand *lengthe* may be considered as a verb = *lengthen*, as the Du. text shows: *Die coninck dede ter stond sijn hof xij dage verlangen* 69/11.

he gate leve for to have as moche of the beres skyn upon his ridges as a *foote longe* and a *foot brode* 45/6. *foote longe*, *foot brode* may be compared to *furlong* = furrough long, the length of a furrough.

The Accusative denotes value in cases of 'imaged negation':

he had not trespaced *the value of an heer* 29/32, alle shal not helpe yow a *strawe* 30/10, it shold not avaylle me a *cattes tayl* 50/14; I care not *an heer* 60/12 (*Cp.* not, nought = *nā wiht*; French *ne pas*, *ne point*, &c.).

Lastly the absolute Accusative indicates manner, reference: *wytnes of maister abrion* 82/11, *i. e.* 'according to maister abrion'. The same idiom occurs in Chaucer, only there we find the preposition *on* instead of *of* (Einenkel, 65); — ,he lete the foxe saye *his wyll*' 18/15; the sense, as shown from the context, is not 'express his will', but 'say as much as he would say'. — Note the use of that in:

The serpente answerd I have not trespaced, and *that* (= as to that) I reparte me hoolly un(to) the kyng 77/4 (Du: *Ic gae des claerliken aan den coninck* 98/30).

### Vocative.

The article is sometimes retained before a Noun in the Vocative case, espec. before a Noun in apposition, which assumes more or less the value of a proper name:

he called lowde kywart *the hare* come here to fore the kyng 42/12 (See, on this use, Kellner, *Outlines*, § 223).

'*Strong theeif that ye are*' 101/25, in the sense of the modern 'you theeif' (in Du: *felle dief reynaer* 133/24). Mätzner does not mention this use, but simply speaks of a vocative which has the value of a predicate in

such instances as ,ye fools', ,you little jade: which he refers to the O. E. *þu avordena . . . þu stunta*, Math. 5, 22. (Mätz. II, 171).

Einenkel treats of the construction under Conjunction *that* in Paul's Grundriss 916 § 143 (1<sup>st</sup> édit.), and quoted two instances: *Wrecche mon þet þu hit art!* Kath. *Fox that ye ben!* Chaucer. (\*)

It seems to me that, even in starting from the *causal* meaning of the conjunction *that*, we cannot arrive at a plausible explanation. I would suggest that *that* is here a Relative, and a good illustration of the transition from demonstrative into relative meaning (see Relat. Pronoun). To me, the whole phrase is the upshot of two tendencies: tendency to emphasize a judgment by means of repetition, — tendency to abbreviate this repetition, so as to make it compatible with the *exclamation*. Supposing I want to lay some stress on the opinion that ,you are a thief' or that ,John is a thief', I shall say: ,You are a thief, you are, — John is a thief, he is' (or also: ,J. is a thief, is John'!) If, now, I wish to transpose this from the nominative into the vocative case, from the form of the judgment into that of the apostrophe, I may say: ,thief! . . . you are a thief! — thief! . . .! — *that* you are' (= you are *that*, viz. a *thief*, the Demonstrative being used to avoid the repetition of *thief*); — finally in the vehemence of speech, the stop between the two sentences will disappear, the two will

(\*) . . . . . „wofür“, adds Einenkel, „bis jetzt nur roman. Analoga, Ital. *Pazzo che tu sei* — Frz. *jünger*, Diez III, 119“.

Littre, speaking of such cases as „Infortuné que vous êtes' — Aveugle que j'étais“ refers to similar cases without exclamation, e. g. „La cruelle qu'elle est (viz. la mort) se bouche les oreilles et nous laisse crier“ (Malherbe), which he explains by „la cruelle *laquelle* elle est“. However Littre's explanation is very vague: „*que*, construit avec un Adjectif et le verbe *être* fait une sorte de locution qui signifie *étant*“.

Note, among the older references adduced by Littre, the next one from Froissart (I, I, 317): „Et lui accorderent que *une poignée de gens qu'ils étaient* avoient desconfit le roi d'Écosse et toute sa puissance.“

coalesce, and *demonstrative coordination* well be changed into *relative subordination*: ,thief that you are!'

### Genitive.

#### VARIOUS WAYS OF EXPRESSING THE GENITIVE.

The analytic form, with *of*, was already usual in Chaucer, for all the functions of the Genitive. *Of* is generally preferred with the objective Genitive, but it will be seen under Preposition *of* that it appears also where the sense is a subjective one. *Of* is almost exclusively the form of the *genitivum qualitatis*; however, the synthetic form here and there occurs in this acceptance; this Genit. is quite equivalent to an adjective.

god gyve hym a *shames deth* that hath loste suche good venyson 17/31 (Not Du: dat god u sceynde, &c).

This makes it possible that we have a similar case, with apocope of the ending *es*, in:

tolde to her that ther was no *deth wounde* ne peryl of his lyf 116/85 Cf. your doughter that lyeth here dede we shal gyve unto her *the dethes right* 11/8.

Note also *winters day, night*, where we should use a compound noun:

he laye thre wynters longe nyghtis in the feelde 82/9; hit was so that in a wynters day that they wente to gyder 94/23.

Likewise in Chaucer and Gower, we find ,a lives creature' Cf. Kellner, XVI, 3; Kellner, *Outlines*, § 166; Einkenkel, p. 170.

We find a few survivals of O. E. flexion, without *s*: an *egge shelle* 110/20 (O. E. feminine *ja* - stem, Cf. t. Brink, *Chaucer's Sprache*, § 207), the *belle rope* 26/13 (O. E. *belle* - *an*). Tho spack Grymbart the *dasse* and was Reynarts *suster sone* 7/23. (On the declension of *suster* and other nouns of relationship, cf. t. Brink, § 215).

Note in the last instance and in the following, the accumulation of interdependent genitives, which should now be avoided:

How grymbert the dassé the foxes susters sone spak 7/20. This use is old. Cf. Mätzner III, 326. For instances from Chaucer, Einken., 84.

Forms ending in *s* remain uninflected in the Genitive. Therefore the analytic form was preferred for the numerous proper names in *us*, *es* and this practice was probably extended to all proper names (Einken., 84). Here is an instance of synthetic uninflected form:

it is helene king *Menelaus* wyfe of Greece 84/19. *Priamus sone* 84/5.

This passage exhibits a peculiar word-order which is also found in the Du. original (,dat is des conincs wyf van grieken' 110/22). But the case is an instance of the well-known Early M. E. construction ,the kinges sune Henry'. When a word in the Genitive is followed by an apposition, the governing word is placed between the genitive belonging to it and its apposition. Certain connections of Preposition + Noun are treated like simple appositions so that the construction is found where we now use the so-called ,group genitive' (Cf. Jespersen, *Progr. in language*, espec. p. 293, &c. typical instance: *the Queen of England's power*). Besides the passage just quoted, note:

I had in the popes palays of woerden a good bedde of heye 73/16 (Du: in des pæus hof van woerden). With any name of dignity other than *pope* a confusion would arise with the preceding case and *of woerden* would be referred to *pope*. Both forms of Genitive are used here besides each other to denote two different relations of the word *palays*. Cf. in Chaucer, *kyngé Priamus sone of troye* (Einkenel, 83.)

When several Genitives belong to some word to which they stand in the same relation, the governing

word may be omitted after one of them, — espec. in comparisons. Instead of substantives in the Genit., we may find a subst. besides a possessive pronoun, which shows that the latter sometimes retains its original value of a Genitive:

Come forth alle ye that ben of *my kynne* and *reynarts* 79/25; Yet was *his* strenghte and myght moche more than the foxes 107/7.

DOUBLE GENITIVE, (Kellner's 'pseudo-partitive genitive'): ,A fellow *of his*'. The term 'pseudo-partitive' is justified inasmuch as in such cases as ,that beautiful face of hers' no idea of partition is included. (Kellner, Outlines, § 178). The construction was probably due to a blending of ,a felaw his' and ,a felaw of him', which was further influenced by cases where the meaning was really a partitive one and by the remembrance of the O. E. constructions *seo heora jugop*, *seo heora gebyrd*, (Einenkel, 86). In Chaucer this use is not yet developed after the Defn. Pron. *this*, *that*, nor with substantives: *That ilke proverbe of Ecclesiaste*, not: *of Ecclesiastes* (Einenk. *ibid*). It is therefore interesting to find the following instance in *Reynard*:

he sawe fro ferre come fleyng one *of seynt martyns* byrdes 19/37 (Du: doe sach hi van verre *enen sinte martijns vogelen* comen vlieghen 25/23).

#### FUNCTIONS OF THE GENITIVE.

It is difficult to separate the syntax of the Genitive from the treatment of the preposition *of*. Most of the cases will be studied under that head and I shall devote the present chapter especially to the *Partitive Genitive* and related constructions.

The simplest case is that where this genit. was governed by comparatives or superlatives, by numerals, by interrogative or indefinite pronouns by substantives

denoting quantity. This use is old, remember the O. E. genitive after *hund*, *þusend* and other numerals.

In M. E. there was a tendency towards replacing the genit. by the simple *apposition* in these cases. So we find in Chaucer *a busschel venym*, *a morsel bred* (Kellner, *Outlines*, p. 109). But, says, Dr. Kellner, at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, there was a stop in this development, and expressions like those just quoted, are not to be met with in Caxton'. This is going too far as may be seen from instances like: *an hondred men* 82/39, *a litle watre* 82/24. But it remains true that, possibly under influence of the Latin genit. partitive, there was a reaction towards the O. E. and Early M. E. use, and *of* was introduced even in expressions which had never been in the genitive. Of course, in some of the appositive phrases referred to, the genit. may have been simply disguised by the decay of case-endings. But in other cases the partitive relation was not expressed in any way, as the following instance will show: *what they gate they shold departe to eche the half* 87/12. Among the misunderstood constructions which I alluded to, one of the most interesting is that of *one* + Superlative. Cf. Chaucer, 'one the beste knyghte' besides 'one of the beste knyghtes' and the curious mixed construction, 'Oon of the grettest *auctour* that men rede' (Nonne Prest. T., 164, five mss., against one with *auctours*). The first supposition which arises is that *the beste &c.*, is a genitive partitive and that such instances as 'one the beste knyghte' are due to the weakening of inflections. But Einenkel, who discusses the matter at length (*Streifzüge* 87-90), shows that there is nothing to corroborate this view in the older language. If we go back to the Legend of Katherine (beginning of



the 12<sup>th</sup> century) we find cases like: *cum nu, my weddet, leovest an wummon*, w. 2419-29 (not *wummonne* nor — *menne*). And if we look for such O. E. instances as *þa betstra monna*, we find them to be very unusual indeed. In order to understand the case in point we must, according to Einkenel start from such cases as *þaer waeron þreo þa betstan ele* (Blickl. Hom., 73,21), or *Two the beste them slayn had I* (Guy, 8095) we come to the conclusion that 'the beste' in 'oon the beste' is an apposition and that the phrase means: the best of all (\*) The author quotes after Grimm, the following parallel in M. Du. *ene die meste overdaet*, Reinaert, 137.

Chaucer, as a rule, introduces *of* after *one*; it is therefore worth mentioning that the original construction is met with in *Reynard*:

Yet was I unto the tyme that I was wened fro the tete *one the best chylde* that coude onwher be founden 34/22 — Likewise in Du: So was ic tot dat men mi speende *een dat beste kint* dat men ye ghevinden mocht 44/17; and on eche side of the byer wenten tweyne sorowful hennes that one was called cantart and that other good hen Crayant they were *two the fayrest hennes* that were bytwene holland and arderne 9/23.

In order to illustrate this appositive use of the superlative I further draw attention to the next passage:

He is a *Iewe The wysest* in connyng 82/1.

Besides this use of the apposition, another substitute for the partitive genitive is the attributive use of certain adjectives denoting quantity. Thus instead of *part of his army*, the O. E. had *sum his fultum*. Compare the construction of *half*: he gaf to me but *half the longes* 91/41:

(\*) Einkenel paraphrases the expression in this way: *der eine der zugleich der beste ist, oder der beste der zugleich einer, oder der einzige ist.* (*Streifzüge*, 88, al. 6).

Closely related to this is the construction of substantives in the genit. which are very much alike to adjectives. In order to express the idea ‚all sorts of worms’, the O. E. put it in a more concrete way and said ‚Worms of every kind’, *alles cunnes wurmes*. (Cf. Kellner *Outlines*, 104–107). To this origin may be traced partitive expressions with *kinne* (kind), *manere* not followed by *of*, – with a noun in the Singular, ‚suche maner mete 48/15, such maner wayling 58/30, what maner wryting’ 62/28; – with a Noun in the plural: such maner thyngys, all maner beestys 10/17, all maner langages 52/29, such maner lettres 63/15, al maner herbes 81/38, three maner colours 82/12. – We find also ‚*many figure playes...*’ Instances with *of* also occur: ‚al maner of beestis 54/11, al maner of langages’ 81/37.

N.B. The adjectival value of the words *manner* &c. in these cases account for constructions like ‚these sort of thyngs’ which are not rare even in recent English. Cf. *Outlines*, § 172 and Franz. *Syntax des älteren Neuenglisch*, Engl. Stud. XVII, p. 390.

ELLIPTIC PARTITIVE GENITIVE. The word governing a partitive genitive may be omitted. This was already the case in O. E. after verbs like *haebban*, *niman*, *etan*, *drincan*, (See Mätzner, II, 274, 275). The following instances remind us of this:

though the hony combes be swete... *take of them* by measure 14/34; there lerned I fyrst to *lapen of the bloode* ... And after I began to *taste of the flessh* 34/26,27.

This Gen. acquired a very wide expansion in M. E. It was used after all sorts of Verbs and not only with plural nouns, or nouns of substances but even with abstracts and with singular concrete nouns. Einkenel suggests that a possible origin of this use

was the change of meaning of such words as *ought*, *nought*, *anything*, *somthyng* which from independent words became negations or Indefinite Pronouns.

*E. g.*: yet this was *of the leste* = this was but the least thing (Du: noch dit was van den minsten) 35/8; this is of thy faders harneys 22/38.

,who that wyl rede this mater though it be *of* iapis and bourdes'.

In connection with the Partitive Genitive, I wish to say a word about a change of meaning which seems to have taken place in some cases of its application. In an instance like O. E. *þúsend wigendra*, a thousand (of) warriors, the genit. implies that a group of a thousand has been taken *from* or *among* the warriors and the term ,genit. partitive' is perfectly to the point. But suppose that we consider the warriors, not as a larger group from which a partion has been isolated, but as the units composing the collection of a thousand (any larger collection being left out of consideration), then the relation between the two words is changed. The idea of the thousand being a part of the warriors is superseded by that of each warrior being part of a thousand. The notions expressed by the two words become *co-extensive* and the function of the word in the genitive is very much alike to that of an apposition. This may be observed in N. E., in certain connections with a numeral + *of*, where the latter has the sense of ,consisting of'. To a question about the number of persons attending some party, we may hear some such answer as: *there were five of us*, meaning, not that there were five ,of us' and more of other sorts, which would be the usual case, — but that ,the five of us' made up the whole party, that ,we' = the party, were ,five'. If we keep the term ,genit.

partitive' to denote this relation, it is well to be warned that a somewhat different thing is meant, than in the ordinary cases. (\*) I may perhaps be pardoned for making an observation which is not quite relevant, — as I do not find it made anywhere.

---

(\*) 'Collective Genitive' would perhaps be more apposite.

## ADJECTIVE.

Instances of adj. agreeing in gender and number with a noun are very rare. In Chaucer, *the Concord of the adjective* is not unfrequent with French adjectives following the noun and taking the plural *s*: *places delitables, thinges espirituels* (see t. Brink, *Chaucer's Spr.*, 132). In Caxton, comp. on the contrary:

He shold I trowe be herde bothe wyth *the lordes spyrytuel and temporel* 117/19. — Note, however: *Many good diverses metes* 60/29; ther were thre *hebrews names* therin 81/35 (Du: drie hebreesche namen).

### ADJECTIVES USED SUBSTANTIVELY.

With a personal sense:

Though Reynard be a shrewe ther be many *good* of his lignage 31/33. I knowe hym for *the moste noble* that now lyveth 83/4.

With a neutral sense: *ye saye soth* 24/28 (cp. Einkenkel, 32); frequently in adverbial locutions with *at*, espec. with adj. in the Superlative: „*atte longe* it shal be wel knowen” 78/32 (Du: „Men sal noch *om lanck* wel vernemen” 101/6). Cp. the French „à la longue” (\*). *Atte laste* is a somewhat dubious case. According to Einkenkel (*Streifzüge* 32), *laste* is an original substantive, O. E. *lâst* = track. (See, however, Bülbring, *E. Stud.* XII, 290);

Ye knowe al thyng *at the narewest* 65/34; — I hope to come *at alther lengest* with in fyve dayes agayn 61/19 (Du:

(\*) Such formations as „à la longue”, „à la dérobée”, „à la légère” are old in French (Darmesteter, *Gr. hist.*, § 260) but I am not able to give a special O. Fr. reference for „à la longue”.

ten alren lenghesten 78/32). Note here the adverbial use of *alther* and compare: two birchen trees standyng *alther* next the pytte 41/27 (for the *strong* genitive *alther* = *alder*, *aller*, see t. Brink, *Chauc. Spr.*, § 255); — seke every man upon his feblest and wekest 64/34 was probably influenced by Du: *op sijn weeckst* 83/93.

Adjectives in Apposition may refer to a Collective Noun:

Thenne *the counseyl* concluded *olde and young* that he shold be sente fore 19/6.

Caxton does not use *one* after an adj. referring to a preceding noun, e. g.: ,he stal the grete thynges and I *the smalle* 35/1 (Kellner found only *one* instance in the works of Caxton where *one* is used, cp. Kellner, Blanchardyn xxviii). The *syntactical function* of the Adj. is peculiar in the next passages, where we must admit an ellipsis of *to be*:

who that wold have all leseth alle *ouer covetous was never good* 95/35. The Du. has likewise: al te gierich en was nye goet 126/6. I wolde yet this nyght make that ye shuld be ful of myes, — reynard quod he *ful that were many* 21/15. Dutch: zat dat waer al vele 27/22.

ADJECTIVE USED AS SECOND OBJECT. In a construction with two Accusatives, viz. with a Noun-Object and an Adjective-Object, the second may have the value of a predicate, *i. e.* denote the result of the action expressed by the verb. This use is but briefly treated of by Mätzner (II, 216) and by Koch (p. 110). Einkenkel, speaking of the case ,As he that wery was forgoo' thinks of the German ,sich müde gehen', but prefers to explain the passage by an omission of *and* between *wery* and *forgoo* (Einenk. 37). In Reynard, there are some interesting instances of analogous constructions:

(1) In the Active voice:

The kyng hath *skylled hym quyte* of alle his brokes 44/22 (for the sense of *skylled*, vid. Muller & Logeman, LII). The Du. has a different construction: heeft *hem alle sijne brocken quijt gelaten* 57/5.

And when he had *eten his bely fulle* 69/5, id. 99/28, 99/39; the Du. uses *different* constructions: doe hi ghenoech hadde &c. *castyng wyth his feet the duste that it flewe the wulfis eyen ful* 106/2 (The Du. has: dede hem sijn oeghen vol stuven).

(2) In the Passive:

and there upon was a marble stone *polished as clere as ony glas* 11/17 (Not so in Du: een pollyst marmorsteen — *die* also *claer was als een glas*): (the lettres) be *redy wreton* 51/9 (not so in Du: . . . sijn alrede ghescreven).

COMPARATIVE.

Before the Comparative, the use of the proportional *the* with the sense Latin ,*eo*' corresponding to the O. E. instrumental *þi* is frequent and often nearly expletive:

lete his male slyde off) by cause he wold be *the lighter* 87/37; he wolde love and rewarde hym so wel that he sholde ever be *the better* 88/25; I was in myn even song therfore have I *the lenger taryed a lytyl* 12/36.

The Comparative occurs instead of the *Superlative* when two objects are compared:

and bytween the *gretter* teeth and the *smaller* is a large felde and space . . . 83/29 — Yet thought the foxe I have good avauntage . . . he (the wulf) shal be somewhat *the weyker* 102/15.

SUPERLATIVE.

Among various ways of expressing the Superlative *absolute (Intensive)*, we may note the compounds with *over*: *overcovetous* 95/35. (Du: overgierich), he was to me *overswyft* 61/37 (Du: te cloeck), *overgrete* 56/36, *overnyce* 56/24, *overgood* for me 89/13 — *Overmuch* a fool

110/36. This use of *over* is old. Compare Chaucer: ‚over grete a point of compas’, ‚over large a spender’, Einenk., 20.

Note also *richer than rich* = very rich: ‚thenne shal thou be *richer than riche*’ 84/12. In Du: ‚Soe bistu boven allen rijcken rijck’ 110/12.

*More, most*, and even, *much* are used as Adjectives (likewise in Chaucer, Einenk. 39):

I trowe that never man sawe *more* (= greater) wonder 26/34; as I sawe her (viz. the she-ape) me thought she semed *more* (greater) than ysegrym the wulf and her chyldren were *more* than I 98/27,28; — ther fonde I the *moste* plente of silver and of golde that ever I sawe 38/39 —

perhaps *much* is an Adj. = ‚great’ in:

there is *much thyng* complayned an yow. Cp. ‚This olde folke can *mochil thyng*”, Chaucer, quoted by Einenk., 39. (*Thyng* might also be a plural, Ch. Römstedt, 38, and, in this case, *mochil* would be an Indefinite Pronoun).

*Very* is still an adjective (as in modern ‚the very same’ . . .) = real, true, e. g.:

he is a *very* murderer 6/33, ye shal wel understande the very yonste and good wyl that I bere to you ward 14/15.

*Quite* is also used as an Adj. (= O. Fr. *quite*, cp. Stratmann).

Thus we were *quyte* of reynart a longe whyle 10/12.

Ye shal goo *quyte* of all the complayntes that ben complayned on you 24/25 (Du: id.) *skylled hym quyte*, etc. 44/22.



## PRONOUN.

### Personal Pronoun.

The distinction between the Nominative *ye* and the oblique cases *you*, *yow* is very consistently observed, e. g. :

my lord if *ye* wil have worship *ye* muste do herfore Justyce and avenge *you* in suche wyse as men may fere and holde of *yow* 56/4. Grymbert sayde wel dere eme what thyng shal *you* lette *ye* knowe al thyng at the narewest 65/33.

It appears from instances collected by Franz (Synt. des älteren N. E., E. Stud. xvii, 215) that even in the 17<sup>th</sup> c. *you* had not entirely supplanted *ye* in the Nominative. *Ye* was considered more solemn and used, e. g., in Milton's Addresses to the House of Commons.

*The*, *thou* sometimes interchange with ,*ye*, *you*' in a same passage without any appreciable shade of meaning.

Thenne saidest *thou* aunte sprynge in to that boket that hangeth there and *ye* shal come anon to me, I dyde so, and I wente downward, and *ye* cam upward tho was I alle angry, *thou* saidest thus fareth the world . . . 97, al. 1.

Sometimes *thou* denotes contempt, anger, menace. In the following speech of Reyn. to the wolf, *you* is first exclusively used, whereas *the* is used alone in the second part, where Reyn. pretends to be a judge.

Tho came reyner in grete angre and bote hym thre grete woundes in his heed wyth his teeth, and said what is that syr wulf hath one there byten *yow*, how is it wyth *yow*, I wyl al otherwyse on *yow* yet abyde I shal brynge *yow* somm newe thyng, *ye* have stolen many a lambe and des-

troyed many a simple beest . . . al this shal I now avenge on *the*, I am chosen to reward *the* for *thyn* old synnes for god wyl no lenger suffre *the* in *thy* grete ravayne and shrewdnes, I shal now assoyle *the* and that shal be good for *thy* sowle take paciently thys penance for *thou* shalt lyve no lenger the helle shal be thy purgatorye . . . 106, al. 2.

Cp. Abbott §§ 231—34 for the use of thou, you in Shakesp. and especially for the history of the growth of *you* at the expense of *thou* in the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> century, see Franz. *op. citat.* E. Stud. xvii, 216—221.

#### OMISSION OF PERSONAL PRONOUN.

Cases of omission of Pers. Pr. are frequent in O. E., M. E. and Old French. The phenomenon may be accounted for by the originally synthetic nature of Aryan languages.

Following Kellner, I shall distinguish between the omission of the Pers. Pr. as Subject and as Object, in Coordinate and in Subordinate sentences (Kelln. xxxii).

##### (A.) Subject-Pronoun omitted.

(1) In coordinate sentences, having the same subject:

Thō was the foxe sorier and hevyer then to fore was mery and (*he* omitted) was as angry and sayde 17/28.

Note the next passage where a Verb with Pers. Pr. omitted is set in parallel with a Latin Verb:

now herke dere cosyn what I shal saye Confiteor tibi pater of alle the mysdedes that I have don and (*I* omitted) gladly wil receyve penance for them 25/35.

The coordinate clauses may be themselves subordinate to some principal sentence:

I muste saye what my gryef is (. . . that is to wete) that ye have don a foule and shameful trespaas whan *I* had pardonned you alle your offencis and trespacis and ye promysed to goo over the see on pylgrimage and (*I* omitted) gaf to you male and staf 72/22.

Instances abound, especially after *and* which serves as a support for the Verb and replaces, as it were the Pers. Pron. — Cf. 5/13, 14/30, 26/17, 27/9, 87/27, 113/33.

(1*b*) The coordinate sentences may have a different subject. The case has been overlooked by Kellner. We may first mention the case where there is only a discrepancy between grammatical subjects, — the logical subject being common to both sentences:

hym lüsted no lenger to smyte the bere, but (he) called dame Iuloke in the water 16/39; *it* repenteth hym and (he) is sory that he ever hath . . . trespaced agenst you 53/23.

Other cases where the omitted Pronoun has to be supplied from the context:

tho the provende of six monkes was not suffyicient to hym and (*he*) had not enough to &c. 43/21. Thenne he unlused hym and delyverd hym out of the snare and (they) wente forth to gydre a good whyle 75/27; and who somever bereth on hym these thre uames, he shal never be hurte by thondre ne lyghtnyng ne no witchcraft shal have power ne (shal) (*he*) be tempted to doo synne 82/7; Nevew now be ye sure fro alle myschief and drede, and (*I*) counseyle yow that ye reste you a lytyl 104/9.

(2) When the subject is the same in a principal and a subordinate sentence, the pronoun is omitted

(*a*) in the subordinate sentence:

Tho was the foxe sorier and hevyer than to fore (*he*) was mery 17/29.

(*b*) in the principal sentence:

And so (*I*) departed thens meryly that I so wel had spedde 99/33;

(3) The subject is not the same in the principal and in the subordinate sentence, and has to be supplied in the latter from the context, e. g. from some oblique case:

So is it now knownen to you alle by hys owen wordes that (*he*) is a diffamer of wymmen . . . 96/25.

For similar instances in *Blanchardyn*, see Kellner xxxiv.

(4) *It* preceding impersonal Verbs is omitted.

According to Kellner, there are but two instances of this omission in *Blanchardyn*.

The fact is much more frequent in *Reynard*.

We first notice the omission of *it* in comparative clauses, where it still occurs in N. E. (Mätz. II. 33).

... *as is* to god wel acceptable 64/4 ... *as moche as* in hym *is* 96/26; — in lyke wyse *is* fallen to me 68/25; they take hede of nothyng but on theyr synguler prouffyt yet ben they take up and rysen grete, the more pity is 87/8; *so fareth* by me 89/36; *Thus thinketh* me a ryghtful Iugement 78/4.

Generally a logical subject is also expressed:

where grete courtes ben gadred ... where *as nedeth* subtyl counseyl 24/37; whan nede is 103/21, what hurted the foxe to speke fayre 90/15; *methinks*, *methought* are usual. The following passages seem to be copied from the Du:

*there lyeth not* on 19/30 (Du: daer en ligt niet an), perhaps *not* = *nought* and must be considered as Indefin. Pr. — me growlett 100/2 (Du: *mi gruwelt*).

The omission is old but *hit*, *paer* are O. E. also. Mätz. II, 17. *It* is of course omitted when *there* is used in connection with the Impers. Verb. *There* may be postponed to the Verb': yet ,standeth ther more' 73/34. It may be omitted altogether: ,We ben so nygh of kynne eche to other that of right *shold* be angre bytwene us' 109/16.

(B) The omission of the Pers. Pr. as object is very rare (Kelln., xxxiv). — I was not able to find any case in point in *Reynard*.

#### PLEONASTIC PERSONAL PRONOUN.

Besides the omission of Pers. Pronouns there is the converse phenomenon, viz. their occurrence where

they would at present be considered pleonastic. The important use of a 'supplementary Pronoun' after adjective clauses will be examined under the Relative Pronoun.

Other instances are, with Subject-Pronoun :

Bruyn the bere and ysegrym the wulf *they* be plegge for me 48/35 (Du. *die* 62/22. Maister abrion of tryer *he* is a wyse man 81/37.

(Du: *dat* is een alte wise man 106/15).

With Objective Pronoun :

the smal fethers he slange them in wyth the flesshe 55/35. (Not Du., cp 71, 26). And the debate bytwene yow I holde it on me 113/7 (the same in Du. 149, 3) (\*)

The Pers. Pron. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Pers. is found with an Imperative :

*follow ye me* 14/19 *sorrowe ye not* 14/37 *saye ye me* trouthe 21/4 *be ye* (mercy ful, sure, &c.) 36/17, 52/1, 73/33, 104/9, *do ye wel* and folow her 57/21, *deme ye* no man 73/35 (Transl. of 'nolite judicare'), *aske ye* hym 101/29, *thynke ye* on the example 110/1, that shal he ever be and thynke ye not the contrary 116/14 O. E. — Cf Kelln. Outlines § 259.

The Pron. *ye* appears also in connection with the vocatives 'sirs', 'lords', &c. But it is difficult to distinguish it from the Adv. *ye* = yea (See Adverb. p. 4).

In *ye tybert saye me* trouthe 21/4, *ye* translates the Du: *Iae tybert segdi mi oec waer* 27,11... In *ye lordes* and sires what saye ye hereto, *ye* stands for Du. *ghi* (Ghi heren wat segdi hier toe 74,20) — *ye lordes* 23/29 (Du: ghi heren 30,30); — And thenne he sayde *ye* sires I brynge to you a faste pardon 53/20 (Du: *ghi* heren Ic breng u enen vasten vrede 68,21).

*It* is sometimes used redundantly, at least without referency to any, but a very vague object;

*ye* have also my wyf shamed and sklandred that she shal

(\*) The repetition of the Pron. in Du. is not always reproduced by Caxton. Cp. *dese die deden* 21,13 and *thys* (= these) *did*. C. 16/18.

never recovre *it* 101/33 (nothing corresponding Du. 134/4). Now ben ther many false shrewis . . . that . . . take on them to lye and to telle *it* forth (viz. to tell forth their lies) 65/5.

*It* announcing an object-clause:

the foxe wil telle *it* how it byfelle 97/24.

*It* recalling a preceding object:

But the shame and villonye that he hath don to my wyf, shal I never hyde ne suffre *it* unavengyd 6/13.

For instances of pleonastic *it* after intransitive Verbs, Cf. Mätzner II, 184 (Shaksp. has to 'lord *it*' and to 'prince *it*', Mätzn. says that this use belongs to a later period of the language). — For *it* 'stop-gap', *it* after trans. Verbs, think of some such mod. expressions as 'take *it* easy' &c.

*He, him* may refer to an undetermined subject, viz. to the unexpressed Subject of a Verb in the Infinitive:

hit is better *to have* prys honour, reste and pees, And many frendes that be redy to helpe *hym* than to have shame, hurte, unreste and also many enemyes lyeng in a wayte to doo *hym* harme 110/10. (Still found in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Franz E. St. xvii, 394, 6).

Personal Pronouns in the plural may refer to Collective Nouns:

And in to thys daye they devoure ande ete bellyns lignage where that they may fynde *them* 54/2; . . . where-soever he wente and in what felowship he shall be by-loyyd though *they* hadde hated *hym* to fore 82/36.

As to Pers. Pron. emphasized by a preceding *it is* we find:

And yf any hier shold have a reward *it shold be I* by right 88/40, besides the older construction 'but how *I am he*, that nowe ye wille doo on me what *it* shal please you' 32/38.

I did not come across any instances of the idiom 'it is me', which Sweet, in his *M. E. Gramm.* 52, admits is found even in N. E. educated speech and

the origin of which is explained by Jespersen (Progr. in Lang., § 37, 249).

The Pers. Pron. *they*, *them* seem in Caxton to retain something of their original demonstrative meaning. Hence, they are not uncommonly preceded by the determ. Adj. *alle* and followed by *that*:

alle they that may helpe her 16/40; and waked *alle them* that were in the hows 22/20; made his confession . . . to fore *alle them* that wold here it 34/17.

In the next instance, *them* is used quite in the sense of 'people' and followed by an adverbial determinant denoting origin:

thy kynge . . . commanded *alle them of the court* to go and conveyne reynart 47/23. A similar use of *they*, *them*, is found in later times. Franz quotes from Raleigh: they of Megalopolis, them of tegea, &c (E. Stud. xvii, 391). Cp. They leef and ronne faste fro them ward . . . as *they* that were aferd of theyr lyf 87/15. (= ,as people' te).

*Him* once occurs in a similar sense:

Your eme tought me ones a prayer that is of moche vertue to *hym* that shal fyghte 102/34.

Note also *they* = *those* in:

I shewd hym ones this cynge, he sayde that *they* were tho thre names that seth brought out of paradys 82, 3;

Let is remembered that *they*, *them* are etymologically plural cases of the O. E. Demonstratives which also originated the Definite Article (Cf. Morris, Outlines of Engl. accidence, § 176).

*Them* is still used as a Demonstrative in the popular talk, (see Storm, *Engl. Phil., Vulgärsprache*, 800).

Franz refers to a similar vulgar use of *they*: *they houses*, for *those* house. But I found no confirmation of this statement (Franz, op. citat. in E. Stud. xvii, 221).

Perhaps the author thinks of '*them houses*'.

## Emphatic Pronoun with „self”.

This pronoun may be used alone: ‚everyche . . . wylle be a lord *hymself*’ 56/12, or as an apposition to a personal pronoun: ‚*Ye yourself* shal not goo peasibly in the hye way’ 56/7. Sometimes ‚own’ is inserted, or the Pr. is emphasized by some other way: ‚I wil *mysell* in my persone helpe therto al that I may’ 56/38. The next instance is remarkable as to form and tells much about the history of these various connections: ‚*they them selven* ben hurt and rewarded with the same’ 86/13. In the preceding case: *I wil mysell* etc. the two elements coalesce and have partly lost their independence but in the last instance, we find a trace of weak declension which, as well as the graphic separation of the two words *them & selven* corroborates Kellner’s view, viz. that the two words were primitively in apposition to each other, that *self* was not looked upon as a Substantive and that some change of pronunciation in *me self*, *the self* may have brought about *myself*, *thysel*, where the first element has taken the form of a possessive.

Note moreover that the Pr. of the third person resisted the analogy of *myself* and that the latter does scarcely appear before the 13<sup>th</sup> century. (Kellner, *Outl.*, § 296).

## Reflexive Pronoun.

Both the simple and the compound form occur. According to Kellner ‚as early as Caxton’s time the compound forms seem to be the rule. Of *thrity* in-



stances occurring on the first 42 pages of *Blanchardyn* only *three* are simple . . .' (Kelln., do., § 299).

From my enquiry in *Reynart* it seems that this is saying too much. In *Reynart*, at least, the proportion is certainly greater on the side of the simple form. This, in the First Part (pages 4—54) is used in the following passages: 4/13, 6/4, 6/7, 10/26, 12/29, 13/7, 15/25, 17/17, 17/28, 18/14, 19/36, 21/29, 25/33, 25/28, 25/31, 25/36, 28/5, 28/39, 29/23, 29/26, 29/28, 30/26, 31/29, 32/4, 32/37, 38/18, 34/5, 44/14, 46/33, 47/29, 50/15;

the form with *self* is found on 5/16, 6/27, 8/18, 12/32, 20/7, 14/14, 18/1, 28/13, 29/4, 31/31, 32/34, 39/35, 40/2, 41/15, 43/23, 43/28, 47/17.

Possibly there is a preference for the latter form, where the Pron. is preceded by a Preposition. This, among the passages referred to, is the case in *he doth to hymself no worshyp* 8/18, *tho thought reyn. in hym self* 12/32; cf 20/7, 18/1, 31/31, 41/15.

*Self* is not inflected with *s* in the plural forms:

Where ben they that so wolde doo, that is to destroye *them self* for to kepe yow 40/2.

Reflexive Pronouns may appear in a more emphatic form:

I counseylle you reyn. that ye put *you your self* out of this curse 43/28; I have ynowh to doo with *myn owne self* 118/29.

There is sometimes a great affinity between the reflex. Pron. and a *dativus ethicus* of the personal Pr. as some such cases as the following will show:

he gate leve for to have as moche of the beres skyn . . . as a foote longe - for to make *hym* ther of a scryppe 45/7. *I fere me* that I shal not conne wel goo thyder 13/7.

It is probable that these instances represent the original case of the reflexive use of the Pron., viz. that any reflex. Pr. took his source in a *dativus ethicus*. This is the theory developed at length by *Voges* (*Der*

*Reflexive Dativ. im Englischen, Anglia*, VI, 316--373).

Moreover the simple form was the primitive one. There are O. E. instances of *me sylf*, *þe sylf*, *him sylf* but it may be noticed that *sylf* has generally an independent, emphasizing value. Later on, *self* lost this value and reflexive pronouns were occasionally emphasized by some other word, as seen above.

The plural *selves* does not occur until the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The simple form occurs in Shakespeare (Abott § 223), it is comparatively common in Bunyan (instances ap. *Franz, op. cit.* Engl. Stud. xvii, p. 400) and disappears from literary prose about the time of Dryden. It survived longest in connection with *bethink*, *bethought* (Instances from Thackeray ap. *Franz. op. cit.*).

The Reflexives *itself*, *oneself* belong to a later period. In Caxton, *himself* is used instead:

how that he gate afterward helene . . . and how he brought her in to troye . . . was al coven in the felde *every thyng by hym self* 84/25.

For *himself* referring to *one*, see Indef. Pron., 86/11.

### Possessive Pronouns.

*My*, *thy* are used before consonants, *mine*, *thine* before vowels: (Kelln., xxxv). I must add that the rule is not absolute. *Myn* occurs before an *h*; thus, besides *my herte* 37/26, 95/2, 109/29, 111/1, 115/18, *my heed* 55/1,5 we find *myn herte* 37/26, 81/7, 81/23, 88/12, 93/11, 109/24, *myn heer* 37/25, 100/24, *myn husewife* 39/6, *myn hows*, 50/34, *myn honour* 95/26; *myn helpe* 94/2, 103/9; also before other consonants: *myn necke* 49/18, *myn nece* 71/7, *myn mynde* 111/2, *myn buttokkis* 114/8.

The forms with *n* gradually fell into disuse about

the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (Franz. *op. cit.* E. St., xvii, p. 384).

*Its* does not occur.

The oldest instance quoted by Koch is from Florio, (1598). Spenser does not use *its*, Shakesp. only 14 times (Koch, Gramm. p. 249, Abbott, § 228), It is even probable that *its* was introduced in Shakespeare by the editors. See *Notes & Queries*, Febr. '93.

The use of *his* after a personal Noun, instead of the Genitive is hardly represented in *Reynard*. The following passage is not quite conclusive:

I comande you upon your lyf that ye doo worship to reynart *his* wyf and to his chyldren 44/10 (Du: . . . dat ghi reynair sinen wive ende sinen kinderen ere doet 56,27).

Four analogous cases from Alfred's *Orosius* are quoted by Wülfing (*op. cit.* I § 251). This use was not rare in Early M. E., e. g. in the second text of *Layamon* (Mätzner III, 244), it was very developed in the 16<sup>th</sup> c., but seems to have been less in favour in the second part of M. E. Einenkel does not mention it for Chaucer. — Instances of this use in modern vulgar English will be found in Storm (Engl. Phil., 775).

The usual view as to the origin of this idiom is that it was due to a phonetic confusion, viz. to a misinterpretation of the inflexional *s*. This is the opinion of Sweet, quoted by Storm *i. loc. cit.* — It is perhaps more natural to regard this construction as an anacoluthia, since we find it in other Germanic languages, viz. in familiar German and Du. where the phonetic explanation does not hold. This view is confirmed by the fact that in the examples quoted by Wülfing the nouns are followed not by *his*, but by *hiora* and *hyre*.

*My* is used before titles, in addresses to superiors,

also before nouns of relationship (*my dere cosyn* 20/13) espec. before *lord, lady*; Kellner (xxxv) says that it occurs in this connection so as to form almost one word. I should say, from the instances referred to, that this was less the case then than now; or at least that the two words *my* and *lord (lady)* were kept distinct in the mind, seeing that they could be separated by intervening attributes, — but that the two words together were regarded as forming one group with a following noun *kyngge, queen, &c*:

*my worthy and dere lorde the kyngge* 113/15, *my dere lorde kyngge* 115/1, *theyr lorde the kyngge* 111/25, *our lorde the kyngge* 111/30, *my lorde the kyngge and noble lady the quene* 41/3, *merciful lorde syre kyngge* 18/34.

N.B. *min domne biscop* occurs in Alfred's *Beda*: this use is not due to the French.

When the Possessive is *used substantively* a preceding word has generally to be supplied: . . . helde *my part* and *his* to(o) 35/7, but the pronoun may also be used absolutely with the special sense of his, their, 'people':

the trespasses that ben lyed agaynst *hym and his* 23/34; that *we and owris* may abyde in honour and worship 56/36; whiche was to *you and youres* right *doubteful* 75/14. O. E. & M. E. instances ap. Kellner, *Outl.*, § 312; M. E. instances ap. Mätzner, II, 11.

The Possessive may be preceded by the Article:

they maye wel speke and saye theyr advys but *the myne* is beste 25/1. More instances from *Blanchardyn*, ap. Kellner, xxvi. — Ye muste heche my chyldren with *the youris some wysedom* 99/5. — This may be French imitation. Remember, however, the O. E. construction *seo heora jugoþ* Blickl. Hom. 163,3, *seo hire gebyrd* ibid 163,9 (Einenkel, 86).

Instances like the preceding show that the Posses-

sive was originally merely attributive and had no determinative, viz. restrictive force. This accounts for the fact, that it is often followed by a restrictive relative clause, beginning with *that*:

my best beloved newew *that* I know in al my kindrede 59/2, in token of mekeness and obedience of *your* penance *that* I gaf yow 28/18; I shal rather gyve you *my* male *that* I bere 51/6.

As to the use of the Possess. Pron. in relative sentences, it may be noticed that the primitive meaning of *his* = 'of him' (Genit. of Pers. Pr.) is retained, to a certain extent, in later times, in the constructions where the Possessive appears as antecedent of a following Relative = 'they shall be condemned . . . to be *his* slaves *whom* they offended' Burton. *A. M.* 66.

I did not come across this construction, — which occurs in O. E. (Wülfing I, § 246, *in fine*, § 278), and is still very usual in the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> c. (Franz, op. cit. E. St. xvii, 388).

The Possessive occurs in connection with Adjectives used substantively and meaning equality, superiority or inferiority: the Possessive in these cases represents one of the terms of the comparison: . . . ,and was *your* better and wiser 100/31. Du: ende hi was u betere ende wiser 132,21; a little further the Du: onse betere, etc., 133,16, is translated, better . . . than we' 101/25. But the construction may be traced to the O. E. period, where *min*, *þin*, *his* *gelica* are found.

When two or more terms are enumerated, the Pers. Pr. referring to them may be expressed only once. This use is met with in all periods of the language but acquired a greater extent in modern times, owing to the general tendency towards compression of expression. See Mätz. III, 240. — In *Reynard* the

omission of the Poss. Pr. is, of course, especially frequent with those 'doublets' or couples of synonyms in which our text abounds (*his feest and court* 5/2, *his cote and skin* 10/13, *his condycions and nature* 92/1, *ony lygnage and frendes* 67/34, *my wyles and subtylte* 59/23, *ne me lygnage ne kin* 115/13: Note that the terms may be of a different *number* and may be separated by a negative particle), — but occurs also where distinct ideas are meant *their good faith and also worship* . . . 119/10.

The Possessive may be altogether omitted, where the possessor is easy to supply:

ye shal not thenne escape neyther *with wyf ne wyth chylde* 24/21; he coude not get out wyth myght ne wyth crafte *hede ne foote* 15/7.

Besides these cases which seem to be standing phrases, we must bear in mind all those where parts of the body are referred to. In French the use of a Possessive before names of parts of the body is considered a pleonasm, unless some comparison or opposition is meant; the Mod. English uses the Possessive when the sense is reflexive: *she cut her finger*, or when the noun is object: *he bent his head*; when it is included in some adverbial relation, the definite article is used, as in French or in Dutch: *he took her by the hand*'. The use exhibited in *Reynard* is somewhat different. Instances with the Pers. Pronoun:

she smote hym wythout myssyng *on his heed* 62/39; she hytte me . . . vj grete woundes *in my heed* 63/15; thou wounded me in xx places *in my heed* 110/34; ye shal this daye for your werkys be hanged *by your necke* 67/12; they were by slabbed and byclagged *to their eres* 98/30. He mocketh *you* to fore *your visage* 94/15 &c.

Instances with the definite article:  
caught her by the heed 55/28. id. 69/11.

Both constructions sometimes occur in the same sentence:

this clevid to *his* bones and can not be had out of *the* flesh 40/21; he smote wyth *his* foot reynard on *the* heed 107/31.

The phrase *make your uryne* may also be regarded more or less as pleonastic.

As to the origin of the omission of the Possessive in such cases, I would point to certain uses of the *Dativus commodi* in O. and M. E. — *gistoddun him aet licaes heafðum* Ruthw. — M. E. *She falleth him to foote* Chaucer (quoted by Einkenel in Paul's Grundriss).

In opposition to this use, I lastly mention the emphatic designation of the possessor by means of the analytic Genitive: *of him* instead of *his* (Cf. *Genitive*).

## Demonstrative Pronouns.

THIS. *This*, used substantively, with indefinite meaning:

this is good luck 14/11; — meaning ‚this place’: had I alle the hony that is bytwene *this* and portyngale I shold wel ete it allone 13/36, — applying to time: I have to fore *this* seen 67/31.

Cf. ‚*This* too with whom you are to marry’, Ben Jonson, quoted by Franz. E. St. xvii, 391.

*This*, as Adjective, especially in temporal expressions: ye shal now goo to reynaert and saye to hym *this seconde tyme* that he come to court 19/16; your fayr wordes may not helpe you I thynke wel that ye shal *this daye* for your werkys be hanged by your necke 67/11.

Expressions like ‚this good while’, ‚these six years’ etc. were frequent in the 17<sup>th</sup> c., Franz. *ibid.* 392.

*This moche*:

*this moche* must my fadre here of hym to whom he had most his trust on 87/34.

‚This much’ is quoted by K. Oliphant (N. E., I, 530) from Coverdale, ab. 1550 as if it were a new expression. Mätzner III, 123, gives an instance of this much = thus much, from Byron.

Neutral *this* opposed to *that*:

who that wyl go thurgh the world *this* to here and that to see, and *that other* to telle... 63/39.

THAT. The demonstrative *that* may apply like *this*, to a preceding object:

Can he *that* subtylte in suche wise that he stammer not in his wordes... *this* may may doo wonder 64/38.



*That* is used instead of the Def. Art. in connection with *one . . . other* :

I wold I myght see suche abataylle, that one was wyly and that other was stronge, that one fought with strenghte, and that other with subtylte 107/10-14.

It is also used in connection with *other* alone, espec. when a comparison or opposition is implied :

*that other syde* e. g. of a river, (18/15, 31/16, 77/9); he ought by right here *that other partye* speke 57/9; — and had brought *that other daye to fore* in to his yerde a grete oke (*other* here = an ordinal number);

with *one* alone :

*that one of his eyen* 108/4; that one of them (viz. of the jewels) was a rynge of fyn gold 81/22.

Even before Nouns, *that* may be equivalent to a Def. Art. :

the kynge dyde do crye this feste over alle in *that* lande 54/12 (So in Du: dede dese feest over al dat lant te weten), he made tybert the catte to goo in *that* wyld lande of Arderne 36/23 — However it is possible that there is a shade of meaning of the article, *that* being, used like Latin *ille* (‘Vafer *ille* Sisyphus’, Horace) to denote something well known, renowned, &c. — This is the case when dame Julock, after her husband has lost ‘his ryght colyon’ in the fight, deplores that ‘he shal never come doo, that swete playe and game’ 23/3 (Very rare in Chaucer: king of Greece *that contre* . . . Eienk. 18) (\*)

We may note here that in the connection *that other*, *other* is sometimes Substantive = ‘the remainder’ =

They ben good to dygeste (viz. pigeons), they may almost be swolowen in al hool, the bones ben half blode, I ete them wyth *that other* 59/31 (not so in Dutch: die laet ick al mede doer gaen 76,23); The lesyng oftymes cometh un-avysed, and falleth in the mater unwetyngly. And so whan

(\*) *That other* gave rise to the form *tother*, sometimes *t’other* which occurs in the colloquial speech of later times (frequent, for instance, in the mouth of the Squire, in “Tom Jones”).

she is wel cladde, it goth forth thurgh with *that other* 64/31.

*The same*, with *same* used as a subst. may be regarded as a demonstrative which is often equivalent to a personal pronoun.

this Jgement thought yow good, and alle your counseyl which at tyme were by you and folewed *the same* 78/8; the unshamefast lecherye... with the avaunting of *the same* 118/22.

*That* is sometimes used instead of *it* and placed, as object, before the Verb, thus giving to the expression something more concrete and more emphatic than with the simple *it*:

a poure man is no lorde *that* may ye know eme by me 13/14; yf he ever here after mys doo and trespace, *that* shalle he dere abyde and alle his lignage... 40/32; who otherwise wylle now haunte the world, than devyse a lesyng in the fayrest wyse and *that* byswymple with kerchievis aboute in suche wise that men take it for a trouthe 64/36 (Not Du: ende wel bewimpelen mit doexkens 83/14). Reynard the foxe sware that he lyed as a false knave and a cursyd theef and *that* he wold doo good on his body 105/7 (The context, as well as the Du. text: 'ende *dat* soude hi op sijn lijf waer maken' show that *that* is here Demonstr. and not Conjunction); — Dere eme that I ete what myght it helpe yow *that* yf I tolde you 13/13;

Another interesting case is:

And whan he was redy he asked me yf I *that* wold ffor your saake bere two lettres to you 52/12. After all the preceding instances we cannot simply dismiss this *that* as 'parasitic'. Perhaps there is misprint, *yf I that* being written for *yf that I* (Conjunct. *yf that* = *yf*) But I prefer to compare the passage with the next one, where the Demonstr. Adv. *therof* is used about in the same way as our *that*: his feet ben yet sore therof whén for my sake he was unshoed 102/14.

The use of a Demonstr. in these cases is psycholo-

gically interesting and we shall have to return to it when we explain the formation of Substantive Clauses (*Vide under Conjunction that*). It shows a certain incapacity of abstracting a complex member of a sentence and grasping it as *one* object, — Jespersen would say of ‚parenthetizing‘, (thinking of the arithmetical operation figured by  $x (a + b)$  (\*) Thus, instead of ‚If I wold (for your saacke bringe two lettres . . .), we first have ‚If I wold *that*, viz.: bringe two lettres . . .

The Demonstrative, serving, as it were, as a resting-place for the mind, points to a transition-stage between coordinative and subordinative construction.

---

(\*) I must mention, however, that the opposite tendency manifests itself in *Reyn.*, e. g. on p. 84, end of al. 1, where a series of adverbial clauses are followed by a principal Verb, without being connected with it by a recapitulatory *that*: „how that he gate helene . . . and how he brought her in to troye . . . the grete love and joly lyf that they had . . . was al corven in the felde“.

## Interrogative Pronoun.

WHICH is used, as it is now, to denote classification, distinction;

*Whiche ben frendes and kynne unto Reynard the foxe,* (title of capit. xxxi 79/12).

WHAT is often used quasi-adverbially:

And her wyth wil I leve ffor *what* have I to wryte of thise mysdedes, I have ynowh to doo with myn owne self 118/28. — The context shows that ,what have I to wryte' = ,why should I write'.

Likewise in: *what have I to doo* wyth the wulf 96/21, it is not necessary to look on *what* as the Direct Object of *do*. ,Do with' has a complete sense = *deal with* (Cf. the Fr. ,*avoir à faire* or *affaire à, avec quelqu'un*).

N.B. Remember the O. E. use of *hwaet*, which was not only exclamative = ,Lo! behold!' but also adverbial = ,why, wherefore'.

Note *what* in connection with *many*:

*What many* a spity worde have ye brought forth wyth false lesyngis 101/30.

For a similar use cf. Genesis xx, 9: What hast thou done unto us? *and what have I offended thee?*

Note also the use of *what* in statements put into the interrogative form for the sake of emphasis:

*What trowe ye* how many a grete lesyng muste I lye er I coude escape from hym 49/31. *What wene ye* how many ben ther suche false extorcionners now in thise dayes 115/3.

*What* is elliptic in the connections *what if, what though*. In the next instance we have a curious case of a stronger ellipsis, viz. the whole sentence depending on the conjunction *though* is omitted:

that me repenteth, though it be to(o) late — *what thawh* sir kyng said the lupaerd, yf ther be ony thyng mysdon, it shal be amended 53/7. — The Du. has here simply ,Wat is dan heer coninc' 68/7.

*What ther of* = what does it matter? viz.: it does not matter 46/28.

It has been shown under the *Relat. Pron.* that interrogative Pr. easily pass into Indefinite or ,generalising' Relatives (*who that*, etc.). The transition may be observed in such passages as: . . . wheresomever he went and in what felowship . . . 84/36 and *what* man loked in the glasse had he ony disease . . . he shold be anon heled of it 84/30. — The change of sense of *what* is linked with a change of ,direct' into ,indirect speech'.

As to the idiom *what with* . . . *what with* 37/4, see under the Preposition *with*.

## The Relative Pronoun.

THAT. *That* is the normal, by far the most frequent relative in Caxton. In the forty first pages of *Reynard*, it occurs about eighty times, whereas *whiche* only occurs about forty times *whom* five and *where* (in the compounds *whereof*, *whereby*, &c.) ten times. It is used in quite a general way, with reference to persons or things and may have as its correlative a noun or a pronoun. It is found especially after personal pronouns: *they that* 16/40, 19/23, 27/27, 27/31, 31/17, 34/14, 35/39; *them that* 4/20, 7/18, 9/15, 22/20, 34/12, 35/30, 39,7, 40/7.

The frequent occurrence of *they that*, *them that* in cases, where to day we should use a demonstrative pronoun before the relative, is worth noticing.

*And for them that* understandeth it, it shal be ryght joyous plaisant and prouffitable 4/20,21.

We still say *he*, *him (who)*, *she (who)* where the French say *celui*, *celle qui*. *They that*, *them that* have, on the contrary, been replaced by *those who*. There does not seem to be emphasis enough in these words for a relative to lean upon them. Possibly the analogy of the French *ceux qui* had some influence here and *he that* remained simply because there was no convenient singular demonstrative corresponding to the plural *those*. Moreover we have already seen when speaking of demonstrative pronouns how the personal pronouns *they*, *them* often retain something of their demonstrative origin.

The use of *they that*, *them that* had become less frequent in the second half of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century (Cp.

Franz. Engl. Stud. xvii, 221). *He that* where we generally prefer *he who* was still used in the xviii<sup>th</sup> century (Cp. Storm *op. citat.* p.p. 704).

On the whole, with regard to the use of *that*, Caxton still stands on the same stage of development as Chaucer in whose writings *that* is the general relative pronoun.

*That* was the first relative pronoun, developed out of a demonstrative — *paet* used like *pe* for various genders and cases, is not rare in Alfred the Great (cp. Wulfing, *Syntax Alfred's* p.p. 407, 408).

Other relatives made their appearance in the language in the following order: *whom*, *whose* — *the whiche whiche*; they gained ground in the xv<sup>th</sup> century; — lastly *who*, in the nominative. A division of functions tended of course to establish itself, between these various forms, which restricted the use of *that* (\*)

In Shakespeare, the general principle for the use of *that*, which holds good at the present time is already in force. *That* is restrictive and therefore, as a rule is not used in a continuative sense. Hence, the following rules are applied in Shakespeare: a) *that* can only be used after nouns preceded by an article; b) it cannot refer to a proper noun, except in a special case, when this noun is in the vocative case. (Abbott, § 259).

But these rules do not apply to Caxton.

a). Ther cam olde wymen *that* for age had not one toeth in her heed 15/36, — Then shewde he them *lettres that* plesyd moche to bruyne 39/24.

b). *Cuwaert the hare that* hier standeth . . . 7/2, — . . . but

(\*) For this development, see Mätzner III, p.p. 557–568. It will be seen that in the Elizabethan period *who*, *that*, *which* were used almost promiscuously, each particular author favouring the one or the other form. But in the latter half of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century *that* was again preferred. Hence, Addison's „Humble Petition of *who* and *which*“.

*Tybert that sawe that he must deye 22/29 — . . . dam Julock that was ful of sorowe 23/11.*

The connection of *that* with its antecedent was looser than now. *That* was sometimes separated from its antecedent. In the following example, the antecedent is a noun in the possessive case:

I ledde him to *the richest prestes hows that was in the vermedos 28/20*. — Cp. Shakesp., *Hamlet*, V, I, 85 (quoted by Abbott § 262): As if it were *Cain's jawbone that did the first murder*.

Less striking instances, such as the following, are often met with:

How the fox brought *them* in danger *that wolde have brought hym to deth 36/21*; alle the beestis gyve to you the prys *that have seen this bataylle 111/36*.

Therefore we must not lay too much stress on what Kellner says in summing up the differences in the use of *that* and *whiche*, namely that *whiche* not only follows an immediate antecedent but may be separated from it by other nouns'. (Caxton's Syntax, xxxviii, 1).

WHICHE. *Whiche* is after *that*, the most frequently used of relative pronouns. Though it appeared in the language later than *that*, it is, in Caxton, fully developed as a relative. Primitive or transitional forms like *the whiche*, or adjectival ones, such as *whiche* + the repeated antecedent, are already antiquated. *Whiche* is used both for things and for persons. Instances of the use of the word *whiche* after the names of persons or personified beings are perhaps the most frequent in *Reynard*, e. g. 8/33 (myn Eme reynart . . . whiche) &c.

The construction: pronoun + *whiche*, either with reference to persons or to things, is much less common; in this respect *whiche* differs in its use from



*that*. The next instance stands isolated in *Reynard*. ,*That whiche* clevid by the bone myght not out of the flesshe' 29/5.

According to Mätzner (III, 563), this represents the original case of a pronoun followed by *wiche*; that is to say, *whiche* was first used after *that* in order to avoid the combination *that that*. It was afterwards tolerated after other pronouns of neutral meaning and, finally, after personal pronouns. — However, this is the only instance of *that whiche* in *Reynard*. For, as we shall soon see, *that that* was avoided by a simpler contrivance, viz., the omission of the second *that*.

Instances of *Indefinite Pron.* or *Numerals* + *whiche*:  
*many moo* came after *whiche* alle thought to hurte me 26/40; and ther came *moo than xx whiche* wolde not have comen . . . 112/13.

*Personal Pronouns* + *whiche* (N.B. the *Personal Pron.* sometimes has a demonstrative meaning):

But he laughed in his herte that *all they* brought hym forth *whiche* had a lytyl to fore been with him so wrooth 47/30; who wil aventure for *hym* his eerys, his eye or his lyf *whiche* is so fel a beest 23/36; and *he whiche* is grete 98/10;  
 the wulf was better withholden and gretter with you than *I* was *whiche* am your humble subject 112/23;

The old interrogative *hwylc*, used as a relative, mostly with an adjectival meaning, and with reference to persons or things, is found as early as Orm (See: Noack, p. 32). In Elizabethan English, *which* is generally confined to things, although survivals of *which* referring to persons are to be found later. (See Franz, *op. citat. Engl. Stud.* xvii, p. 206, 4) and used with a noun antecedent. See for Shakespeare, Abbott § 266-268; for Bacon, Rohs, *op. cit.* p. 44. — Spenser, archaic in this respect, often uses *which* for *who*. See Düring, *Pronomina bei Spenser*, p. 35.

*Whiche* is frequently used with reference to a whole sentence or to part of a sentence, e. g.:

That the lyon the noble kyng of all beestis wolde in the holy day of thys feest holde an open court at stade *whyche* he dyde to knowe over alle in his lande 5/9-12.

*Whiche* is used in connection with Prepositions, e. g. *In whiche* 10/2; *on whiche* 68/36; *by whiche* 56/31; *of whiche* 61/31.

But, in this connection, we often find, instead of *whiche*, *where* in the compound words: *whereof*, *whereon*, *wherein*. Sometimes, though not very frequently, the *antecedent is repeated* after *whiche*, or, at least, recalled by some equivalent word; *whiche* then retains its original value, that of an adjective:

In this historye ben wretton the parables goode lerynge and dyverse poyntes to be merkyd *by which poyntes* men maye lerne 4/23. It was upon a wednesday *on whiche day* I am not wonte to ete ony flessch 68/36. — And ther in is th(e) historye how venus Juno and pallas strof for th(e) apple of gold *whiche eche of them wold have had whiche contraversye* was sette upon parys 83/33,35. (The antecedent being all that precedes *whiche*, is here summed up again by the word *contraversye*). — Hit is like to tree of hebenus *of whiche wode* kyng Crompart made his horse of tree 84/39.

*N.B.* In Chaucer *which* sometimes stands for a genitive (Ten Brink, Chaucer's Sprache 254): swich licour *of which vertu* (= out of the virtue of which) engendred is the flour. (Canterb. T. Prol. 4).

This use is completely obsolete in Caxton. — The last instance quoted from *Reynard* might appear to be an analogous case, but the context shows that *of wiche wode* must be looked upon as *one appositional group*.

With regard to this repetition of the antecedent after *which*.

Cp. the O. Fr., *jusques à mercredi, auquel jour il doit*

*partir*; and similar instances. (See Darmesteter, *Syntaxe* p.p. 80,81). For a similar use in Shakespeare, see Abbott § 269.

THE WHICH~~E~~ so far as I am aware, *does not occur* in *Reynard*. The fact is worth notice, inasmuch as *the whiche* is found in other works of Caxton and Kellner quotes 8 instances of its use, all taken from the forty first pages of *Blanchardyn* (Kellner, Caxton's *Syntax*, p. xxxix).

*The whiche* is found as early as in R. R. de Hampole (cp. Noack, p. 55); it is frequent in Chaucer, in the Paston letters (Blume, *Spr. der P. letters.* p. 26), in Spenser (Düring, *Pronomina bei Spenser* p. 25.) For instances in Shakespeare, see Abbott § 270. This use, however, is less prevalent in the Elizabethan period. Rohs (*op. citat.* p. 42) says there is no instance of it in Bacon; but I found 2 in the *Advancement of Learning* p. 37, l. 31; p. 234, l. 10 (Clarendon Pr. Edit).

It is generally admitted that *the which* answers to O. Fr. *liquels*. Dr. Lindner (quoted by Noack, p. 60) alone maintains that *the* in *the whiche* is to be considered as the old relative particle *pe*, not as the definite article, and that O. E. *se pe* or *he pe* is sufficient to explain *the whiche*. This theory must be rejected, for it has been shown (see, for instance Abbott § 270) that the entire use of *the whiche* is parallel with that of *liquels*.

Perhaps we may see a confirmation of this view in the comparative frequency of *the whiche* in *Blanchardyn*, a translation from the French. This was at any rate true as regards Caxton, and shows how the translator was apt to be influenced by the language from which he was translating. (Cp. for this point Prof. Logeman's remarks on p. xli of Muller & Logeman's Edition of the Dutch text).

**WHOM.** Dr. Kellner (Caxton's Syntax, xxxix) says that *whom* was only used of persons and in connection with prepositions. Here, however, are several instances of *whom* in the objective case, without preposition:

Chantekler's daughter *whom* Reynart the fox hath byten 11/18; Tho cam Tybert the catte *whom* I receyved frendly 30/30; and other . . . *whome* I shal name afterward 66/13; I have thre ful waxen children . . . *whom* I wold alle to gydre aventure for his love 79/9; — Me *whom* men putten to laboure 86/22; God . . . *whom* I humbly beseech 118/24.

*Whom* is not used for things, properly speaking, but here and there for animals. Of course it is difficult to decide whether, animals are personified or not in Reynard. In the following passage, it is perhaps better not to look upon *henne* as a personal antecedent:

And brought on a biere a deed *henne of whom* Reynard had byten the heed of 9/15.

The above quoted instances with *doughter* (11/18), *children* (79/9) are dubious: *sone*, *doughter*, *child* were generally considered neutral nouns; see Einkenkel, Streifzüge, p. 41.

Originally *whom* was applied either to persons or to things (see Mätzner III, 567). This holds good for Spenser, who has *eyen whom*, &c (Düring, *op. citat.* p.p. 32, 33; also for Shakespeare but in personifications, Abbott § 264). Instances of *whom* after nouns designating animals occur in Bunyan, Walton, &c (Franz, *op. citat. Engl. Stud.* xvii, 206).

*Whom* preceded by a preposition: *to whom* 73/21, 76/13, 77/1, 81/25, 87/34, 118/25; *of whom* 8/15; *fro whom* 66/22.

**WHOSE.** As a true relative, referring to a preceding antecedent, this pronoun is not, that I know of, to

be found in Reynard. In the following passage, no antecedent is expressed:

They retch not *whose* hows brenneth 78/25.

The genitive function of the relative is generally expressed by (*whereof*), *of which*; we once find *of whom* 9/15 and the combination *whom . . . his*:

bruyn the bere myn Eem whom I made his crowne al bloody 26/3 (Dutch: bruyn minen oem dien ic syn crune al bloedich maecte 33/19;) —

but the construction is found in O. E., see below: Relative with supplementary Pronoun.

*Whose* was used by Chaucer, Mandeville, but only for *persons* (Mätzner III, 568. Noack even gives instances of its use as far back as Orm) (\*) With reference to *things*, *whose* is frequent in Spenser (Düring, p. 36).

**Who.** In the Nominative, with an antecedent preceding it, *who* was only admitted into the language at a later period, and seems to have first come into regular use in the works of Berner, xvi<sup>th</sup> century (Kellner, Outlines, p. 208; Morris, Outlines § 204, 205) I found, however, an instance of its use in Reynard: . . . every man beware hierby who hath harme and seathe 16/11. Early instances of *who* are given by Kellner, Outl., p. 208, from Wulfstan. *Who* is not uncommon in Shakespeare, but was not accepted by Ben Jonson (Morris § 204).

**WHERE.** *Wherof* 10/39, 14/29, 26/15, 26/25, 38/2, 75/2, 88/19, 90/4, 99/38; *wherfor* 8/36, 26/18, 38/3, 66/32, 71/9, 76/37, 91/26; *wherin* 26/22, 85/23, 87/40, 95/32; *wheron* 114/3, *wherupon* 6/3.

(\*) All that yho sahh aundd herrde off Crist.  
*Whas* moder yho wass wurrthen (Orm, 3424).

*Where* generally refers to whole sentences, not so often to a definite antecedent, rarely to persons.

Instances with a definite antecedent:

This preest had *aspynde wherin* henge many a good flitche of bacon, *wherin* many a time I was wonte to fil my bely 26/21,22; so good a *boone wheron* his so moche flessch 114/3; goed *flytches* of bacon *wherof* he ete so moche 26/25.

Note that the use of *wherof* as a possessive genitive is very rare. In the instance just quoted, it has the value of a partitive genitive. In most cases it refers to the preceding sentence and has about the same meaning as *wherfor*:

he fonde the kyng in a grete sekenes *wherof* he was sory in his hert 90/4.

The modern use of *where* + a separable preposition is sometimes found also, e. g.:

What reynart cosyn unhynde now your sakke *wher* all the wylis ben *in* 87/32.

In order to explain these compounds, it is quite unnecessary to adduce Dutch influence (*waervan*, *waerbi*), as one might be tempted to do in *Reynard*. We may trace this use back to the oldest periods of the language. In O. E. similar compounds, formed of demonstrative adverb + a preposition, were found, the preposition often being separable (Mätzner III, 570). *Wherof*, *wherin*, &c were still decidedly preferred, in the first half of the xviii<sup>th</sup> century, to the preposition + which (Franz, *Engl. Stud.* xvii p. 207).

As. *As* is used as a relative in connection with *such*, the latter having reference to persons: e. g. 89/5; more frequently to things: 4/5, 8/26, 12/18, 22/13, 72/29, 74/26, 93/35, 113/9, or having a neutral, indefinite meaning (= anything) 9/9, 16/17, 114/21.

*That* is also used as a relative after *such* (See Kellner, *Caxton's Syntax*, xxxix). This use, however, is rare in *Reynard*.

*Swoylce* . . . *alls* instead of the older *swoylce* . . . *swoylce* appears as early as the XII<sup>th</sup> century (Vide quotations from Orm in Morris' *Outlines* § 221). *As* is explained by Koch (II, § 352) as being the upshot of *eall swoylc sum*.

*That* after *such* is old also. We find instances from Layamon in Mätzner III, 536.

WHO THAT, WHAT THAT, WHO SO, WHOSEVER, WHO, WHAT, &c. All these forms were used as General or Indefinite Relatives, with an antecedent *following* them or without antecedent. It was probably through this intermediate stage that the originally interrogative pronouns passed into use as relatives. *Who* in *who that* often seems to retain something of its interrogative force although the adjunction of *that* generalises its meaning.

Instances of *who that*: Theme *who that* wylle have the very understanding of this mater, he must ofte and many times rede in this boke 4/14; *who that* is hardy the aventure helpeth hym 66/6. — *What that*: . . . and suffre the foxe to saye unberisped *what that* he wolde 36/15. Also: 58/1, 112/1, &c.

These compound forms of relatives are frequent in Chaucer, and Kellner gives much earlier instances. In Caxton they have become rarer and, besides that, they do not reach beyond the M. E. period. I found no instance of them in Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*. Abbott (§ 250) quotes a single instance of *which that* from Ingelend, 1560. Even Spenser seems to have avoided this use.

As to the origin of *who that*, Eienkel once more attributes it to French influence; this *that*, he says,

comes from the French *que* (Einenkel, *Syntax*, in Paul's *Grundr.* 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 919 § 147). A parallel with the French seems hardly necessary if we remember the old similar use of *þe*, which being reduced (like *that* later) to a mere relative particle, had the power of changing a preceding word into a relative pronoun *se þe*, *seo þe*, *þæt þe*. The only difference here, is that the same process is effected by *that* on *interrogatives* instead of *demonstratives*.

Caxton uses the simple *who*:

I wolde that ye wolde aventure that *who* of you tweyne had most trespaced shold hange by the necke 72/7. *Who* of you alle is withoute synne late hym easte the first stone 73/38. (\*)

The simple *who* (*what*) in this sense, is not rare in Chaucer (*Ten Brink*, *Chauc. Spr.* §§ 254).

,*As who saith*' 66/11.

With regard to this phrase, which reminds us of the French *,comme qui dirait'* the questions may be asked: 1) whether it is really due to the French, as some authors believe it to be (e. g. Einenkel in Paul's *Grundr.* 919 § 147); 2) whether *who*, in this case is an indefinite *relative* or a true *indefinite* pronoun.

Littré explained *qui* in the corresponding French idiom by supplying *celui*. In the *Syntaxe* of Darmesteter *qui* is explained in a more satisfactory way as an indefinite pronoun: „Jusqu'au xvii<sup>e</sup> siècle, *qui* suivi d'un verbe à la 3<sup>e</sup> pers. du sing. pouvait avoir le sens de *si on*. Les exemples de cette tournure pullulent dans nos auteurs. Elle nous est restée dans *comme qui dirait* et aussi dans le proverbe: *Tout vient à point*

(\*) In Dutch, we find *wie*, *wie dat*, *soewie*, *die*; but they seem not to have influenced Caxton's choice of either form. *Who that* corresponds to *die* (73/27), to *soewie* (82/30), and principally to *wie* (18/39, 70/17, 71/19). *Who* (7/27, 43/38), = Dutch *so wie*. *Whom he woude* (84/6), translates: *hoe dat hi woude*.



*qui sait attendre*, changé par une déformation moderne en 'Tout... à *qui sait attendre*'. (Darmesteter Gr. hist. iv, p.p. 77, 78).

Now, if we remember that 'as who saith' can be traced back in the language to a respectable antiquity (Chaucer, Mandeville, Robert of Gloucester, R. R. de Hampole, O. E. Hom. (see Mätzner III, 584. Morris, *Outlines*, § 227); if, on the other hand, we bear in mind the numerous instances, collected by Wülfing (§ 326) of O. E. *hwa* used as an indefinite pronoun = *some one*, we will be cautious in answering the first question; although French influence is not necessarily excluded we cannot boldly stigmatise this idiom as a 'gallicism'.

N.B. The use of this phrase is moreover not identical in English and in French. The French 'comme qui dirait' is generally a mere parenthesis (\*) = 'comme on dit'. In all the English instances I know 'as who says' is indispensable to the sense of the sentence, and is introductory to some 'direct speech' — Note that Darmesteter's explanation of the phrase applies perhaps better still to English than to French, as the conjunction *as* often had the sense of 'as if'; cp. 'as it were' under the heading *Conjunctions*.

Instances of *what* in *Reynard*:

And *what* she desyreth that geteth she anone 71/6, *what* I desyre I foyle not of it 71/8, *what* they can gete that take they 92/31.

*What* is also used adjectively, and then sometimes separated by the substantive from a following *that*:

and *what* jugement *that* shal be given there I shal obeye and suffre and never doo the contrarye 76/28.

(\*) To put it otherwise in French, the phrase belongs to what M. Bréal, in his book, *la Semantique*, Paris, 1897, p. 254, calls the 'subjective element' in language.

## WHOSO:

For *whoso* sayth alway trouthe he may not now goo nowher thurgh the world 65/26; other instances: 65/28, 86/40, 100/10.

Origin: O. E. *swa hwa swa, swa hwaet swa*. Cp. Wülfing § 306. Later forms: *hwa swa, hose, whose*.

WHOSOEVER. These compounds are not rare in Caxton where they generally occur under the forms *whososomever, whosommever, who somme ever*. See 63/27, 68/22, 82/5, 96/14, 109/78, 115/11, 118/7. (For the use of *whatsomever, whatsomdever* in modern 'Vulgärsprache', cf. Storm, p. 780).

Origin: *who that... ever, who that... ever* appear early in the M. E. period (Cp. Morris, Outlines § 224).

*Whoever, whatever, whichever* belong to a later period.

As was stated in the beginning of this paragraph, all these pronouns may be used without antecedent or with an expressed (following) antecedent. Even in cases where the antecedent is expressed, it is generally not indispensable to the sense. We shall therefore have further opportunities of considering these cases in our next paragraph which deals with the *Supplementary Pronoun after Relatives*.

## The Relative Pronoun in the Sentence.

For convenience' sake it seems advisable to deal here with several points which properly belong to the syntax of the Sentence. Three questions have to be examined: The use of Supplementary Pronouns after Relatives; -- the Omission of Relatives; -- Subordinate construction by means of Relatives, instead of Coordination.

### SUPPLEMENTARY PRONOUN.

This is the phenomenon we may still observe in modern German: *ich der ich, du der du, &c.* In O. E. the constructions *sé pe hé, sé pe him, sé pe his* were common. The supplementary pronoun either immediately followed, or was separated from the relative. In some cases, it was entirely redundant: in other instances, it was a means of supplying the deficiency of the indeclinable *pe*, as, for instance, when it was used to express the Genitive: *Aelfmáer . . . pe se arcebiscop aelfeáh áer generede his life* (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, quoted by Sweet: Anglo-Saxon Reader, p. LXI). Such a use which is essentially the outcome of a mixture of constructions and is still to be found in vulgar speech, becomes rarer as syntax gains in logical regularity. (For instances in Shakespeare, see Abbott § 249).

In arranging the instances collected in *Reynard*, I follow the classification of Kellner. Three principal types of relative constructions may be distinguished:

I. *The antecedent or correlative is a noun in a complete sentence, which is followed by a many-worded adjective, or adjective clause.*

a) If the relative pronoun is in the nominative case, the construction, as a rule, is the same as in Modern English. Kellner, says he has not come across a single instance of redundant pronoun in Caxton (Kellner, Caxton's Syntax xli).

b) The relative is an oblique case. Then, as a rule, the relative is used in connection with the corresponding preposition: *of whom, to whom* (see, above, instances under *whom*). But there are exceptions where the construction: a relative + *his him, &c.* is found instead of the simple relative:

I have trespassed ayenst alle thee beestys that lyve in especyal ayenst bruyn the bere myn Eem *whom* I made *his* crowne al bloody 26/2. But now I am he *that* now ye wille doo *on me* what it shal plese yow 32/28.

II. *The correlative sentence is divided into two parts by the relative clause.*

a. The correlative is the *subject* of the sentence. Then, a redundant personal pronoun in the Nominative was almost the rule in O. E. and M. E. Numerous instances from O. E. Homelies in Kellner p. xliii. But Kellner says this is no longer the case in Caxton and he has not found any instance of it in *Blanchardyn*. The following one, taken from *Reynard*, is therefore probably due to the Dutch:

*He that* wil wyne *he* muste laboure and aventure 27/26; Dutch: Die verwerven wil die moet dat pinen 35/31.

b. The correlative is the *object* (direct or indirect) of the sentence. Then, as a rule, it is in the Nominative case and a redundant pronoun follows in the

Dative, Genitive or Accusative. The modern use is rather the exception.

Your daughter *that* lyeth here dede we wyl gyve *to her* the dethes right 11/7.

Alle they *that* may helpe her be they men or wȳmen I give *to hem* alle pardon of her penance and relece of theyr sinnes 17/1.

And also the kyng *whiche* so moche hated hym he had made *hym* suche a fool that he broughte hym to his owne entente 47/32.

And tho synnes *that* have brought you in the grete sentence and curse I make you quyte of *them* and take *them* in myself 70/26,27.

An alle tho *that* ben in the lande . . . I shal brynge *them* alle in the popes curse 70/37.

In all these cases, the relative is in the Nominative. According to Kellner a relative in an oblique case is very rarely followed by a redundant personal pronoun. The following instance comes very near to this. Here we have a redundant pronominal adverb *ther of* equivalent to *of it*:

Alas newewe this is an evyl connyng *of whiche* lyf scath und hurte may come *ther of* 65,24,25.

### III. *The relative sentence precedes its correlative.*

The supplementary pronoun is the rule in *Ayenbite* (just as in the French original *qui . . . il, quiconque . . . il*), also in the *Gesta Romanorum*. It still occurs in the xvi<sup>th</sup> century (Kellner XLIV, XIV).

In *Reynard* I found instances of both uses, — with and without supplementary pronoun.

The two next passages are interesting as the personal pronoun immediately follows the relative, thus reminding us of O. E.: *sé pé he*:

Who shal blame Reynard . . . who *that* understandeth the

lawe and can discerne the right and *that he* be of hye burthe as myn Eme Reynart 18/31.

Who can gyve to his lesynge a conclusion... and *that he* can so blynde the peple... that is the man 65/12.

Instead of a personal pronoun, we may of course find a demonstrative, e. g. *that* :

And *what* she desyreth *that* geteth she... 71/6. Other instances: 4/14, 64/34,37, 65/26,28, 66/5, &c.

Instances without supplementary pronoun :

*Who that* hath nede of helpe shal fynde on her grete frendship 70/32. Cp. : 68/22, 73/27, 76/26, &c.

In contemporary English the supplementary pronoun is not used, except for the sake of clearness of meaning, when the correlative sentence is widely separated from the relative by intervening clauses.

#### OMISSION OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

According to present use, this omission is only permitted, in literary language when the relative is in the accusative case. — This restriction, however, is recent.

In Reynard, the relative is found to be omitted in the Nominative, although perhaps not so often as in the Accusative, e. g. :

lyke an hound had been deed 55/23; ffor yf ther be ony can saye and make good... that I have trespaced I wil abyd al the right and lawe that may come thereof 92/41.

In the following cases, we logically should expect two relatives, the first being used as object, the second as subject: in both passages the latter has been omitted.

... his fowle hound *whom* I never see doth good or proffyt 86/21; I have conspyred the kynges deth fro the tresour *that* you have said to hym is in hulsterlo 101/41.

In the next, the omitted relative in the Nominative

may be supplied by a preceding relative in an oblique case:

God fro *whom* nothyng may be hid and above all thyng is mighty.

Omission in the Accusative:

thise evyl bestis . . . shulle do to hem alle the hurte they maye 70/5.

On the other hand, the relative is sometimes expressed in the accusative in cases where we should most likely omit it:

It is the best counseil *that* I ever yet herde 33/26. This was alle *that* he studied 33/23.

Omission after *that*. — The very numerous cases which I consider under this head have been looked upon in various ways by different authors. Thus Kellner, p. XLV, speaks of 'attraction' in that; of *that* = *that whiche*; Morris, in his Outlines (§ 214) says: '*That*, in virtue of its being neuter, is sometimes used for *what*, and a preposition may precede it'. — I should say, not that *that* is 'used for *what*', but simply that it has, in that case, the meaning of *what*, in consequence of a second *that* having been dropped after it. The reason why a preposition may precede is thus made evident: *that* is demonstrative, not relative. I see no essential difference between the instances given by Morris: 'I am possessed of *that* is mine'; — 'Throw us *that* you have about you'. — 'We speak *that* we do know and testify *that* we have seen' and the one quoted above (92/41) or the following . . . say amen to *anything* might do you a pleasure — . . . he is a stranger to *all* has passed. (Franz, Engl. Stud. xvii, 204). In that case, what need is there for a different explanation? Why are we to suppose that a confusion arose between *what* and *that*? The fact is that O. E. *paet paet* was soon avoided, probably for euphonic

reasons. As substitute for *that that* in *Reynard* we have sometimes found *what that* or *what* (see above) but in the great majority of cases, *that* is used:

Who that wyll have the understandyng... he muste ... earnestly and diligently marke wel *that* he redeth 4/16; that courtoys hier complaineth of, that is passed many yeres goon 6/27. — Tho wente I ner and fonde maister reynard that had lifte *that* he fyrst redde and songe 7/8. Comp. the O. E. omission of *þe* in *for þam* = *for þam þe* (Wülfing § 304, 11).

The omission of the Relative is a phenomenon common to all Teutonic languages, the development of which is a characteristic feature of English syntax. As to the origin of this development, the authors who have treated this subject, do not agree (see Noack, p. 75, for an analysis of the views of Kölbing, Flebbe, Lohmann, &c.), and it is probable that several different origins must be taken into account. Most of the alleged O. E. instances of this use have been explained as containing no omission of the relative at all, but as being assyndetic constructions of two sentences. Wülfing says he can only quote three instances of true omission from Alfred (Wülfing, § 304, 11). — The principal origin was perhaps, according to Lohmann, the omission of personal pronoun: in cases like the following:

Geaf hit þá his án munac, Brihnóp wás geháten (Saxon Chronicle, A. D. 963).

This use was extended to demonstratives and as demonstratives and relatives became identified, sentences like this were misinterpreted as elliptical relative clauses.

Now, — and this is a point I wish to draw attention to, — Lohmann attaches a great importance to Norman-French influence, in observing the distinction be-



tween principal and subordinate sentences, by altering the order of the words in the relative.

But Wülfing shows that the rule according to which the verb, more especially the auxiliary verb, was rejected to the end of the clause, was liable to many exceptions in O. E. He even goes so far as to say that this rule cannot be used as a test to decide whether *se*, *seo* *paet* are, in a given case, to be considered as relatives or as demonstratives. (Wülfing, *se*, *seo* *paet* § 275, A).

So that we can only reply, in answer to the question concerning French influence, as we have already done, on several previous occasions, that it was probably, but not necessarily, at work, and certainly not *alone*.

#### RELATIVE SUBORDINATION INSTEAD OF DEMONSTRATIVE COORDINATION.

*Which*, *whom*, &c. are very often found to be equivalent to a coordinative conjunction + a personal pronoun, or a demonstrative pronoun, — a construction which reminds us of the Latin *qui = et is*, *quo = et eo*, *qualis = et talis*, *ubi = et ibi*, &c. Likewise the adverbial relative *wherfor*, *wherupon* stand for a preposition + a pronoun; and *which*, when it refers to a whole sentence, may be replaced by a demonstrative of neutral meaning, *this*, *that*.

Later on, when we look at these facts from the point of view of *style*, we shall see that Caxton here exhibits, — as in Latin — a tendency towards synthetic style, the more interesting in that in other respects his style is rather analytic, and his syntax, coordinative.

Instances of this construction:

... ffor I had viii fayr sones and seven fayr daughters whiche my wyf had hatched... and they wente in a yerde

whiche was walled round about. *In whiche* (= in his yard) was a shadde where in were six grette dogges *whiche* (= they) had to tore many a beestys skyn in suche wyse as my chyldren were not aferd, *On whom* (= and on these) Reynart the thief had grete envye, &c 10/1-5,

... hier by dwelleth an husbondman named lantfert *whiche* hath so moche hony that ye shold not ete it in vii yere *whiche* (= and this honey) ye shal have in your holde yf ye wille be to me friendly, &c. 13/38.

With *whom*: nevertheles they that were moot pryneypal in this feat were of my next kynne *whom* gladly I wold not bewraye, &c (= and I wold gladly not bewraye them) 36/1. —

With *where*. And there he hath bepyssed my children where as they laye in suche wyse as they therof ben woxen blynde *whereupon* was a day sette — (= and upon this).

Sometimes the relative, being subject or object in a sentence introduced by a conjunction, is placed at the beginning of the sentence, thus reminding us of the Latin constructions *quod si*, *quod cum*, &c. The following is an instance of a contracted construction where *whiche* is, at the same time, subject and object.

Tho begonne they placebo domino with the verses that to longen *whiche yf* I shold saye were me to long 11/14.

Pleonastic *whiche*. — Suppose now that the construction becomes anacoluthic. If *whiche* has already a somewhat vague meaning, as when it refers, for instance, to a whole sentence, then, it will be impossible to justify it in the sentence; it will be reduced to a mere connective particle, or become entirely parasitic, and the relative clause, merely parenthetical. The passage to this state of things may be observed in the following quotations:

Thus al chyding he cam to the ryver where he fonde the beere sare wounded, bebled, and right seke, *whiche* he myght thanke none better therof than Reynart *whiche* spaeke to the bere in skorne 17/36.

That hast thou shewd wel on my messagers these poure felawes.

Tibert the cat and bruyn the bere, whiche yet ben al bloody *whiche* chyde not ne saye not moche, but that shal this day coste the(e) thy lyf... 30/21.

This is murder rape and treson, *whiche* ye ought to do Justyce theron sharply 95/23.

N.B. In all these cases the relative may be used with or without a supplementary pronoun, according to the rules given above.

*Origin and History.* This use is generally explained as an imitation from the Latin. It developed into full bloom in Elizabethan times, when Latin influence was at its greatest. (Kellner, *Outlines*, § 122).

In French also, these constructions date from the period of greatest Latin influence on that language (from the xiv<sup>th</sup> to the xvii<sup>th</sup> century), and it is probable that Latin influenced English, in some cases, through this medium. Cf: ,Et t'envoient ladite ville Anguer-ran de Bournoinville et un chevalier... *lesquels* pour ce qu'ils avaient tenu la ville contre le Roy... la ville fut pillée' (Alain Chartier, quoted in Darmesteter's *Grammaire historique*, iv, p.p. 80, 81).

The earliest instances given by Mätzner are from Chaucer and Mandeville (Mätzner III, 583).

But we may admit that this external influence was at least helped by internal and psychological factors. There seems to be a natural tendency in the popular speech towards linking sentences by means of relatives, — owing to a sort of laziness of mind, as if people were reluctant to resolutely end one sentence and begin a fresh one. The instances of ,pleonastic which' collected by Storm in his chapter on *Vulgärsprache* (Engl. Phil., p.p. 801, 802) are highly interesting to this purpose.

Since this construction is based upon Latin, it would be natural to expect to find traces of it in O. E. translations from the Latin, such as those of Alfred. But there is one difficulty. We find, indeed, the Latin *qui, cui, cujus* (= *et is, et ei, et ejus*) translated by *sé, séo, þæt*. But are the latter to be considered as relatives or as demonstratives? Wülfing, it is true, has adopted the line of looking upon these pronouns as relatives whenever they correspond to a relative in Latin (Wülfing p. 395 A); doubt still subsists; in a few cases, however, the context seems to point to a relative:

... her beoþ swyþe genihtsume weolocas, of pam biþ geweorht se weolocreada taelhg, þone ne maeg ne sunne blaecan nene ren wyrðan (= *cujus*) — See Alf., Beda, 471, 19, quoted by Wülfing, p. 395.

Cases with *se, þe, þæt þe, þætte* are more decisive, e. g.:  
Cludas feollon of muntum . . . þætte para wundra maest was, þa se mona ful waes & þære suman firrest, þæt his þa apeostrate — Oros. 256, 17, quoted by Wülfing, p. 403.

The construction began to decline with the influence of French style towards the end of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century.

This use is of course quite distinct from the case where *who, who that, who so, &c.* being indefinite, not true relatives, have the meaning of 'if any one' and introduce a relative clause with conditional meaning. Instances of this also occur in Reynard:

In lyke wyse *who so* have envye and spyte of an others welfare, and were servyd in lyke wyse, it shold be wel behoefful 86/40 &c.

My lord was not this ynough sayd and warned, *who so* wold understonde it, that al that he fonde he shold saye the contrarye 100/10 &c.

Now *who that* said to yow of the ffoxe more or lesse than ye have herd or red, I hold it for lesynge 119/22.

## Indefinite Pronoun.

ONE. *One* is sometimes very nearly equivalent to the Indef. Article:

*One* false shrewe and deceyvar hath betrayed me 52/36; Wo shold luste to do that game to *one* so stedfast a wyf (\*) 96/27; he saw fro ferre come fleyng *one* of seynt martyns byrdes 19/37.

*One*, used alone = some one, somebody:

here hath ben *one* to day by fore yow whiche was to them ny(g)he of kyn 100/29. What is that syr wulf, hath *one* there byten yow 106/9. Thou myghtest wel have said this to *one* that knewe the(e) not 110/28.

According to Kellner, the modern use of *one* = people, Fr. *on*, Germ. *man*, does not occur in Caxton; its place is still occupied by *men'* (Kelln. XLVI, § 16). The following passages, however, come very near the case in point:

The feest was ful of melodye, *one* myghte have luste to see suche a feeste 54/24; *One* shal alway seke on his frendis 70/33; (the stone) shoon lyke as fyre had ben therin in suche wyse that yf *one* wold goo by nyght hym behoved non other lighte 82/14; how may *one* better be taken than by his owne propre envye suffre hym self to betaken 86/11.

The Du. has *,een'* in all the passages quoted and Du. influence may therefore be admitted in the second set of examples.

Note the use of the Personal, Possessive and Reflexive Pron. *he*, *his*, *himself*, referring to the Indefinite *one*. The special Reflexive *one's self* belongs to a late

(\*) Cf. a similar tautology, in Chaucer, Kn. T.. 105-6:  
For in my tyme a servant was I *one*.

period, (not yet usual in Shakespeare). *One* may be preceded by a Def. Art., by a Demonstr. or by a Possess. Pronoun and have the meaning of 'one of two':

He wold wel forgyve reynere the losse of *his one eye* that he loste in the prestes hows 44/30, viz. of 'one of his eyes', since Tybert had never before been blind of one eye. (Dutch, likewise: *sijn een ogh*, p. 57).

Cf: and now I have lost *myne one eye* 108/27. (Du. simply: *myn oeghe*).

He smote the wulf in the heed... and *that one of his eyen* henge out 108/4 (Du: *syn een ooghe* 142,17); loke hetherward to me is not *myn one eye* out 110/33; *his one hand* by whiche he deffended hym sterte in the fallyng into ysegryms throte... 108/20 (Du: *sijn een hant*); and thenne the wulf... departed out toke *that on half* for hym self, and he gaf yow a quarter &c... 91/38; There muste ye scrape and dygge a way a lytyl the mosse on *the one side* 41/31.

Although we have a similar use in Dutch, I believe that the construction developed spontaneously in English. We have seen, under the Demonstr. Pron. that the connection *that one... that other* was frequent. Even the use of the Demonstr. instead of the Def. Article seems to point to an opposition, so that *that one* was immediately associated with *that other*.

Now in all the instances above, the objects referred to are such as can only exist, or are generally found *in pairs*: eye, hand, half, &c. An interesting case, in this respect, is the next one where 'buckets' are concerned:

How broughtest thou me ones in to the welle where *the two bokettys* henge by one corde rennyng thurgh one polley, thou sattet in *that one boket* byneth in the pytte in grete drede 96/37.

It was natural that when *the one* was used with reference to such paired objects, the *other* member

of the association should have appeared before the mind's eye.

Cp. moreover, the use of *the two* = two, in Chaucer (Einenkel 16). The Def. Art. can here only be explained by the fact that 'the two' are mentally compared to *all the rest* of the longer unit to which they belong, and which is conceived as divided into two unequal parts.

NONE. *None, no' as an Adjective Pronoun.*

This *no* (*none*) = O. E. *nán* must, according to Stoffel (*Studies*, 76-114), be distinguished from the Adverb *no* = O. E. *ná* (*ne* + *á* = *never'*), as well as from the absolute Adv. *no* = Germ. *nein* (\*) With regard to the use of the Adj. Pron. *no* in Reynard, we notice that it still often occurs in the form *none, non*, not only before vowels and *h*, but before other consonants. Thus, besides take *no hede* 10/22, a poure, man is *no lorde* 13/14 it is *no wonder* 33/25, we find:

Thenne was I glad and mery and also toke *none hede* 10/28; that the wulf shold have *none holde* on hym 103/16; (the frosshys) complayned that they had *none lorde* 37/29; ther is *none thyng* byloved ne knowen in the court now adays but money 118/4.

(\*) The Adj. Pron. *no* + *Subst.* interchanges with *not* (*an*) *a* + *Subst.* The distinction between both uses has been laid out, with much acuteness, by Stoffel. I may here briefly recapitulate his theory.

The essential difference is that *no* + *Subst.* is always in Mod. Engl. a 'word-modifier' — whereas *not a* may be according to the cases and to the position of the stress, a 'word-modifier, or a 'Sentence-modifier'. To make Stoffel's meaning clear, let us quote one of his instances. *He is not a fool*, with weak stress on *not* is equivalent to 'I deny that he is a fool', the sentence being a negative one and the weak *not* being a sentence-modifier; but *he is not a fool* with not strong stressed is equivalent to *he is no fool* = 'he is the opposite of a fool', the sentence being not really negative, since *not* in this case is a 'word-modifier' (p. 80). — This is the case where *no* or *not a* + *Subst.* is predicate. No such distinction can be made for *not a* + *Subst.* — Subject of Sentence. 'Not a schoolboy would be puzzled by the question' cannot mean two things. *Not* in this case is invariably a sentence — modifier, — the following *Subst.* being strong-stressed (p. 83, supra). In Dutch, on the contrary, a difference of meaning may be expressed by a difference of stress: compare, *geen schooljongen* and *geen schooljongen*' (84, supra). — Strong-stressed *not* (+ *Subst.*) as Object of a Verb (viz. of *to have*, for other transitive Verbs do not allow of this construction, as they are accompanied by some auxiliary, espec. by *do*), is also very rare, e. g. 'he has *not* a wife and six children'.

We find the phrase *it was no need* 13/1, equivalent to the mod. *it's no use*'.

As to the history of this use of *none*, Franz says that *none* = *not any* still occurs in the 1<sup>st</sup> half but becomes rare in the 2<sup>d</sup> half of the xvii<sup>th</sup> c. For traces of this use in N. E. cf. Herrig's Archiv, 1891, 4.

The Adverbial *no* = *ná* occurs, as in Mod. E. before adverbial and adjective comparatives, before some other Adj. especially before *other*, as this word, being usually followed by *than* was regarded as a comparative (Stoffel 107). Here and there we find *none*, instead of *no*:

He eteth *no more* than once a day 9/2; coude the kyng fynde *none laste messenger* but yow ffor to sende hyther (\*) 13/3. *None* is regular before *other*: hym behoved *none other lighte* 82/15; *none other luste* 83/25; but I myght *none other wyse* doo 99/30; my dere lorde it was *none otherwyse* 96/3 (‘No otherwise’, used adverbially as in our instances occurs in Shakespeare. ‘We do no otherwise than we are willed’ (Henry V, I, 3, 10 — Stoffel, 107).

From these cases we must distinguish those where the Adj. in the comparative, or *other* are used as neutral substantives. In: ‘I desire *no better* but to have wonne the felde’ 112/3, *better* may be regarded as an Adverb like *more* in *no more*; but in: ‘the foxe wiste *none other* but that...’ 23/15 and in several cases where *none other* = ‘nothing else’, I consider *none* as Adjective = *nán* and *other* as Substantive. There is another possibility, viz., that *none*, e. g. in: *I desire non other* 92/41 is Subst. as in ‘I’ll none of it’ (Mätz. III, 305, gives old instances of this use).

*‘None’ as Subst.* = *‘nobody’*.

(\*) As to the distinction between *no* and *not* in these cases, Stoffel says that *not more . . . than* means ‘as (much) . . . as’ whereas *no more than* = as (little) . . . as (p. 89); — *no less a . . . than* means as great a . . . as (p. 96). The distinction belongs to a late period.



I knowe *none* in al my lygnage that I now wolde labour fore thus sore 14/16; and *none* shal wyte me therof 17/25; ther is *none* lyvyng unther the sonne, that I vouches-auf better my tresour on 41/7; I knowe *none* so trewe 41/26.

This use was still frequent in the 17<sup>th</sup> cent., and may be found even now (Franz, E. St. xvii, 395, Anm. 1).

SOMEWHAT = something:

and that coste hym *somwhat* for his thefte 10/10. Cf 51/14, 98/3. Shakesp.: This gentleman told *somewhat* of my tale. Meas. f. Meas. V. 84.

ANY, as a Subst. = anybody:

I love hem as well as *ony* may love his chyldren 37/10, &c. Still found in Spenser and Shakesp., Mätz. III, 278.

ANY = anything:

here is but lytel to ete... what saye ye, Tybert wyl ye ony therof 20/35.

MANY as Substantive:

*many* do more wyth crafte and connyng, than with myght and strengthe 19/30 (Proverb).

EVERYCHE = every body:

and everyche thenne wyl be a lord him self 56/11; wher-ever she cam everich was glad of her 73/8. Cf 15/36, 118/15. Still in Spenser (Düring. p. 53) and Shakesp. (Abbott. 12).

We even come across ECHE BODY:

eche body pluckyth his hand fro hym 114/37. Body is used = man, like in mod. Scotch... (Cf the Fr. 'c'est un drôle de corps') For various usages of *body*, vid. E. Stud. XVII, 395.

EVERYMAN:

every man beware hier by... every man wil be ther at and put more to 16/11.

ALL MAN is found with a similar sense:

he saide he wolde... lye so many lesynges ere he sholde myshappe that *all man* sholde have wondre of it 100/16.

NOMAN = nobody:

he loveth noman so wel... 6/34. It is worth noticing that Caxton very generally writes *noman* in one word.

MEN = people (mod. one, you, he):

ye sawe never fowle that *men* rated laye so styлле, as Isegrym dyde, whan his shoes were haled of 45/32. Also in the form *me*: nay my lord it is tyme for *me* ought not spare to doo wel 47/20 sette ye so lytyl by hony, *me* ought to preyse and love it above alle mete 13/20. *Me* ought not preyse to moche the daye tyl even be come 75/7 (Proverb).

This Indef. Pron. is not mentioned by Düring, op. cit., as in use by Spenser.

OTHER. — Still without an *s* in the plural:

but yf he had ony sorow it was bycause *al the other* that were there were not in the same plyght as the wulf 47/13. Cf 14/16, 74/5. 74/26, 79/35, 86/12. — Still frequent in the 17<sup>th</sup> cent.; cf. Bacon's *Advanc. of Learning*, 114/6, 62/16, 160/10 (Clar. Pr. ed.).

*Other* as Substantive:

send some *other* to hym 19/26; ther be many that see a strawe in an *others* eye 74/14; my wordes shal be herde as wel as anothers 92/40. — Still in Mod. & N. E. Mätz. III, 290. For *other* Subst. = 'the rest' see 'that other' under Demonstr. *that*.

The mod. construction of *each... other* was not developed any more than in the 17<sup>th</sup> c. (Franz. op. cit. E. St. xvii, 400). The Preposition is inserted between *each* and *other*:

my fadre trusted in the prompe that eche made to other 87/18; we ben so nygh of kynne eche to other 109/15; they alle toke leve eche of other 119/8.

SUCH, as Subst., — in the plural = such people:

ffor *suche* be so woo lyke as they had loste theyr Inwytte 68/24. Neutral: bruyen the here satte and groned and muste take *such* as was gyven to hym 16/27.

*Ought, nought.* — *Ought* = something, anything:

have you *ought* forgotten at lantferts 18/23. Cp. mo-

dern: for ought I know' — *Nought* = nothing: myn eme gate ne had nought 8/6. — Freq. in 17<sup>th</sup> century. Franz. E. St. xvii, 399; Mod. ,all to nought'.

I found two instances of the word *thing* used as a Pronoun. In a few cases it seems as if the word *thing* were used as an Indefinite = something, anything. This is only apparent, *thing* being only an old plural form without *s* (Cf. Römstedt, *Schriftsprache bei Caaxton*, 37):

I were not wyse yf I sholde saye *thyng*e that were not trewe 40/36; *Thynge* that thoucheth charge ought to be gyven in knowleche to frendis 68/19; *thoucheth* may also be explained as an old 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. plur. (Römstedt, 46).

In the next instance however *much thing*, really seems to be a sort of Indefinite = Fr. ,grand chose'.

There is *moche thyng*e complayned over you 24/15.

ALL. *All* is often prefixed to a following Pers. Pronoun:

*all we* instead of mod. we all: *all we* agree to the same 57/29 thenne may ye have honour and worship and *all we* that ben your frendys 105/18; *all they*: alle they thenne lefte bruyne the bere lye 17/2.

And *alle they* cryeden wyth myn enemyes agaynst me 113/20.

*all them*:

*all them* that were in the hows 22/20 *alle them* that wold here it 34/12.

This use is old. Murray gives the following references: — c. 1000: *Ealle hi sind an Godes gesihpe*, Aelfric's Saints L, I, 140 — 1382: *alle we as shep erreden*. Wycliffe, Isa, LIII, 6—164: *alle we like sheep have gone astray*.

For *all* Subst. used as an Accus. absol. in ,alle that he coude, myght' see *Adverb*.

,Alle the world' seems to be an emphatic expression

of *all*, comparable to the mod. ,what in the world':

Though thou promysedest to me *alle the world* of fyn rede gold I wold not let the(e) . . . escape 110/21.

Hesitation as to NUMBER of Indefinite Pronouns. —

The Personal Pronoun referring to an Indefinite such as *many*, *eche*, is sometimes in the plural, sometimes in the singular and both forms may occur in the same sentence:

And *many* ben ther that be so plomme and folisse that whan *they* wene beste to prononce and shewe *their* mater and conclude. *They* falle besyde and out therof . . . and leve theyr mater wythout tayl or heed and *he* is compted for a fool 65/10.

Me thynketh it is so hyere, ther be *many* that see a strawe in anothers eye, that can not see a balke in *his* owne there be many that deme other, and *hym self* is worst of alle, though *one* falle ofte, and at laste aryseth . . . *he* is not therof dampned 74/4-6.

*Eche of them* followed by plural pronoun 98/36, 119/13: *eche* of them wente to *their* own howses.

A collection of similar cases, with *every body*, *nobody*, &c is given by Jespersen in ,Progress. in Lang.', p.p. 29, 30 (*If everybody was what they should be*. G. Eliot, &c). The author considers the use of the plural pronoun as a way of supplying the missing genderless singular, viz. he believes that *they* is used, as the speaker feels that neither *he* nor *she* will do. — and finds in the fact an additional argument for his thesis, that ,In language, analysis means suppleness, and synthesis means rigidity'.

Mätzner's explanation (,der Grund dieser Abirrungen liegt in der Verwechslung distributiever und kollektiever Begriffe' II, 150) applies rather to the case with ,many'.

## Numerals.

*Bothe two* is found, instead of *both*:

the cony laprel and the roek were so sore aferde that they durste not speke, but pyked and stryked them out of the court *bothe two* 71/26. (In Du: simply ,si streken beyde uten hove' 92,7).

The form *tweyne* occurs besides *two*, e. g. 7/28, 71/35, 105/27. Römstedt observes (E. Schriftspr. bei Caxt. 39) that this form is only found after the Noun, or when used absolutely. We find however:

ther laye in a grete ape *with tweyne grete wide eyen*, and they glymmed as a fyre 98/18.

Note the apposition of Numerals to Pers. Pr. in *we ten*, *them thre* 83/36.

## V E R B.

### Impersonal Verbs.

While O. E. was very rich in Impersonal Verbs, this construction is decreasing in M. E., partly, no doubt, in consequence of the confusion between cases. The change may be noticed in Caxton.

However, several verbs expressing states of the human mind, inclinations or disinclinations have kept the impersonal form:

*Lyst*: hym lusted no lenger to smyte the bere 16/33;  
Also personal 96/26.

*Repent*: that me repenteth 28/2, whiche me sore repenteth 46/3, 53/1.

*Behoove*: reynard yow behoveth wel suche shoes 45/19; ,suche shoes' probably represents the O. E. Genitive of the thing, — *behōvian* being used like *opus est* (Mätz. II, 204); it is possible however that it is a Nominative and that we have in *behoveth* the old southern ending of the plural in -eth (cf: ... *for them that understandeth it* 4/21); — as it behoved 85/25. Thow haste so ofte deceyved me that me behoveth now to take good hede of thee 110/31. — Also used personally in the sense of ,be needed': Constance is fythyng and behoveth to the lordes. Cf: 31/31, 45/19.

*Growle*: hym myght growle that ever he sawe hym 78/37. (Du: hem *gruwelen* mocht 101/11). Tho cryde he alas me growleth of thyse fowle nyckers 100/21. (Du: mi *gruwelt* ... van desen jonghen nickers 132,12); tho growled them alle and were aferd of that syeding water 114/11. (Du: Doe *gruwelde* hem allen over dat siedende water 150,16).

The word must be regarded as a ,Dutchism' in Caxton. It is not mentioned in Stratmann's M. E.

Dictionary, nor in Skeat's glossary to the Works of Chaucer. *Me growleth* must not be confused with N. E. *growl* = grumble. The latter is referred by Skeat to Du. *grollen* and mentioned as a new word in Vanbrugh's 'Confederacy', 1705. (Kington Oliphant, *New English*, p. 140).

*Me growleth*, on the contrary = *gruvelen* (etym. connected with O. E. *gryre*, Germ. *graus*).

*Plese*: Mercyful lord my lord the kyng the plesse it yow to here our complaynte 9/32.

*Think* is very often used impersonally in *me thynketh* = modern *methinks*. On the origin of this verb, see Mätzner II, 208. The examination of our text does not corroborate Kellner's statement, that there is a striking want of inflexion in the Impersonal Verbs, especially in *thynk* = seem (Kelln. 23).

On the contrary Caxton has very regularly *me thinketh* and I cannot quote a single instance of *me thynk*.

Caxton also uses the impersonal construction in the passive:

But abyde by yow to the utterist how wel *it hath ben otherwyse enformed* your hyenes 115/21; *theron was hewen in grete letters in this wyse* 11/17.

As a grammatical subject we find *it*, as well in true Impersonal Verbs as in impersonal constructions where a logical subject follows. In this case *it* announces the logical subject and at the same time sustains, as it were, the Verb. *Hit* appears in O. E. See Mätzner II, 17.

Instead of the grammatical subject *it*, we find the adverb *there* used as a support for Impersonal Verbs. *There* is then pleonastic and does not point to the *place* where the action happens, although this was its original sense which may still vaguely be felt:

I trowe it is beste that I goo wyth you for *ther lacketh* my counseyl 24/29. (\*)

Constructions with *there* can only be termed impersonal in a wide sense. In fact, the subject of the action is expressed; yet, by means of *there*, this action is presented as if it were a spontaneous effect. This reminds us of the use of the Fr. *il y a*, *il est*. Besides, instances of *paer* instead of *hit* may be found in O. E. *paer waerþ geworden mycel eorþ-bifung* (Math. 28,2). Moreover, Caxton seems to be here influenced by the Dutch.

The here sprange up... emonge an heep of wyvis that he threwe a deel of hem in the ryver... *ther was* the persons wyf one of them... 16/37. Perhaps we have here a blinding of two constructions: there was... emonge them... and: the persons wyf was *one* of them. Dutch: daer was des pastoers wijf mede 22,1. *There leept and ranne* alle that *there was* 22/22. It is possible that the first *there* has kept its local meaning. Cf. the Du. daer liept al datter was 29,7.

I pray yow... that ye wil punysshē this false traytour and morderar or ellis *shal ther* noman goo and comen over the heth in saefte 55/11. (Du: daer en sal nyemant over die heyde vaeren 70,29). — In *ther cam olde wymen*, &c... 15/35, the action is again conceived as impersonal: what is meant is an 'irruption' of old women (Cf Du: daer quamen oude queven *ghelopen* 20/22).

The Impersonal construction may be justified in the last instances by the fact that the logical subjects are indefinite or collective. — *There* is also found with Verbs in the Passive.

I consider the construction as impersonal in the next three instances because the Subject, although

(\*) With the Impers. *lacketh* cp *nedeth* 24/38. — Traces of this construction, when found in later authors, e. g. in Shakespeare, are often explained as the use of a *transitive* verb in an intransitive or *passive* sense: lacks = is needed (Abbott, § 233). But the reason of this is, that these verbs were originally impersonal. For *nedeth*, in O. E. see Mätz. II, 6.



expressed, is a word cognate to the Verb, and is therefore merged into the predicate:

Ther was daunsed manerly the hoveदानce 54/14.

Ther was never lyed a greter lesyng 57/37.

Ther was never suche a prouffre prouffred to ony kyunge  
109/2.

The corresponding Du. passages are:

Men dansede daer manierliken den hovedans 69,19.

Nye en wart meerre loeghen gheloghen 74,13.

Ic waene nye coninck soe schonen ghebot gheboden en  
wert 143,23.

In the first example, we have the indefinite *men*, which confirms my view that the E. passive Verb is used impersonally in order to denote an action with an undetermined subject like in the Latin *dicitur*. This is evidently the sense of the passive in the following instance:

ther upon was leyde a marble stone . . . and thereon *was hewen* in grete letters in this wyse 11/17. (the Du. quite similarly has: Ende daer wert op gehouwen . . . aldus 14/28).

The original sense of the Adverb is also obscured and the construction impersonal in: *what is there happed* 55/30. This is not a question meaning, 'what has happened here?' The rook knows very wel what has happened and the phrase is exclamative as the construction shows us:

he caught her by the heed and boote it off tho was I in grete sorowe and cryde lowde Alas alas *what is there happed* (Not so in Du: O wi o wach wat ghesciet daer 71,20).

This passage throws light on another interesting case:

*Ther is a beer taken* 15/28. (Du: Daer is een beer ghevanghen 20/13.

The sense is not: ,in that place a bear lies, having

been taken'; the important part of the statement is not the presense of a bear in a certain situation, but the news of the taking of the bear. I say 'the news' because it seems to me that *there* has here, as well as *daer* in the Du. original a meaning akin to the temporal one, so that I should paraphrase the passage in this way: 'a bear has just been taken'.

The sense of the Past Pple also deserves our attention. It is not a mere attributive Adjective referring to *beer*, it is connected with *is*. It denotes an action which is entirely past, so that the present *is*, joined to this Past Pple, has the sense of a perfect tense (cf: the Lat. *captus sum*) But the result of this action is considered as being *still felt* and in this, if I am not mistaken, resides the efficacy of the construction *there is*.

The omission of *it* or of *there* in Impersonal Verbs is still frequent in Caxton:

With *lyst*, *behoove*, &c., see above.

With *thynk*, I found but one instance of *it*: 'It thynketh me good' 60/40, and one of *that* 8/21.

Though ye be not grete *ther lyeth not on* 19/30, — a literal translation of the Du: *daer en ligt niet an* 25,17, where *niet* probably is an Indefinite Pronoun = *niets*.

Where as *nedeth* subtyl *ounseyl* 24/38.

*So faryth by me* 89/36. *Swa hit fareth* is found in E. M. E. (Stratmann's Dictionary).

*In lyke wyse is fallen to me* 68/25.

Note the presence of the comparative expressions *so*, *lyke wyse* in the last two instances:

The omission of *it* was usual, as it still is now, in clauses, especially in comparative clauses. See Mätz. II, 33.

*As is to god wel acceptable*. — 64/5, *as moche as in hym is* 96/26.

But *it* is found also:

*As it wel semed* 106/35.

It may be omitted in impersonal phrases formed of *is* + *Noun*:

*the more pity is* 87/8; *whan nede is and tyme* 103/21. (The Du. has slightly different constructions).

*There* is omitted in the following passage:

We ben so nygh of kynne eche to other that of right *shold be no angre bytwene us* 109/15. (The Du. has a personal construction).

### Transitive and Intransitive Verbs.

The faculty which constitutes a feature of English, that of using the same Verb indifferently in a transitive, intransitive, causative or reflexive sense, according to Kellner became ripe in the Elizabethan period, but was nearly complete in Caxton.

I first mention the construction of Intransitive Verbs with cognate Accusatives. The result of the action, or the very activity expressed by the Verb is in this case regarded as its Object. The accusative must not necessarily be a word of the same root as the verb provided it has a cognate meaning:

He *fylle* so grete a *falle* . . . 27/30; how many a grete lesyng must I *lye* 49/31; she *hytte* me at the fyrst stroke vj grete *woundes* in my heed 63/14; wyth grete angre he lyft up his foot and *smote* the foxe on the heed so grete a *stroke* that he fyl to the grounde 106/29, &c. tho cam reyner in a grete angre and *bote* hym the grete woundes on his heed 106/17.

Closely allied to this, is the construction of Intransitive Verbs followed by an accusative denoting space or distance:

He *wente* his *waye* 10/11. I coniure yow by the *longe*

*waye that youre soule shal goo* 35/24; *He ranne the hye way to maleperduys ward* 58/21; *Tho wente he his strete* 55/36.

Among the remaining cases, I first examine the use of some verbs of teutonic origin:

*Abyde*, — intransitive:

I shal be to you a tryew friende and *abyde* by yow 13/23; ... yf we *abode* here 20/32; he wil not for me neyther come ne *abyde* 19/25;

sometimes used almost as an auxiliary verb: *murdre abydeth not hid* 89/27;

transitive: for t(o) *abyde* suche right and sentence as shal be there gyven 12/18. Cf 19/7.

The simple *byden* is also found, used intransitively: And in nede alway have *byden* by yow 67/27.

O. E. *ābidan* was used either alone or with a genitive, rarely with an Accusative (Koch, p. 99).

*Aby(d)e* is a different Verb = *abye*, O. E. *ābycgan*, pay for. The *d* has been inserted by the Editor, without any reason. *Abye* gives a forcible meaning and is indicated by the Dutch text: ... he had fasted and prayde that yf I lyve a yere he shal *aby(d)e* it 11/5 (Du: hi salt becopen).

he hath confessyd hymself that he ... consentyd to kywardes deth, it is reson that he *aby(d)e* it 59/12. (Du: Mōgelic is dat hi dat becoep 68,12).

*Menen*:

intransitive: the foxe *mente* of good strokes 14/21;

transitive: ... he *mente* no *falsehede* 57/12 (Du: gheen beschuyt in *dochte* 73,21).

The same word as Du. *meenen*, but also as O. E. *māenan*.

*Sorrow*;

intransitive, 14/40; transitive: there dede he *that* I may wel *sorowe* and bewaylle 39/34.

O. E. *sorgian*, E. M. E. *sorgien*, were intransitive. *Herken*, hark, transitive: 41/18, 97,27, also with *after* 41/16.

O. E. *hercnian*, with Genitive, Koch 84.

*Answer*: late me *answere this fowle theef* 30/16.

O. E. *andswarian* with Dative. M. E. often with *to*. Koch 84.

*Trust*: transit., 41/26.

*truste* 41/26; trans.: I have none ... that I *truste* so moche *to* 20/21.

O. E. *treowsian* Koch, 86.

*Get*:

he wrestled and plucked so harde and so sore that he *gate out his heed* 18/1.

O. E. *gietan* (only in compounds) = become. Koch, 10.

*Speed*, intransitive in:

I have now wel *spedde* 17/24; How bruyn the bere *spedde* wyth the foxe, Table, capit. vii;

but also transitive, and even used in the passive: how brunne the beere *was sped* of Reynart the foxe, Title of capit. vii.

Cf. Chaucer: God spede you (C. T., A, 2558),

O. E. *spédan*. E. M. E. often *it spedith* ... *to* Koch, 92.

*Breke, cleve*,

intransitive in: me thynketh my bely wylle breke or cleve asonder 13/9. Transitive: ... a grete oke *whiche* he had begonne *to cleve* 14/27.

O. E. *brecan*, used in the same way, Koch, 6.

*Stere*,

intransitive: he *styred* not 45/34, transitive: they myght not *stere hande ne foot* 45/3.

Transitive verbs are derived from intransitive ones by means of a preposition or of the prefixes *for*, *be*, &c. These compounds were more numerous in Caxton than now:

Compounds with *be*, *bi*:

*Byfalle*, sometimes intransitive; I thought by this a lyknesse whiche hier a fore tyme *byfyllen* to the frosshis 37/27; *bewaylle* 39/34; *belyke*, resemble: *reynkin* my yongest son *belyketh me* so well 25/13.

*Lican*, impers. Verb in O. E. Koch, 86.

*Belye*: I crye out harowe on them that so falsely have *belyed me* 67/29.

Similar compounds are formed from Substantives: *bysiege*, — *byslabbed* 98/30 (Du. word, s. *Reynart* 129,33, *Inleiding*, 11); *byclagged*, *ibid.* (genuine Du. word, S. *Reynaert* *ibid.*).

Note also the following compounds with *by*, from Transitive Verbs:

*byhelde* 63/25, *bywrappe* = cover 71/28, *byknowen* 70/14, *bydwongen* 37/29, 50/12, probably Dutch (not found in Stratmann, nor in Skeat's Glossary to Chaucer); *beryspe*, p. 27 (Dutch); *bywymple* 64/36, perhaps due to Du. influence (s. on this word, Prof. Logeman's note in *Reynaert*, *Inleid.*, 11); I *benamme* his lyf from hym 61/35 (not Du: dat ic hem . . . dat leven *ghenomen* hadde); And for grete payne he *byshote* hymself 111/12; (Du: ende dat hi hem van groter pynen mit allen *bescheet* 146,34); the Pret. *schoot* is quoted by Stratmann, *i. v.* schiten; *bydryve* 73/24, 78/39, probably borrowed (Mull. and Logem., L.)

Compounds with *for*: the kyng wold not *forgoo hym* 90/6. (Du: Die coninc en woude sijne oec niet ontberen 118/13; I have *forwrought* (= ruined) and angred my frendes 52/38. — Note also *forhongred* 114/18, and from Transitive Verbs: *fordoo* 38/11, *fordryve* 70/5.

Compounds with *mys*:

. . . whiche *mysfyllen* her *evyl* 55/26; I wold ever *mysake hym* 116/16.

The last Verb is not found in Stratmann's Dictionary and is probably borrowed: the Du. has: ic woude dan ewelic *syns missaken* 152,33. But it was formed on the analogy of the E. verb forsake and used like

it with the accusative. Cf O. E. *sācan* = to fight, chide, Intransitive.

The following Transitive Verbs are likewise borrowed: *wappred* and *forslyngred* hym 16/17 (note that the Du. has *slingeren* without prefix and see Prof. Logeman's note Reyn., Inleid. LIH); on the morow erly he *ruymed* his castel (Du. des morghens vroe 'doe *ruymde* hi 78,15).

The matter stands differently with *dowed* in:

I *dowed* the cony bytwene his eerys (Du: Ic *duwede* 79/17), the foxe *dowed* and wronge his genytours 111/11 (Du: *duwede* 146/32). — See Stratmann's M. E. Dict. *in voce* *pewen*, p. 633.

*Letten* = hinder is also genuine, although there is a similar Du. verb *letten*. Cf. O. E. *lettan* & S. Chaucer C. T., E, 389.

A bold use of an Intransitive Verb as a Transitive: *have you slepte your dyner* 63/5. This is a translation from the Du: *Hebdi u eten verslapen* 81/6. The sense is given by R. II, 4077: *gheslapen op u mael*. See Muller & Logeman, Notes, p. 178.

I pass on to verbs of Romance origin. The following are used in the transitive sense:

*amende*:

the transitive is here the primitive use (*emendare*): *amende* it 73/30, *amende* hym 79/29,31;

*accompany*:

ye reysed and accompanied your self with . . . a persone *agravate* 43/23;

*complayn*:

This *complayn* I to yow gracious kynge 10/39. In E. M. E. always with Genitive Koch, 103.

The simple Verb *playn* is generally found as intransitive:

she *playneth* not 8/19; he *complayneth* and I *playne* not 69/10.

*escape*: with *from* 31/36; with the *Accusative* 30/35; *eschewe*, avoid, generally translates the Du: *scuencen*, but comes like the latter from O. Fr. *eschiver* (O. H. G. *skiuhan*, G. *scheuen*).

With *of* = prayde the kyng to have mercy on hym in *eschewyng* of more harm 36/11;

generally with the accusative ... every man almost es(c)heweth his companye and waye 112/28.

*Espy*, is used without object. I found no instance of *espy* + *of*. (Cf Chaucer, *Tr.* and *Cr.* 6, 6).

*Mervayl* = wonder, often Intransitive: 48/31, 52/6. — O. Fr. *merveillier*, transitive in the sense of 'admire' — in the sense of 'wonder' generally Reflexive: *se mervilher*.

*Repent*:

we becomen felaws *whiche* I may wel *repente* 34/37.

Generally used in M. E. with *of* S. Koch, 103.

*Remember*: I wold fayn *remember my sowle* (= think of) 10/24.

It is sometimes difficult to say, owing to the confusion of cases, whether the object is in the Accusative or the Dative. The last interpretation is probable when the simple object interchanges with the prepositional object preceded by *to*, as in the following verbs: *owe*, 42/17, *tell* 37/24, *show*, *plese*, *oby*, the latter generally with *to*, cf 37/38.

This is especially the case for constructions with a double object. The Dative is essentially a personal case, therefore, we often find the personal object preceded by *to*. This *to* is perhaps more frequent in Caxton than in Present English where there is a tendency to replace it by the simple case when the object immediately follows the verb:

And I *gyve to hym* his lyf and membre frely agayn 44/8; *gaf to hym self* better hope than his herte sayde 20/7. I



and my wyf the quene have *promysed to hym* our grace and frendshyp 44/5.

Mätzner admits that there is an original Accusative of the person in two cases: after verbs of *request* (*I ask you pardon*) and after verbs of *exclusion* (*We banish you our territories*). See Mätzner II, 219, 220.

As regards the first category, it is worth noting that Caxton uses the Genitive of the person after *demand*:

of suche thyng as I shal *demaunde of you* 42/18; I demanded *of her* how she wold selle it 62/8; here demand = ask a question.

The *Genitivus rei* is found after *pray*:

ere I departe fro this worlde *I pray you of a bo(o)ne* 34/5.

Note also the constructions with two Accusatives:

*Thank*: — *that thanked hym* the bere 14/18. *That thank I my subtilytie* 49/36.

The Du. has the Genitive: ‚*des dancke ick*’ . . . The construction is not mentioned for Chaucer by Einkenel (S. *Streifzüge* 108 &c) but is found in Orm and Layamon.

*Present*: Parys herde this venus whiche *presented hym this grete Joye* . . . 84/7 (Du: Parijs die hoerde hoer *dit presenteren* 110,8). The construction ‚to present somebody with something’ is however also very old. (Mentioned in the ‚Romance of the Emperor Octavian’ ab. 1370). (K. Oliphant, *New English*, V, 83).

*Hold* = consider. The two accusatives here refer to the *person*. Caxton also has the construction with *for*: *I heelde you for* one of the wysest clerkes that now lyve 63/18.

In connection with this case, I mention the following one of a verb with two accusatives, one of which has for the other the function of a Predicate and ought to be preceded by *for*, *to* or by *as*:

And also *amendes* he shal *gyve* to you *bellyn the ramme*

and alle his lignage . . . in suche wyse that where somever ye fynde them . . . ye may frely byte and ete them wythoute ony forfayte 53/24. The (Du. *ter soenen* . . . gheven).

*Here* with Accusative of the person and Genitive *rei*:

I wolde ye wold *here me* now of alle that I have trespassed in 61/24.

For Intransitive Verbs, used, like Transitive ones, in the *Passive* and the *Reflexive* voice, see the following chapters.

The complement of this freedom was the faculty of coining Verbs from Substantives, Adjectives &c. e. g.:

*angre*, make *angre* 28/9, 49/29, 53/38 &c. *lenghte* the time 33/6. I shal *shorte* the mater 31/19 *vitaille* (O. Fr. *vitailles* = victualia) = furnish, provide, — not mentioned as a Verb in Stratmann; — *felawship*: I herde never of none that *hath felawshippid* with hym 74/37 (also in Wycliffe). *Knowleche*: *knowleche* hym overcomen 108/30 (also in Langland and Mandeville).

Besides the tendency to convert Intransitives into Transitives, I must point to the opposite tendency to treat transitive verbs as Intransitives, or to use the latter in an absolute sense, without any determinant, — a peculiarity which has not generally been noticed:

*steken*, prick: ther was a vylayne that *stake* on us wyth a pyke 98/15 (Du: *stak nae ons* 125,19, but *steken* is a usual M. E. verb).

Cf. . . and began to *stryke* and *smyte* . . . upon his heed and visage 16/9.

*Say*, speak: the kynge saide Reynart ye *saye* resonably 93/5.

(the Du. has ,spreket');

*stele*, walk stealthily: Late us departe and *stele* secretly away in somme other forest 49/19;

*curse*: we shal *curse* tor them in alle chirchys 81/27. Does this refer to some practise of legitimate imprecations

in order to find lost objects? The Du. has: *soe sal men se vervloeken ende te banne doen* 105,31; here the Verbs refer not to the lost jewels, as in Caxton, but to the people that know about them: *die daer of weten*.

Notice *leve* in the sense of *be left, remain*:

Eche of them take his part... yf eche of hem had had one more ther sholde but lytyl *have lefte* over 60/19 Du: daer en bleeft niet over. Cf. Stratmann, M. E. Dictionary.

*Chide*: I wil not moche *chyde wyth* you 67/13.

*Hate*: where they *hate* they loke frendly 60/31.

*Wynne*: he *wynneth* in the spyrituel lawe and temporal 65/1.

*Seke*: one shal alway *seke on* his frendis 70/33 (Du. *sijn vrienden... besueken* 91,3) this was the original use. — Note the special sense of *seke* = demand require, which is perhaps due to the Dutch in: ,hongre... *seketh* narrowly to be holpen' 77/10 (The passage is a free translation of: ,so *soect* men die noot durft nauwe' 99/4);

*seke* is also used as a Transitive Verb: *what I seche* I fynde not 27/24.

Romance Verbs:

*Dissymyle*: the foxe dissymyled and saide 42/8.

*Graunt*, *graunt acquiesce*, O. Fr. *graunt*: The ser-pent graunted therto 75/38.

*Mocke*: thus scorned and *mocked* the foxe 23/10.

O. Fr. identical with *moucher* (*Mueum-are*), transitive:

*Tary* has undergone the influence of O. Fr. *targer* (*tardicare*) but is properly derived from O. E. *tergan*, to vex, hinder, delay, transitive (S. Skeat, Etym. Dict.).

Used by Caxton as an Intransitive, absolutely or with a prepositional object: *ye tary long*; — *ye taryed after hym*. For other constructions of *tary*, see Kellner, LII.

I lastly mention some Intransitive Verbs which are borrowed from the Du. and some others which, being no longer used, might seem to be in the same case:

*rutselen* 18/23 (Du: hi begon te rutselen over sinen stert 27/7;

*wentelen* 18/24 (Du: so wentelde hi dan licht een half mile 24,8);

*ye borde* and *iape* 27/24; men muste *Jape bourde* and *lye* 65/25. Both words are M. E. — *boert*, *boerten*, stands in the Du. text but the M. E. Verb was derived from O. Fr. *bourder*. *taste* = touch, feel: Isegrym tasted here and there 27/23 Du: hi *tastede* hier hi *tastede* daer 35/26;

*wringe* used without object: he wrange he wrastled and cryed 15/16. Although the phrase is closely modelled on the Du., there is no borrowing: ,hi toech, hi worstelde ende hi riep' 20,1.

*plucke*, without object: he wrastled and *plucked* so harde and so sore 15/39. (Not Du: doe toech hi soe harde ende soe swaerlic 20/26;

*crutch* (= cratch, according to Dr. Murray).

he sawe wel that he begyled was he began to howle and to braye and *crutched* wyth the hynder feet.

Du: ende krassede mitten aftersten voeten 19,28.

Intransitive Verbs used with an 'absolute' meaning: *go* with a fuller meaning = walk was probably brought about by the Du. text:

he supposed never to have *goon* (h)is feet were so sore 16/6;

Dutch: hi en waende nimmermeer te *gaen* die voeten die waren hem so seer 20/32.

Whan reynart and grymbert had *goon* a whyle to gydre 25/24.

Du: Doe reynert ende grymbert een stuc *ghegaen waren* 33,5.

I *goo* in drede and ieopardye of my lyf 25/26, viz. not: ,I goo into' but ,I go about in'. Du: ic gae in vresen van der doot 33,3.

*Witen:*

he was caught in the gryn by the necke and er he *wyste* 22/1.

The Du. has the neutral Pronoun: *eer hijt wiste*.

Pres. Engl. *know* is used in the same way, whereas the Fr., except in the affirmative phrase *'je sais'* generally requires the undetermined object.

*Become* is also found with a fuller meaning than it usually has at present. This Verb has become a 'quasi-auxiliary', that is to say it cannot, any more than *be*, form a Predicate by itself. In the following passages it has retained its etymological sense of motion and is followed by *where*:

Alas in what daunger be ye comen in, *where* shal ye *become* 58/24 (Du: *waer sul di bleven* 75,10). I wold fayn knowe *where they ben be comen* 80/36 (*waer die ghebleven waeren* 105,9) I shal wyte *wher* thise Iewellis *ben becomen* 81/27 (Du: *waer . . . ghebleven sijn* 106,9).

Cf. Chaucer, Misc. Poems, 7, 247: Alas! wher is become your gentillesse!

*Become* is used in Pres. English as a quasi-auxiliary in order to express the *progressive passive*: 'became changed', 'became mingled' I believe there is a similar use of the word in this passage:

Whan Isegrym the wulf . . . wente in to religion and *become* a monk *shorn* in the ordre 43/10 (i. e. 'was shorn into the order of monks') Cf the Du: Doe Isegrym — en moninck beschoren wort 55/24.

### Auxiliary Verbs.

BE is often found instead of the present *have*, — even with verbs used transitively:

*Was goon* 25/21, *was escaped* 17/10, *be departed* 49/14, *was falle* 27/32, *is happed* 55/30.

Of course in most of the cases, *be* or *have* might still be used according as we consider a periphrastic tense with *be* or *have* + Past Pple, as representing a *complete* or an *incomplete* present. But it seems to me that the first point of view was the most frequent in *Reynard*.

HAVE, besides its use as an auxiliary and its sense of *possessing* can have some special meanings which I may mention here:

Thy that were wonte to sytte there I *have* (= get, bring, them away 27/27; the wulf was *had* to the kychen 90/30. Such thynges as dayly ben *used* and *had* in the counseyllys of lordes 4/6 (Du: gehanteert ende gebruyet); he *had* alle other beestis in *despyte* 36/31 (= held in despite, despised).

WILL, sometimes with its complete sense of 'be willing':

I *wold* that ye wolde aventure . . . 7/27; she sware . . . that she *wolde* it had coste her alle . . . 22/35; where ben they that so *wolde* doo, that is to destroye them self for to kepe yow 40/2.

The next passages are still more characteristic:

The bestes . . . wondred what the kyng *wold* 42/14;

He ran to the mare and axed her *how she wold* selle her fool or kepe it 62/32.

For instances in Shakespeare, s. Abbott, § 329.

I found an instance of *will* with the 'frequentative' sense it has in such Pres. English phrases as: 'When I was young, professors, *would invite* their pupils on Sundays' (Mätzner does not refer to this use):

And alwey whan he had so smyten hym thenne *wolde to goo* above the wynde and reyse the duste that it made his eyen ful of stufs 107/4: 'Willen' is not used in the corresponding Du. passage 140/30.

Note also the interrogative phrase *wille we*, used as a sort of plural Imperative (1<sup>st</sup> person), equivalent to the present E. 'suppose' (we do this):

Reynard sayde *wylle we* this nyght *be* to gydre, I wyl make you good chyere &c. 20/18. (The Du. has differently: *neve wi willen* tavont te samen bliven 28,17).

SHALL. — In the following passage *shall* means 'is obliged to' but is used in a relative clause, so that it has not its usual Imperative value:

your eme thought me ones a prayer that is of moche vertue to hym that shal fyghte 102/34. The Du. has *moeten* 135,8.

An analogous instance from Shakesp. is quoted by Abbott, § 315.

*Shal* = must:

They wepe and crye by cause I *shal* goo fro them 60/29.

Note the use of *shall* instead of *will* in the following instances:

Yf ye have wel eten he shal geve you better to drynke and thenne it *shal* not styke in your shrote 15/24.

Ete not to(o) moche it *shold* do you harme 15/21.

Now is brune goon an his waye toward the foxe... whiche supposed wel that the foxe *sholde* not have begyled hym 12/5 &c.

MAY is found with the sense of *can*:

ye gaf hym no more than the grate or bones whyche ye *myght* not ete your self 8/1. What prouffyteth bruyne the bere that he stronge and hardy is, that *may* not helpe them 15/10. I wold goo but nay it *may* not bee 43/7. Cf 67/11, 115/35.

The Du. has here same sense of *mogen*, but this was frequent in M. E. and is still found in Shakespeare, (Abbott § 312).

CAN is found with a complete sense = know, be able and may be followed by an Infinitive or by a Noun-Object:

Ye *can* many a *subtylete* and *can* wel helpe yourself 98/8; he is so subtyl and *can* so many *deceytes*

31/37; I *can* wel *frenshe latyn englissh* and *duche* 62/24.

To this use belongs the phrase *can thank* = Fr. *savoir gré*'.

I *can* hym no *thanke* that hath sente you over this longe hylle 12/38. Cf 19/3, 38/2, 75/2. Cf Chaucer Rom. of the Rose. B. 2112: 'can hym no thank for his servyse'.

I shal not *conne* wel goo thyder 13/7 (Du: *mogen*... *gaen*) you shold not thenne wel *conne* goo to the court 15/22 (Du: *mogen*... *gaen*). He had not *conne* fynde a peny therof 39/14 (no auxiliary in Du: *hee en hadde niet een penine*... *gevonden* 50,31). Cf 23/3, 42/3, 63/34, 69/9, 102/8.

In none of these instances do we find a parallel use in the Du. text. For Shakesp. see Abbott, § 307.

Do. *Do* may have a *complete* sense = *behave, act* and be used absolutely:

My fader dyde not as he shold have *don* to you 90/15.

The kyng dyde forth (= continued) with his courte 54/5.

Note *do on, do of* = put:

*dyde on* the shoys 45/29; *don of* your gloves 18/11.

*Do* may be used to avoid the repetition of other Verbs:

Ye ete the good plays allone... in lyke wyse *dyde ye* to hym of the fatte vlycche of bacon 8/1 Cf 99/33, 105/33, 111/7.

To this use belongs the negative reply: *I do not*:

Reyn. sayd ye moke and Jape therwyth. The catte saide so helpe me god *I doo not* 21/11.

Tybert ye Jape. — reynard quod he in trouth *I doo not* 21/16.

*Do* was not regularly used, as it is now, in the interrogation and the negation. This is a late development hardly to be found in M. E. Einenkel quotes a few instances of *do* in negative sentences (p. 232), for Chaucer. In *Piers Plowman*, *do* occurs twice in negative, but not in interrogative phrases (*Wandschneider*, Synt. des Verbs in Langley, p. 13). The



modern rule was not yet fixed in Shakespeare, s. Abbott, §§ 305, 306.

On the contrary, *do* was used redundantly in affirmative sentences where it has not, as it seems, any special purpose of emphasizing the meaning:

Prayde hym that he wold *doo sece* the batayll and take it up in to his hande 111/26. I shal *do* late you have so moche that ten of yow shold not ete it at one mele 13/31; ther muste be two or thre atte leste to gydre . . . that *don* late the sentence gon 76/10. Cf 54/12, 54/16. (\*)

There is sometimes some difficulty in distinguishing this *do* from *do* = cause, make (see *Infinitive*). In: ,(the mare) hath *do* wryte the pris of her colte under her fote' 62/19, Caxton probably misunderstood the Du. ,heeft geschreven' 80,10, as meaning: she has written the price ,whereas it really means: she has the price written'. — If this supposition is correct, *do* is, here again, redundant.

MOTEN, O. E. *mótan*, out of which was derived the praeterito-praesens *most*, *must* is found in:

I pray god that evyl *mote* (= may) he fare 91/42.

Goo and drowne them that evyl *mote* they fare 190/23.

## Reflexive and Passive Verbs.

REFLEXIVE VERBS. A tendency may be observed in Mod. English, to convert Reflexive Verbs into Intransitive ones, — probably by dropping the Reflexive Pronoun.

Traces of this use may be found even in O. E. For

(\*) On the redundant or periphrastic *do* in N. E. see H. Dieter, *Das umschreibende do in der neuenglischen Prosa*, Iena 1896.

instances from the A. S. Gospels. See Mätzl, II, 68.

Reflexive Verbs were therefore more numerous in Caxton than at present.

Among these Verbs some were originally transitive so that the pronoun which follows them was an Accusative :

*Yield*: Now chese whether ye wyl *yelde* *yow* as overcome 108/23. Cf: *yield thee*, *Minotti*, Byron, Siege of Corinth, 27.

*Kepe*: I wyl fyrste teche them how they shal *kepe* *them* fro the grynnes, fro the hunters and fro the houndes 60/27.

O. E. *cépan*: to buy, to traffic, — store up, transitive.

*Lay*: Reynart . . . *leyde hym*, under an hawthorn 10/26. — Cf. Scott, Rokeby, 3, 8: he *laid him* down.

*Refrain*: he coude not *refrayne hym self* 29/4. — Likewise in O. French.

*Dispose*: . . . how *I dispose me* bothe erly and late in your servyse 66/29.

*Amend*: who that never mysdede . . . hath no dede to *amende hym* 73/29.

*Pain*: *payne yourself* to werke soo that ye wyne the prys 105/16.

Cf: Et sachiés que moult *se penoit*.

De faire a Dieu prières faintes (Rom. de la Rose).

*Pain* sometimes occurs in M. E. without Reflexive. S. Koch, p. 20. — The Verb is still reflexive in Pres. English. So are *behave*; — *bethink*: (O. E. He bepóhte hine. Luc. 15,17.)

Other verbs were originally intransitive, e. g. *rest* which however was already in O. E. used with a Reflexive Pronoun in the *Accusative*. (Koch, 15; Mätzl. II, 70), and the verbs of rest in general, such as *sit*, *stand*, which were in O. E. followed by a Reflexive in the Dative, e. g. *him laei*, (Mätzl. loc. citat.).

Perhaps we have a survival of this use in such instances as:

He wente to lande for to *sitte* and *reste hym* 17/15; where  
bruyne the bere laye and *rested hym* 17/28.

Verbs of motion are in the same case. *Went* is found in the old language with a Pronoun in the Accusative (s. Koch, 15) probably according to the primitive meaning of *wendan*; the other Verbs of motion, generally with the Dative (Mätz. II, 70,71.)

*Wenden*: bellyn sayd fare wel reynart and *wente hym* forth to the court 52/3.

*Haste*: *haste you* and come late us goo 50/22. Cf 92/8, 100/5, 110/8. Caxton also uses *haste* as an Intransitive, s. above.

*Turn*: tho *torned hym* reynart toward his castel 15/25, but intransitively, 17/8: come and *torne* agayn thow false theef.

A last category which deserves our attention are the verbs expressing states or actions of the mind. In these, as in the preceding, the Reflexive Pronoun can no longer be considered as the *object* of the action.

The same construction was extremely developed in O. Fr. and Darmesteter explains the pronoun as denoting 'the subjective and spontaneous character of the Action' (Darm., Synt., p. 99). French, no doubt, exerted some influence in this respect. However we have seen that the freedom of forming Reflexive Verbs from Intransitives existed in O. E. for Verbs of rest and of motion, and Wülfing (op. cit. II, p. 17) gives O. E. instances of the reflexive use of *ondraedan*, *sceamian*, &c. It is not necessary therefore to regard this freedom, with Darmesteter, as a 'peculiar trait' Romance languages.

*Fere*: I *fere me* that I shal not conne wel goo thyder 13/7.

*Repente*: ye ought sore *repent you* 28/39. Cf 110/9, etc.

For the same use of *fear* and *repent* in N. E. see Mätz. 71.

*Feel*: I *fele me* the lenger the werse 90/9.

*Felan*, intransitive in O. E.

Verbs which do not belong to these categories :

*Feed*: *fedeth hym* 83/13.

*Fedan* although originally intransitive was very early used transitively, S. Koch, 10.

*Endeavour*: ... *bad hym* ... that he *solde endevoze hym* to *seche hem* 93/21.

This is perhaps the earliest use of the word, which arose out of phrases like 'to do one's *dever*' (Fr. *devoir*) — to put a man to his *dever* &c. (S. Skeat. Etym. Dict.).

*Understande*: I *understande me* on this werke 70/10.

Du: Ick *verstae me des wercks* 90,7, — both probably from the Fr. *s'entendre à*. I found no instance of a similar use of O. E. *understandan*.

#### INTERCHANGE BETWEEN REFLEXIVE AND PASSIVE VERBS.

There is a close relation of sense between the Passive and the Reflexive; the subject of a reflexive verb is represented as *suffering* the action which he himself originates. Hence, in Latin, passive verbs were first 'deponents', and in Mod. languages, we still say with a passive sense: *ce terrain se creuse difficilement* 'Das versteht sich von selbst'. (\*)

It is therefore not surprising to find a Verb used with the same sense both in the Passive and in the Reflexive form. The title of the 12<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Reynard* is: *how reynard shroef hym* but in the *Table*, the title is given as follows: *how the foxe was shryven to grymbert*. Cf:

I have forgotten on thyng the laste tyme that I *was shreven* to you 61/39, syth I *was laste shryven* I have done many shrewde tornes 61/22.

As a consequence of the wide use of Transitive Verbs in the Reflexive, we find the same verbs sometimes used alone, *viz.* without pronoun, in a passive

(\*) Instances from Vercoullie, *Inleiding tot de Taalkunde*, p. 86.

sense. A typical Mod. instance is *this book sells well*. In Reynard I mention:

*Renew* : . . . as ofte as it cometh to myn mynde alle myn angre and hate that I have to the(e) *reneweth* 111/13.

(Du: so vernyewet mij alle mijn leet 146,2.)

*Overthrow* . . . it made hym to *overthrowe* alle in a swowne 111/18.

(Du: hi stortede in onmachten 147,7.)

Note also the Passive Participle of *bethink* in *I am sore bethought* 38/28.

PASSIVE. The unparalleled freedom of English, to convert a complement in the Dative or even a prepositional complement into the Subject of a passive construction was not yet very developed in Caxton. But Kellner goes too far in saying that the peculiarity is not to be met with in Caxton's works, — a want the more strange that instances of the passive construction are found as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and which Kellner attributes to a sort of ,negative influence of the French' (Kellner, LV).

In fact, there *are* instances of the Mod. use in Reynard. For instances of the impersonal construction of the passive I refer to the chapter on Impersonal Verbs.

Of course we find the Passive use of Intransitive Verbs: ,he was a *compted* for a fool' 65/11. A frequent case is the conversion into the passive of a construction with cognate Accusative:

• Ye shal go quite of alle the *complayntes* that *ben complayned* on you 24/25.

The same process is applied to Intransitives:

*Help*, (originally with Dative or Genitive).

Hongre and nede to save the lyf seketh narrowly *to be holpen* 77/10.

*Complain*: ye be good for to walke wyth, courtoys, frendly and not *complayned on* of ony beest 48/11. And therefore am I *complayned on* of the evyl shrewys 66/30.

*Bere an hond*; – (see, for a discussion of this phrase, Einenk. Streifz. Prepositions, p. 182); like *bere wytnesse* (Fr. *porter témoignage*) seems to have meant originally to carry in the hand the material proofs of an offence, and was followed by a personal object with *to*. Here, this object is turned into a subject:

beholde dere eme thus am *I born an honde* 69/26, thus am I accused, charged (Du: aldus ben ic bedraghen ende belast).

*Speak of*: it shal be longe spoken of after 56/23).

*Do* with a prepositional personal object =

I wolde not counseyllē that he sholde be *done to* more than right 57/33. (Du: dat men hem boven recht yet dede: active construction 74,4.)

Note also the conversion into the passive of a construction with *accus. cum infinitiv.*: I was *suffred* to speke 73/18.

More instances will be found under the treatment of the Infinitive.

*Speed*:

how brunne the bere was sped of Reynart the foxe 12/1.

Intransitive Verb, see 17/24; 19/13.

*Set by*:

the pope is so sore olde that he is but *lytil sette by* 71/3.

The active expression means 'to care little for'. Cf. *sette ye so lytyl by hony* 13/19 also 47/4, 6/8. From the transitive *set* we have the passive expressions *it is sette subtyly* 4/17, = put, written, and (there) was a day *sette*, = appointed 6/3.

*Storven* means 'dead' in the next passage and we might at first night suppose on influence of the Du. But M. E. *steorven* (O. E. *steorfan*) was transit. as well intransit. S. Stratmann, *in voce* *steorven*.

Ysegrym was almost *storven* for hunger 62/4. (Du: Ysegrym was binae van groten hongere . . . ghestorven 79,29).

## T e n s e.

### PRESENT.

Caxton sometimes uses the Present in order to describe vividly some scene of tumult and agitation (*Praesens historicum*):

Lantfert cam to hym wyth the preest and forth with alle the parysshe and began to smyte and stryke sore upon his heed and visage he receyved there many a sore stroke, every man beware hierby, who *hath* harme and scathe, every man *wil* be ther at and put more to 16/11.

### PERFECT.

The use of the Perfect was somewhat wider than now. In some cases it is justifiable and probably serves to indicate some shade of temporal meaning better than the Imperfect could do it:

Whan we *were comen* in to myn hows and ermelyn my wyf understood that I sholde goo over see she fyl doun in a swoun 50/33.

See my lorde these grete woundes that he *hath made* to me wyth hys sharpe longe nayles 55/9.

Sometimes it interchanges, in the same sentence, with the Imperfect, without any very clear difference in meaning:

(The same in Du: so is bruyn voerden coninc ghecomen ende sprac 24,12).

With suche flatoryng wordes *hath* reynard thise two *flatred* that they wente wyth hym 48/17.

(Dutch, likewise: So *heeft* reynaer dese twee *versot* dat si . . . gingen 62,1).

Now *is* brune gone on his waye toward the foxe 12/5.  
(Du: Nu *is* Br. derwart *ghereyst*).

## PAST PERFECT TENSE (Pluperfect).

A similar interchange may be observed between the Past Perfect tense and the Perfect or the Imperfect:

And as reynart *was gon* out to seche his mete he espyed them and caught hem and *was comen* home with hem 58/37. The Du. has here an interchange between Perfect and Imperfect: ,greespe . . . ende is daermede te huys ghecomen' 75,24.

Herken farther how my fadre and tybert the catte *wende* to gydre and *had sworn* by their trouthe that for love ne hate they shold not departe 87/11.

(Du: Hoert voert hoe dat myn vader ende tybert eens te gader ghingen ende hadden . . . ghesworen . . . 114,18.)

Whan the kynge of alle beestis had assembled alle his court ther was none of them alle but that he *had complained* sore on Reynard the foxe 5/20.

The pluperfect would be much more to the point, if the sentence began in some such manner as ,When the king had dismissed the assembly, &c'. The Dutch instead of ,had complained', more appositely has ,had to complain' which Caxton perhaps did not understand (Du: . . . en was dan nyemant . . . *hi en had* over reynaert . . . te claghen).

He spack not one worde but . . . dubbed me in the necke bytwene myn Eeris that *I had wende* I shold have loste my heed 54/37.

The Dutch has the Imperfect: dubbede . . . dat ic meende . . . 70,14.

Some of the passages quoted presents a close analogy with the Dutch and seem to point to Du. influence. We must bear in mind, however, that these constructions are not restricted to *Reynard*, nor even to Caxton. S. Kellner, p.p. LVI, LVII, § 22, and Mätzner, II, p. 79, for other instances.

PAST TENSE after Verbs like: Think, suppose, desire, &c.



After Verbs of supposition, intention, hope, a tense 'anterior' to that of the principal Verb can still now be used in order to denote that the action was contrary to the hope, desire, &c. The distinction thus implied is very consistently observed by our author:

... whiche *supposed* wel that the foxe *sholde not have begyled* hym 12/5 (i. e. that, in fact, the fox *did* beguile him); — *wende* that noman *should have comen* 17/21; ... I had *wende* I *sholde have loste* my heed 54/37; I had *supposed* that ye *had iaped* therwyth 13/26; he hoped that the bere *had be dede* 17/23.

The hore wyth her longe legge had an yron foot I *wende* the nayles therof *had ben* lettres 63/13; I *wende* hit *had be* a mermoyse 98/20; he... cryde so lowde that alle they were aferde, they had *wende* that he *had been* wood 116/32.

In the three first instances, the tense employed is a Future, but a Past tense of the Future (Mätzner's zweites Futur der Vergangenheit) corresponding to the French Past tense of the so-called Conditional:

„should have come”: „should come” = Pluperfect of Future: Imperfect of Future.

The same phenomenon occurs after other Verbs than *hope, think*, e.g. after a Verb meaning accuse, calumniate:

I peased the kynge with grete lesyngis and *bare hym on honde* that the wulf and the bere *wold have betrayed* hym and *wolde have slayn* hym 61/28.

After *judge*: and was Judged that reynart *sholde come* and *have excused* hym hierof and *have sworn* — that he was not gylty 6/4.

In the following example a Verb of *thinking* may be supplied:

(My fader)... hadde gotten many a souldyour that *shold* the next somer *have comen* to helpe bruyne 39/18 (i. e. „that he supposed to have come”).

For the use of the Perfect Infinitive, under the same conditions, see *Infinitive*.

IMPERFECT AND PLUPERFECT especially in Conditional Sentences:

,*Hadde* we an halter which were mete for his necke . . . we shold sone make an ende'. Reyn. 32/12.

I encroach here partly on the Syntax of moods, namely of the Subjunctive mood, in order to show a mistake of Mätzner's. The author considers simple (viz. not periphrastic) forms of the Subjunctive, which have dwindled into the forms of the Indicative, as if they really were Indicatives, — which is of course unjustifiable in a work on *historical* grammar.

The transition from a temporal meaning into a modal signification is a fact which may be observed, for instance, when we use the Future for an Imperative. Likewise an action which is *past* may be conceived in some respects, as an action which is *not real*. In some such instance as ,*I supposed that I should have gone*', which means that in reality, I have *not* gone three points of time are compared: the time of the supposition, the time of the *going*, the time when the writer is speaking or writing. — ,*I shold have gone*' with regard to the initial supposition, expresses relative futurity, but from the point of view of the speaker it expresses an action which is not only past, but unfulfilled, so that if we compare it *now* to the initial act, it ends by having, in relation with this, the meaning of improbability, impossibility.

Mätzner in his § on the Imperfect in conditional sentences (II, 97,5 and 100,3) seems to extend these facts somewhat indiscriminately to various cases. In the instances from the older periods of the language (,*Ic were* onnseli if ic *lernede*, &c.,) the Imperfect expresses uncertainty, not *quia* Imperfect but *quia* Subjunctive. We want an old example with *waes* instead

of *were*. Among the modern instances we have, with the Indicative; 'If vanity *was* a fit thing . . . I might &c.'; *was* is certainly an Indicative, since the simple form of the Subjunctive has not died out, but is represented by *were*; — but then the *condition* is indicated by the conjunction *if*. In 'Had I a daughter worthy of such a husband, he should have such a wife' (Sheridan), *had* may be an obscured subjunctive (*hadde*); moreover, the condition is here indicated by the inversion *had I*. The same may be said of the optative clauses which Mätzner examines in the same place and explains by an ellipsis: 'O! *had* we some bright little isle of our own! (T. Moore) = O! If we had . . .' But the optative meaning is one of the first functions of the Subjunctive and there is perhaps not much reason to separate instances like this from those given in the chapter on the Subjunctive in Principal sentences, p. 121 of Mätzner's Grammar. It seems in this passage of the work, as if the author considered as the only simple Imperfect Subjunctive existing, the Subjunctive of *to be*. But is it not evident that the word *put* in the following instance, — consider it as you like from the point of view of *form*, — must be regarded as a Subjunctive from the point of view of Syntax: 'yf ye *put* me to deth hit were but a smal vengeance' 30/37?

The German *würde* in *Ich würde gehen* is an Imperfect of the Subjunctive and it is natural to believe that the English *would* in *I would go* was originally the same.

Speaking of *should* and *would* in the periphrastic tenses formed with these auxiliaries, Mätzner says: 'Insofern *should* und *would* an sich betrachtet Praeterita sind, werden sie hier gleich den hypotetisch verwen-

deten Präteriten behandelt und *wirken als conjunctive'* (II, p.p. 102, 103). — I believe that *should* and *would were* Subjunctives and find moreover that simple Subjunctives, without *should* and *would were* much more numerous than at present. As to their use, we must first of all draw a distinction between two different things which are often designated by the same term, 'conditional sentence', namely, the principal sentence which expresses the result of a condition, — and the clause which expresses the condition itself. Note that in the first case, the condition on which the action depends may be undetermined or non-expressed so that the preterite or plusquamperfect sometimes becomes simply a means of stating something *in a reserved way*. The *uncertainty* of the facts is indicated partly indeed, according to Mätzner's view by the *tense*, but chiefly, in my opinion, by the *mood*.

Instances of simple Subjunctive :

They leep and ronne al that they myghte as they that *were* aferd of theyr lyf 87/15. — Comparative clause with simple subjunctive. — Dutch: si liepen . . . als die geen die hoers selfs lijfs beducht waren 114,24.

I *wold* wel dere Eme that it *had* not *happed* yow. But that it *had fallen* on me, so that ye ther wyth *had ben plesyd* 109/29,31. Consecutive clause and substantive clause, with simple Subjunctive; we must evidently recognize also in *I wold* the Subjunctive = Optative. Dutch: ick woude u des nye *ghesciet en ware* lieve oem ende dattet mi *ghesciet ware*, op dat ghi daer mede te vreden *waert*. (Imperf. instead of Plpf.) 144,25.

After *to have lever*: They be lyke the wulf that had lever the kinge *had deyed* than he wolde gyve hym his lyver 94/14.

The Du. Text has differently: Si lieten hem eer sterven. Si slachten den wolf die den coninc node mitter lever lanen woude . . . 119, *in fine*.

The wulf sayd, I had lever that they *were* hanged er I that *saide* 101/11.

Du: Ick *hadde* liever dat mense *hinghe* eer dat ick dat gheseit *hadde* 133,12.

Conditional Sentences (first sense):

I wote wel yf ye wolde ye *myght* now slee me but and ye so done had, *what had ye wonne* 110/2. (The Dutch, differently, has the Perfect: wat *hebdi* dan *gewonnen* 145,12).

Had I not ben in the censures of the chyrch I *had* wythoute taryenge *have comen*.

We have here a remarkable instance of a parasitic *have* which is probably due to a contamination between the simple form & the periphrastic form, — *would* and *should have comen*. The same pleonasm occurs in another passage: *had* tybert the catte *have ben* there' 46/12. This particularity is not found in the corresponding Dutch passages.

Subjunctive in dubitative statements, (the condition being quite undetermined and not expressed):

*Hit were good* that right and Justyse were don 7/17.

*It were* hye tyde that ye were at your reste 60/38.

Du: dat *waer* hoghe tijt dat ghi u ruste waert 78,8.

Note also *I would* in the instances above and *had* in *I had lever*, which is not an Imperf. Indicat. but rather a Subjunctive in a conditional sense.

Conditional clause (second sense):

The condition is generally expressed by *if* or *and* = *if*; it is sometimes difficult to say whether the verb that follows is in the Indicative or in the Subjunctive. The condition is also expressed without Conjunction, by an inversion of the Subject, in the interrogative form. The verb may be in the Indicative and even in the Present:

*deceyveth me the foxe* so have I ylle lerned my cases 11/34;

*come ye not or brynge I yow not with me... it shal coste you your lyf* 12/17;

Can he answere and excuse hym I shal gladly late hym goo quyte 80/19.

In these sentences the condition is expressed nearly in the form of an independant sentence, of a question, to which the next words are the answer. But when the Verb is in the Preterite or Pluperfect, the subordination is felt. We have already seen two cases 46/12 and 68/11 (*had I ben* in the censures...). I add the following:

Hadde we an halter which were mete for his necke... we shold sone make an end 32/13.

Du: *„Hadden wi een strop die... te passe waer...”* without a principal Verb (41,23).

Wene ye syr kynge, *hadde I* knowen my self gyilty... that I wold have comen 68/1.

Du: *hadde ick mi... brokich ghekent, ick en waer niet ghecomen* 87,18.

Note that in the second Verb Caxton has the periphrastic, whereas the Du. has the simple form.

He sprange to the cony and caught hym by the heed and shold have slayn hym, *had I* not reskowen hym 69/12.

Du: *had ic* dat niet benomen 88/34. Cp. 13/1, 35/35, 110/19.

The analogy with the Du. text proves little more than that the English of the time gave Caxton the possibility of a close translation. Mätzner, III, p. 503, treats of this interrogative form of the conditional clause and produces instances from all the periods of the language up to Macaulay. In O. E. however the form with *gif* was much more usual (S. Mätzner, II, 98, note). See also the instances given in the § discussed and some stray instances in Mätzner's Grammar, II, p.p. 103, 104, 107.

## SEQUENCE OF TENSES.

Derogations from the *consecutio temporum* are not rare; often this is a consequence of the confusion between direct and indirect speech:

Isegrym commanded anon and bodde his kyn and frendes. that they shold see to reynart that he escaped not ffor he *is* so wyly and fals 32/30.

Who so had in his eyen ony smarte or sorenes or in his body ony swellyng... yf he stryked his stone on the place where the gryef *is* he *shal* anon be hole 82/20.

Have ye also payd hym for the hony combes..., yf ye *have* not it *were* a grete shame 18/5.

## M O O D.

### Subjunctive.

In the chapter on Tense, speaking of the Imperfect and Pluperfect in Conditional sentences, I have had occasion to show that the simple form of the Imperf. Subjunctive, instead of the periphrastic form is still very frequent in Caxton. Here are some additional instances:

*yf I refused* I were a fool 104/24; *yf ye nedε* anythyng . . . I wold alway be redy 117/8; *yf I wente* wyth yow men sholde arette vilonye unto my crowne 43/25; *though thou promysedest* to me alle the world of fyn rede gold I wold not late thee escape 110/21; but *yf I wyste* how to escape *I wente* hardly in 98/15.

Instances of the Pluperfect:

I thought truly *it had ben* an evyl change for to have a foule stynkyng theef 38/6; *yf his formest feet had been* hole the foxe *had not endured* so longe 107/16.

For the use of the simple instead of the compound form of Subjunct. in Shakesp. s. Abbott, § 361.

The decay of the Subjunctive mood is a characteristic feature of Modern English. The modern tendency was already at work in Caxton; nevertheless, the use of the Subjunctive was wider than at present. The Subj. was found alone, not depending on a Conjunction, in sentences expressing wish:

God gyve you good morrow 46/19; god be wyth you 47/23;  
we have both the Conjunction *that* and the optative in:  
goo and drowne them *that evyl mote they fare* 100/23;  
cf. 91/42;



in concessive sentences:

He shold have victorye *were* it by nyght or by daye 82/34;  
I pray and comande alle them that holde of me *be* they  
here or wheresomever they *be* 56/33; — who so *have* envye  
and spyte of an others welfare . . . it shold be wel behoefful  
86/40; I shal bydwynge and subdue the *haddest thou* sworn  
the contrarye 86/8;

in conditional sentences, see the chapter on Tense.

Subjunctive after a Conjunction; — in the 'indirect  
speech' :

saye to hym *that he come* 19/17; thenne myght I saye  
I *were* not happy 30/32; cf. Wene ye *that I were a fool*  
14/37;

after *if*: who shal blame Reynart yf he *have* taken fro  
a theef stolen good hit is reson . . . 8/30; yf bruyns crowne  
*be* bloody what is that to me 30/25; yf ony *sai* on me ony  
thyng 93/2; yf the kyng *hunte* after me 50/16; for yf he  
*see* hym ones he shal doo as he wyl 81/40.

after *though*: though he *be* greet he has no herte 103/38;  
though he *were* to fore fell he is now chaunged otherwise  
than he was 40/23.

but the Indicative also occurs: yf I durste I wolde pay  
you of mercy *though* my hurte and sorow *is* playsant to  
you 32/36.

after *til*: we shal hunte hym til he *be* take 85/40;

after *er*: al his lesynges shal not a vaylle hym er he  
*departe* fro me 94/17;

in consecutive sentences, e. g. after *so that*, etc :

Can he that subtylte *in suche wyse that he stamer* not  
in his wordes . . . 64/39.

## Infinitive.

### FORM. — SIMPLE AND PREPOSITIONAL INFINITIVE.

For the use or omission of *to* before the Infinitive, I refer to the following paragraphs where attention will be paid to this question in each particular case.

It will be found that, on the whole, the use of the simple Infinitive was much wider than now.

On the other hand, in the struggle between the two forms, the preposition *to* was sometimes introduced where we should now omit it.

Here are some characteristic instances:

Therefore he is wyse that *can* in his angre *mesure* hymself and not be overhasty and *to see* wel what may falle or happe afterward to hym 110/4;

(He) . . . thought that he was so grete with the king that he myght *helpe* and *further* his frendes and *hyndre* his enemyes and also *to doo* what he wolde wythout he shold be blamed 119/4;

that they *may* ther by the better use and folowe vertue and to eschewe synne and vyces 119/31.

Note that in these instances, *to* is used when there is some interval between *can*, *may*, and the depending Infinitive, and serves, as it seems, to recall the dependency.

### „FOR TO”.

As the Infinitive with *to* (which was the upshot of the O. E. dative form in *anne*, *enne*, governed by the Preposition *to*) gradually became equivalent to the simple form (O. E. Nominative form in *an*, *en*) it was

natural enough to emphasize *to* by means of some other preposition, in order to denote *aim*, *purpose*. This is the value of *for to* in the following instances:

The king sent to his lordes . . . *for to walke* 10/29, &c. &c. Instances abound.

But the notion of *purpose* was again obscured in *for to* which became equivalent to the simple *to*:

I thought truly it had ben an evyl change *for to have* a foule stynkyng theef *and to refuse* a noble . . . Lyon 38/17.

I knowe alle that is *for to be done* 70/16; he had *for to answeere* to many a fowle feet 29/19; I hope *for to be* yet his best frende 33/26; he had wende *for to have wonne* 85/1; henge it on his necke and chargyd hym not *for to loke* in the male 51/23; menaced *for to take* your lyfe 20/11; commanded . . . his folke *for to be* here 59/18; I counseyllled ysegrym the wulf *for to leve* his religion 69/33; prayde us *for to gyve* yow part of our wyning 91/33; brynge the kinge wyth lesynges *for to holde* wyth hym 33/22.

Instances with Infinitive after Adjectives:

Ye be good *for to walke* wyth, courtoys, frendly, &c 48/10;

Is it . . . wonder yf I be mevyd and angry *for to lose* suche maner lewellis 84/33.

Instances of *for to* after Substantives:

A letter *for to rede* 10/14: a staf . . . *for to playe* 16/20; I wyl be the messenger *for to goo* and paye hym 18/6. a venture *for to be loste* 25/8; he gate leve *for to have* as moche of the beeres skyn . . . as a foot longe 45/5.

After Substantives the idea of *aim*, is more or less perceptible. There is no reason to say, as Kellner does, that *for to* is used especially after Nouns.

What is the origin of this use? Einkenkel, p. 140, shows the parallelism between *for*, *for to* and O. Fr. *por*, *por a*. *For habbe* (Layamon) corresponds to *por gaaigner*. There must have been a certain amount of Fr. influence in the extension of this use.

But *for to* was equally found in O. E. Mätz. III, 58, and refers to a similar use of *for at* in Swedish and Danish. — Moreover, *for* etymologically corresponds to Gothic, *faur*, O. N. *fyrn*, &c. *For to* still lingered in the Elizabethan period:

‘Forbid the sea *for to* obey the moon’. Winter Tale I, 2, 427.

It survives even now as a vulgarism. Cf. Storm, *Engl. Phil.*, 782, 783.

#### TENSE. — PAST INFINITIVE.

After Verbs like *wene*, *suppose*, *hope*, *intend* the Past Inf. is used in order to show that the *hope*, *intention*, &c., were not realised. S. Mätzner III, 64 and 66, for older instances. For Shakesp., Abbott, 360.

He *supposed never to have gone* his feet were so sore 16/6. The serpent *supposed to have gone* thorough but he was caught in a snare 75/15. The first Verb may be in the Present: I *desire* no better but to *have wonne* the felde 112/3. (\*)

There are exceptions to this use:

the wulf *wende wel to be* sure of hym 106/39. *Wenest* thou thus *to deceyve* me 110/24. Exceptions also in Chaucer, s. Einenkel 237, 257.

After *ben like* the Past Inf. is used with a similar meaning:

*We weren lyke* both therby *to have lost* our lyves 95/9; he was in better caas than it *was lyke to have be* 94/7.

(\*) Stoffel, in *Taaltstudie*, Vol IX has devoted an important article to the idiom ‘I intended to have written’. His view, that the so-called Perfect Infinitive of non-realisation is essentially an elliptical conditional sentence, with the conditional clause left out, is developed with great ingenuity. Let us summarize this theory: when *he had slain his brother* = *er hätte seinen Bruder getödtet* came for the sake of clearness to be replaced by *he wold have slain his brother*, another ambiguity naturally arose. *wold* had both a formal and a notional meaning: instead of *wolde have* being considered as a mere formal substitute for *hadde*, people looked upon *wold* as the Past tense of *willen* = ‘vouloir’. The phrase began to be regarded as made up of *he wolde + have slain* instead *he wolde have + slain*, and as ‘todten wollen’. It was natural that later on, Past tenses of other Verbs of wishing, intending, supposing, likelihood, duty, &c. should be substituted for *wolde*.

Analogous cases :

And with that he (russel) tasted for *to have taken* somewhat, the cony smote russel . . . and he fyl down . . . 69/8. — The Past tense is used, because russel had no time to take anything.

Note that the same use accounts for the formation of the periphrastic Past Tense of the Future (French conditional) with *would*. 'He would have gone' = he would . . . but he has *not* gone. In some cases *would* still retains its independent value of *be willing*: I wolde not for a thousand marke have goon wyth hym' 20/24.

#### VOICE OF THE INFINITIVE.

Constructions with Inf. Passive are not yet fully developed in Caxton. The Active is often used with a Passive sense. See, hereafter, Adverbial Infinitive and *Accus. cum Inf.*)

On the other hand, there are instances of the modern construction: points *to be merkyd* 4/3; thynke ye it best *to be done* 40/29.

In O. Fr. likewise we often find the construction: *por son pere a vengier*.

But O. E. did not, either, draw a distinction between the voices of the Infinitive. Alfred, who had the continual temptation of imitating his Latin originals still renders *baptizandus* by *to gefultianne*, *educandus* by *to laeranne*, *misit eum ordinandum* by *sende hine to hadiganne*.

Wülfing gives instances of the Passive, — always without Preposition —, after *biddan*, *bebeodan*. But some of these might be explained as personal constructions, with omission of *paet* after *bebead*, e. g. 'Erconbyrht bebead desfolgyld *beon to worpene*' (= ut E. idola *destrui* praeceperit).

The Lat. construction which became frequent in the 14<sup>th</sup> century entirely supplanted the other in the 16<sup>th</sup>.

#### FUNCTIONS OF INFINITIVE. — INFINITIVE SUBJECT.

The Inf. is generally preceded by *to*.

The Predicate may be a Substantive or an Adjective. Phrases with a Subst. and simple Inf., e. g. *passee over is an ease*, which are common in Chaucer (Einenk. 229) are very rare in Caxton. Instances with an Adj. or a Pple used adjectively: „But alway *to misdoo* and trespace and not *to amende* hym that is *evyl* and a *devely lyf*” 73/31.

Is it not *evyl don to sende* to a lorde his servaunts hede 72/26. (Du: is dit niet *misdaen* 93,12).

In connection with Impersonal Verbs, Caxton also uses *to*, whereas the simple Inf. was the rule in Chaucer (Einenkel 231):

*plese*: plese it you *to here* our complaynte 9/33;

*lyst*: hym lusted no lenger *to smyte* the bere 16/38;

*hurte*: what hurted the foxe *to speke* fayr 20/15.

#### INFINITIVE AS OBJECT.

The Inf. is found principally after the following Verbs:

*Dare*, the simple Inf. is the rule in Caxton as well as in Chaucer:

In the next passage the form with *to* is found besides the other:

I *dar* wel *come* openly in the lyghte and *to answeere* to alle the complayntes that ony man can saye on me 68/6.

In N. E. usage is still divided. As a rule, *to* is used after *dare* = *challenge*, or when *dare* is itself in the Infinitive.

*Can* = be able, is used with simple Inf.:

shal never *conne doo* that swete playe and game 23/3.

*Owe*, more frequently with *to* than without *to*. It was the reverse in Chaucer. S. Einenkell, 233. — *To* is left out in 47/20, 57/9, 75/7, 80/9, 89/14.

*Weten* :

ye were wyse ynowh to goo where ye *wyste to wynne* ony good 105/5.

*Nede*, with *to* :

ye *nede* wel to loke aboute yow and to beware of hym 24/6.

*Have* and *give* deserve special notice.

*Have* is first found with the Inf. alone (prepositional form) :

...and wheresoever he hath *to doo* 65/2. Du: waer he doende is 83,21.

This construction reminds us of the Fr. *avoir à faire*, the same which originated the Fr. future tense (Vulg. Lat. *amare habeo*). Nevertheless the construction was probably genuine. See Mätz. III, 32, 33.

*Have* may be moreover accompanied by an Accusative which seems then to be governed partly by *have* and partly by the Infinitive :

What *have* I *to do* wyth the wulf 96/21. What have I *to wryte* of these mysdedis; I *have ynowh to doo* with myne owne self. — Cf. O. E.  *Ic hadde þonne mete to healdanne* (Mätz. *i. loc. cit.*).

The use of *give* is quite parallel to this :

yf ye have wel eten he shal *geve* you *better to drynke* 15/23.

— Cf. O. E. He *sealdon* Ceolvulfe Myrena rice *to healdanne*, Sax. Chronicle, 874.

Simple Infinitive after Verbs of motion. —

He made hym goo *sytt*e bytwene his legges 7/5 (Du: hy deden voer hem *gaan sitten*, 9/6).

I trowe veryly that ye wyl go *synge* complayn 18/12 (Du: Ic meen ghi zeker wilt *gaan singhen* die compleet 23,30).

Tho saide he late us go *ete* this good fatte hare 49/7. (Du: nu *gae wi eten*, 62, *in fine*).

Yf ye come rede and be a clerk ye may *come see* and rede it 62/10. (The Du. construction is different).

In spite of the analogy of the corresponding Du. passages we need not here assume a foreign influence. A similar use is frequent in Chaucer, s. Einenkel, 230. I find the following instance in O. E. : ‚hic pá to pám symle *sittan eodon*’ (quoted by Wülfing, Engl. Stud. xix, 1, 118).

The Infinitive in these and analogous cases is often said to express the aim of the motion.

In fact the idea of motion is often slightly obscured and the Inf. denotes an action which is not subsequent to, but simultaneous with the motion. In *go synge*, *go sytte*, the two Verbs are after all but a round about way of expressing a single action. I would therefore look on the two Infinitives as coordinate to each other, in an assyndetical way, rather than as subordinate.

At the present time there is a tendency to represent as being coordinate, actions which are subordinate in fact, in such colloquial phrases as *go and fetch my hat*, *come and see me*, which we may contrast with the French *allez chercher*, *venez me voir*. Likewise we find in *Reynard* :

thyнке ye not that he hym self *wente and laboured* that bothe your brethren were hanged 31/8. (Du: dat hi selve mede ghinc ende bracht daer toe dat men u broederen hinc 41,17); I *wente* tho *and pleyde* with the lambes by cause I herde hem gladly blete 34/23 (Du: differently: Ick ghinck mitten lammeren spelen 44,18); Tho *wente* my wyf *and herkened* 55/25. (Du: differently: doe ghinck my wyfe *staen lusteren* 71,14); whiche alle *camen and stoden* by *reynard* the foxe 79/35. (Du: simply: sijn ghecomen).

When the Verb of motion is itself dependent on a



Verb of perception, such as *see* &c., the Verb following the Infinitive is in the Pres. Participle:

he sawe from ferre *come fleynng* on of seynt Martyns byrdes 19/37. (Du: *sach* . . . *comen vliegghen* 25,23).

I sawe my fader *come rennyng* out of an hole 38/25. (Du: *sach* . . . *comen lopen* 40,14).

*Note* also the meaning of *come* in the next passages:

1.) The wulf . . . threwe the foxe al plat under hym whiche *cam* hym evyl to *passe* 108/19.

The sense of motion, of *coming* is here weakened. Moreover there seems to be a mixture of two standing phrases: 1) *come to passe* (S. Mätz. III, 38. Infl. of Du. 'te pas komen' is out of the question, the Du. has here simply 'dat hem misviel' 143,3), and 2) *come evyl*: cf. *This market cam to hym evyl* 16/5. (Du: *quam hem tot groten leyde*); —

also with *become*: that leep *becam yl* to the preest and to his grete sham 22/32; the passage is interesting and shows that at the bottom of the sense of *suiting* in the phrases: *it becomes you well*, &c., there is a sense of motion;

2.) yf I may *come to speke* with hym 24/31.

The context shows that this does not exactly mean *come* (= *go*) *in order to speak*, but that the phrase must rather be compared with:

If I may *come to speche* 59/37 or with: she is *comen to her deth* 11/20 i. e. she has dyed. Here again *come* is a sort of auxiliary, expressing a gradual progression in the action.

*Come* = *happen* in: that *came by* me too 6/31. (Not Dutch: *dat was overmits mi* 8,27).

Omission of Infinitive of the verbs of motion, after Auxiliaries and quasi-Auxiliaries:

He could not go and yet he *muste nedes forth* 18/21. (Not so in Du.). I thought I am therin I *muste ther thurgh* 98/26 (Du: *ic moet doer*).

I wote *wherto* I *shal* 33/2. (Not in Du.).

What somme ever I founde that I *myght over*, I slowe alle 34/33. (Not in Du.).

I *wil* over the see into the holy lande 43/18. — Du. Ende van romen wil ic voert over meer... 55,31.

Cf. Shakespeare: 'I must to Coventry'. Rich. II, 1, 2, 56.

#### INFINITIVE USED AS AN ADVERBIAL ADJUNCT.

The Inf. when used to denote purpose, consequence, manner, &c. is preceded by *to* or *for to*. So already in Chaucer (Einenk. 240, &c.) Instances with *for to* have been given under the treatment of this Preposition. It is worth noticing also that the simple *to* seems in some cases to have retained its original value of an independent Preposition and is used where we should now insist more closely on the notion of *aim* by means of some such word as *in order to*:

(The kynge) gadred hys counseyl *to wyte* what they wolde advyse hym 23/36; noman proferd hym hand ne foot *to helpe* hym 72/35; I am chosen to reward thee... 106/14. Cf 40/20. —

Also after Verbs of motion: who that wyl go thurgh the world this *to here* and that other *to see* and that other *to telle* 63/39.

The Subject of the Infinitive need not be the same as that of the finite Verb: I shal sende for you to come to me 113/10. Cf. 43/27.

The Infinitive is found, with the sense of a future participle after *be*:

it *is to drede* that he cam not so merily again 11/37. And she durste wel speke where as it *to doo was* 73/7. But and they come where as *it is to doo* (= something is to be done, Du: Mer als si comen daert aan den noot gaet 100,27). I muste saye what my gryef is... *that is to wete* that ye have done a foule and shameful trespass 72/19.

This use is old and reminds us of the O. E. gerund: *Us is éac to vitenne* þæt waeren sume gedwolmen (A. S. Homelies, 110, quoted by Mätzner, III, 37). It is not necessary to adduce the O. Fr. *estre a* (Einenk.) *,he wist not watto do'* 17/22 and 68/12 seems to be a condensed expression formed on the mode of *what is to do*.

Note in all these instances the Active form with a passive sense, and see, above, Voice of the Infinitive.

The Inf. is also found after Adjectives. These may be accompanied by a quantitative word, *to* (too), *ynough*, *so*:

ye were wyse ynowh *to goo* by nyght wythout lanterne 105/14; ye be too wyse *so to doo* 110/10; How were ye so hardy *to dare do me do suche a shame* 72/25.

The insertion of *as* before the Inf. after *so* is never found in E. M. E. Instances from Shakespeare, Fielding with simple *to* are given by Mätzner, III, 49.

In the cases mentioned last the notion of *consequence* is still conspicuous. In the following the Inf. cannot be explained in the same way:

after Adjectives meaning: agreeable, favourable, or the contrary: *good to digeste*, *good to doo* 65/16;

*ferdful to loke on* 56/18, *fowle to loke on* 104/35.

In *I am ashamed to telle* 94/35, the king had hem *sorrowful to departe* 47/10, the Inf. expresses the *cause* of the feeling indicated by the Adjective.

Parallels may be found in O. E. for these constructions. S. Mätzner, III, 43, 44.

Note a striking instance with a Past Participle + *as to*, which is probably due to influence of the Du: text:

I am oftymes rored and prycked in my consciencie *as to* love god above all thyng 64/3. (Du: Ick werde wel dicke in mynre consciencien ghewecket *als* gode boven al te minnen 82,9).

The Inf. is found after Substantives. Sometimes an

Adjective like *fit, good for* may be supplied after the Noun and the consecutive meaning of the Inf. is still felt:

I am no byrde *to be locked* ne take by chaf 110/25.

Note the passive construction (the Du. has the Active: ... gheen voghel *diemen met kave locken mach* 146,5).

The next instance is a similar case but seems to be literally translated from the Du:

This fayr grete pryvelage wylle the kynge graunte to you ever *to holde* of hym 53/30,31; that is to say: ever to be held of him. (Du: Dese scone grote vriheden die wil u die coninc gheven *ewelic van hem te houden* 68,33).

In other cases, the Infinitive has about the value of a Latin gerund *in-di*:

How lawhe thise false subtil shrewis that gyve *counseyl to make* thise lesynges 65/17.

What *nede* have ye *to shryve* you 65/36. What *nede* had *I to do* that 68/4; gyve me *leve* to goo fro thee 86/4 god... geve you *grace* long to lyve 117/13. We have *cause* to be sorry 82/27.

The Infinitive is used to denote *manner* and is then equivalent to a N. E. gerund with *in*:

it is sette subtylly lyke as ye shal see in redyng of it and not *ones to rede it* (= in reading it once) ffor a man shal not wyth ones over redyng fynde the ryghte understanding ne comprise it wel 4/18 &c. This, however, is one of those ambiguous sentences of Caxton's where a word may be looked upon, so to speak, 'from more than one side' (See *Style*). We may connect *ones to rede it* with a following Verb which is elided: 'shal cause it wel to be understande'; *to rede* would then be Subject. We may also consider *to rede* as an Inf. absolute. But the Du. text on which the sentence seems to be closely modelled, renders our first explanation probable (Du: mer dicwijl *over te lesen* soe ist wel te verstaen 6,18).

Who otherwyse wil now use the world than devyse (= by devising) a lesyng... &c. he is not ronne away fro his

maister 64/35. — he doth to hym self no worshyp thus to *sklaundre* his wyfe 8/19. Ye misdoo to *saye* to me ony suche wordes 29/10.

We ne rested nyght ne day to *bere* and *carye* away . . . 39/4.

We have good cause to be sorry to *lese* such a lewel 82/27.

In all these instance the Du. has a different construction.

We are reminded of the French a + Inf. in such proverbs as: *à blanchir un nègre, on perd son savon* . . . but the construction may probably be traced back to the O. E. gerund with *to*. In Shakespeare we still find:

To fright you methinks I am too savage. *Macb.* (v, 2, 70 (= *in frightening*).

#### INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE.

This use is rare in Caxton. Kellner says he has found only two instances in his works (Kellner, LXVIII) *Reynard*' has here again been disregarded by this author. Nevertheless I found only one case in point: (\*)

And whyle he rubbeth his eyen take your avantage and smyte and byte hym. Tere as ye may most hurte hym, and alleway to *hytte* hym wyth your tayll ful of pysse in his visage and that shal make hym so woo that the shal not wyte where he is . . . 103/34. —

The Infinitive is here equivalent for the sense to an Imperative so that we might at first sight surmise Du. influence (Cf. the use of Infin. for Imperative in Du: *zwygen!* = silence! etc). But the Du. text has a different construction. (viz. the Imperative: *doet hem* . . . etc 136,15.)

#### ACCUSATIVE WITH INFINITIVE AS OBJECT OF THE SENTENCE.

After Verbs of sensation: *see, hear, feel*:

(\*) The next passage is a dubious case:

I ranne away he shoof the table from hym and folewed me cryeng kylle and slee hym, *I to goo* and *they after* and many moo cam after which alle thought to hurte me 26/39.

The situation, being a scene of tumult, certainly admits of an Infin. absolute. On the other hand, it is possible that *to* in *to goo* is but an adverbial *to*, opposed to *after*, as *voer* is opposed to *nae* in the elliptic construction of the corresponding Du. passage: *ic voer ende mi nae*' 35, 1. For the position of adverbial *to* before the Verb I found a parallel case: Tho begonne they placebo domino with the verses that *to longen* 11/13.

So sawe they comen doun the hylle to hem chauntecler  
the cock 9/14.

In some of these instances the Present Participle would  
to-day be preferred in order to show the subject, in the  
act' of doing what is expressed by the Verb.

As a rule, the simple Inf. is used.

So in Chaucer, — in O. E. (Einenk. 256; Mätz. III, 15).

After Verbs of prayer and command:

*bid*: and bad hym saye 36/34; and bad her kepe it  
secrete 37/17.

As a rule the simple Inf. is used, but there are instances  
with *to*:

bad me *to tarye* for hym 62/31; bad hym *to make* not to  
moche sorowe 93/21.

O. E. *biddan* always with simple Inf., Mätz. III, 10. In  
Chaucer, the use is the same as in Caxton, s. Einenkel, 253.

*Pray*: and they prayde the kyng to graunte it hym 34/17.

Generally with *to*, but the simple Inf. is found: And  
prayde me *goo* to the mare 62/5.

After Verbs of permission: *suffer*, &c.:

God suffreth somme to have worship and thanke of the  
labouris... of other men 51/32. I suffred hym to drawe  
it out hole wythout hurtyng 88/37 (the wolf speaking of the  
head of the crane); Cf 36/16, 110/35;

In the instances we have been considering before this,  
it was possible to regard the Accusative and the Infinitive  
as depending each isolately on the Personal Verb. This  
becomes more difficult with a Verb of permission which  
does not admit of a direct personal object. Still more so  
when the Inf. is in the Passive: ...ereswyn must suffre  
her shois to be plucked of' 45/28 and the difficulty increases  
when the Subject of the Inf. is the same as that of the  
finite Verb: suffre hymself to be taken 86/11; suffre your-  
self... to be deceyvid.

After Verbs of causation, *let*, *do*, *make*, *cause*.

*Let* often seems to form a sort of periphrastic Imperative:

*Late* everyman know hymself 73/26.

With Inf. passive: late hym *be done to* as to a free man 23/30 late hym *be sore punysshed* 57/23.

O. E. *laetan* was of a wide use in the sense of cause, make. See Mätz. III, 13.

*Do.*

With simple Infinitive:

the tresour that I shal *do hym* have 40/17. (Not Du.).

*Do*: cause, with simple Infinitive was often found in O. E., till it was supplanted by the M. E. *make*. Mätz. III, 12.

With *to*:

Ysegrym has *don hym to understande* that ye be a theef 59/13. (Du: Ys. heeft hem doen verstaen 76,6).

Cf. O. E. *gedyde to vitanne* (Oros. 110); — *Do hym wel to iwiten* (Layamon).

Mätzner explains the Pronoun here as a Dative. But in the following instances the Objective case preceding (or following) the Infinitive cannot be explained in this way, and the Infinitive has a passive meaning:

the lyon... holde an open Court at stade whiche he *dyde to knowe* over alle in his lande 5/12. (Du: dede... te weten 7,6).

We may suppose an ellipsis of the person who is caused to do', viz. 'whyche' he dyde (people) to knowe' (Cf. the Fr. expressions *faire faire* un habit, *faire tuer* le veau gras).

Similar instances, with simple Infinitive:

And also he hath *do laaden* torches 59/10. (Du. toertsen laten laden 76,3).

The kinge *dyde do crye* this feste over alle in that lande 54/12. (Du: dede dese feest te weten, 69,17).

The kynge *dyde do ordeyne* so moche mete that everych fond ynough 54/16. (Du. differently: hadde speysen reyden laten 69,21).

In the two last instances the second *do* represents the pleonastic Verb which was once frequent in several Germanic tongues and which we have kept in nega-

tive, interrogative and emphatic sentences (S. Mätzner, II, 62 and our chapter on Auxiliary Verbs).

The Infinitive may of course have the passive form.

And she dyde alle his heer fro the heed to the tayl *be shorn* off 103/13.

Such an instance probably gives us a cue for the explanation of cases where *do* is followed by the Past Pple instead of the expected Infinitive:

he laboureth al that he can ayenst me to the kynge for to *do* me *behanged* 69/40.

In the same way, we find 'do proclaimed':

And I saye yow syth my lorde the kynge hath *do proclaimed* his pees he never thoughte to hurte ony man 9/1.

The case has escaped the attention of Mätzner. Yet it is not isolated. Two instances are quoted from *Aymon* by Kellner (p. LXIV) and several others from the *Paston Letters* (Blume, *Spr. der Past. Lett.*, p. 36).

How are we to interpret such cases? A first resource is to consider *do* as a factitive = 'render' and to assimilate the cases to those enumerated by Mätzner under the Past Participle III, 87, e. g.: 'My two sisters *got* their fortunes *paid*' (Hook). But there is no instance with *do*, and it has to be proved that *do* can have this meaning. On the contrary, we have cases with *do* + Passive Inf.:

In order to explain the unknown by the known, it is better to suppose that there is in the passages in point, as well as in such instances as *suffre it un-avengyd* 6/13, *suffre this unpunysshyd* 7/12, an ellipsis of *to be*.

*Make* is common with the prepositional, less common with the simple Infinitive. The Du. does not seem to have any influence on the choice of either construction.



The wordes... *made* hym so moche *to lawhe* that he coude not wel stande 14/10. I *made* her leep in a grenne 26/4.

With the Passive :

The kynge... was wrothe and *made* the wulf and the bere anon *to be arrestyd* 44/39.

With the Active in a Passive sense :

I *made bynde* his feet to the belle rope 26/13. Du: Ic deede beyde sijn voeten aan die cloclyne *doen* 33,32.

*Make* replaces *do* and is found chiefly with simple Inf. in E. M. E. (Layamon, s. Mätz. III, 12). This use was probably modelled on that of O. Fr. *ferre*. In Piers Plowman, the Proportion between preposition and simple Inf. after *make* is about 15:10 (Wandschneider, *Synt. des Verbs bei Langley*, 1887, p. 63). In Chaucer the proportion is about equal between the two uses (Einenkel, 236).

*Make*, in the sense of *cause*, espec. with *to* is on the whole more frequent than in Pres. English.

*Cause*: the nede of hongre may *cause* a man to breke his oth 75/34.

*Put* = *cause*: But me whom men *putten to labour* *to bere* and *drawe* 86/23 (Du: mi dien men ten arbeide dwinghet). Also in Chaucer. (Einenkel, 255, refers to the Fr. *mettre*).

*Bring*, frequent with the sense of *cause*, get. — Inst. with *for to*: Money... *bryngeth* false wytnes ayenst true peple *for to gete* money 118/10.

*Teche*: ... *teche* men *see* thurgh their fingres 65/20.

In all these cases it is still possible in some degree to consider the Accus. and the Inf. both separately. In the next category they form a whole and the construction is quite similar to the Latin *Accus. cum Infinitivo*.

After Verbs of knowledge, appreciation, affirmation, the *Acc. cum Infinitiv.* is rare in Caxton.

There are very few instances of this use in O. E. (Mätz. III. 29). A few may be found in Chaucer (Einenk. 237). It became more frequent in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, espec. in the works of learned writers, and in translations. Reginald Pecock is said to have first introduced it in original writings (Krickau, *Der Acc. c. Inf.*, p. 17). But, on the whole, the construction belongs to a later period, and reached its full development in the Elizabethan age. Bacon makes a large use of it (S. Rohs, *op. cit.* p.p. 23, 26). It must be regarded as a latinism, as in France also, the frequency of this use corresponds with the period of the greatest Latin influence, the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries (Darmesteter, p. 141).

In many of the cases enumerated above, the personal construction alternates with the Infinitive one. Caxton even frequently uses a preposition with *that* where we should to-day prefer the Infinitive, as a convenient way of compressing the sentence. This applies in particular to *final clauses* (see, below, under *helpe, &c.*).

The personal construction is found instead of an Infin. used adverbially :

after Adjectives: I am *sory that* I lyve thus longe 32/22;  
ye may be *glad that* ye have suche wyse children 60/35;

after Nouns: fynde the *way that* ye goo wyth us to the place 43/1; knoweth he wel the *way how* he may aryse 117/28;

after Verbs: ye doo grete wronge *that* ye so lye 76/20;  
instead of the Inf.-Subject of Impersonal Verbs: this becometh you wel *that* ye thus doo 32/21;

instead of Inf.-Object: yf thou *promyse* to men *that* thou wilt not envenyme me . . . 75/22;

instead of the Acc. c. Inf., after *make*: *made hym that hym thoughte that* his eyen shold goo out 107/19;

after *counseyle*: I counseyle you reynard *that* ye put you your self out of this curse 43/28;

after *bid*: Isegrym commanded anon and *badde* his kyn and frendes *that* they solde see to reynart 32/29.

after *pray*: *prayde* hym *that* he wold doo so wel as to tell them . . .

after *command*: I commande . . . that they make them redy to the warre 58/8;

after *help*: (he) helped hym *how that* he myghte come out 69/18; I helpe hym *that* he wente fro hym 69/13.

#### ACCUSATIVE WITH INFINITIVE AS SUBJECT OF THE SENTENCE.

„No wonder is a lewid man to ruste’ (Chaucer, Prol. 502).

This construction was very rare in O. E. s. Mätzl. III, 22. In Chaucer, on the contrary, it is common with Impersonal Verbs and Impersonal phrases formed with *to be* and an Adjective, a Noun or an Adverb (*it is good, it is wonder, it is in vain*). S. Einkenkel, 250—252. The construction is a Latinism which was introduced either directly or through the French. But older, genuine constructions probably paved the way for this. Take a sentence like *no need was hym beseech*, where *hym* was a Dative, ‚commodi’ governed by the Predicate *need*: as soon as the Dative relation became obscured, in the general process of the loss of case-endings, the word being looked upon as a Nominative or an Accusative may have been mentally disconnected from the Predicate and considered as the Subject of the Infinitive. Another possibility was a confusion by similarity of form, between an Optative and an Infinitive without *to* in some such instance as: ‚No wonder is (that) a lewid man ruste’.

Traces of the construction with Acc. + Inf. Subject may be found in Shakespeare, s. Abbott, § 354.

In *Reynard*, the personal construction is preferred:

*It is ryght that a pylgrym shold alway thynke and pray for them that doo hym good 45/14. It was harde that I escaped out of pryson 49/32.*

The modern practice is to place *for* before the Subject of the Infinitive: ,It was hard *for me to escape*' &c.

There are some instances of an analogous kind in *Reynard*, ,they shal be good *for you to keep* your feet hool' 45/21; ,thise Iewels wer over good and precious *for me to kepe and have*" 89/14 are not precisely cases in point, but show an analogy with personal constructions such as: ,it is good for me to kepe thise Iewels'. Note also the use of *for* in the two next instances:

I shal sende *for you to come* 113/10. That must be shewed *to the kyng for to have knowleche* therof 9/16. (No Du. influence).

Now what is the origin of Mod. *for* with Acc. c. Inf.? Abbott explains this use by a ,transposition' of *for* in a sentence like:

*it spedith a man for to deye for the peple* (Wycliffe). The Preposition was, according to him, shifted before the *Substantive* and related to it. (Shakesp. Gramm. p. 255).

Stoffel shows, in a chapter of his *Studies* which is devoted to this Subject, that this theory does not rest on good proofs, and maintains that *for* before Accus. c. Inf. is not the old ,purpose-for' but a new *for* which introduces in the sentence an analytic *Dative*. This is probably the right interpretation of *for* but I think we cannot safely accept Stoffel's next statement that the *Dative* was here ,a substitute for the *original Accusative*' (*op. cit.* 67).

The author considers the following sentence from the A. S. Gospels: *gód is ús hér to bécome* as an early instance of acc. c. Inf. Subject. Finding a similar construction in Gothic, he goes so far as to say that

,the Acc. c. Inf. as the logical subject of a quasi-Impersonal Verb must once have been as common in the Germanic tongues as we find it to have been in the classical languages' (p. 55).

Admitting that there are instances of this construction in Gothic we should expect the author to make it certain that they were not inspired by a foreign model. The Gothic passage corresponding to the O. E. quotation above is *god ist unsis her wisan*: I leave aside the doubt about *unsis* and admit it to be an accusative, but I question whether it was not brought about by the Greek text *καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ἰδε εἶναι* (S. Bosworth & Waring, Parallel Gospels, p. 334).

Stoffel's argument concerning the O. E. passage in point is derived from the Latin text: *bonum est nos hic esse*. But here another doubt arises: why should the O. E. translation be absolutely accurate, when Luther himself translates *hier ist gut sein* and the A. S. Gospels of Mark and Luke have *gód is þæt we hér béon* (Bosworth, *op. cit.*, 210, 234). The assumption of an Acc. c. Inf. in O. E. needs to be proved; on the contrary, the construction of the Dative 'commodi' in O. E. is an established fact. (See Wülfing, *Synt. Alfreds*, I p. 69, &c). Are we not allowed to suppose that the O. E. translator replaced a foreign idiom by a more familiar one?

A statement of such importance as that of Stoffel's above-mentioned ought to be supported by strong arguments. The author has hardly discharged the *onus probandi* by adducing *two* O. E. examples, one of which is dubious whereas the other may be a Latinism (*op. cit.* p. 54). Another contention of the same author is that the original Accusative continued to be felt as such throughout the M. E. period, till

in the end it was changed into a Dative (p.p. 54, 57). The arguments produced are *three* instances with pronominal subjects of the Infinitive, — *two* of which are said to be 'unmistakeable':

*now it is right ,me' to procede*

and

*It is shame ,you' to bete me.*

Although these Pronouns look like *Accusatives*, we can have no absolute certitude as to the case, in presence, say of Jespersen's researches on case — shiftings in the Pronouns (S. Jespersen, *Progress in Language*, p. 182).

It is therefore much more natural to suppose that people had *no* definite notion about the case of the Subject of the Infinitive, which was regarded sometimes as an *Accusative*, sometimes as a *Nominative*. This view is conformable to the historical facts and rendered probable by the decay of inflections. It is the best way of accounting for the Shakespearian use of the *Nominative + Inf. Subject*, which Stoffel has not overlooked, (p. 50). Moreover the transition of an indefinite case into a Dative is more easy to conceive than the substitution of a Dative for an *Accusative*. Stoffel has seen the difficulty and admits that the *conditio sine quâ non* for this substitution is, that the predicate of the principal sentence should be compatible with a complement in the Dative, that it should be some such expression as *is fair, is good, is necessary, &c.* Of course, the author adds, *for* afterwards lost its dative force and was introduced into sentences of a different kind, but this happened later: Quite right, but if the *conditio sine quâ non* was that the Predicate should admit of a Dative complement, is it not infinitely probable that *in the origin*, this

Predicate really *was* accompanied by a Dative and *not* by an Accusative?

To recapitulate: we have seen that the use of the Infinitive, — which was in many cases originally imitated from the Latin, was later exploited by the tendency towards shortness of expression which is a feature of N. E. But neither of these causes were already at work in Caxton. Moreover the construction of *Acc. cum Inf.-Subject* which was common in Chaucer was then falling into disuse; so that, on the whole, Caxton's use of the Infinitive was not very extensive.

#### ACCUSATIVE WITH OMITTED INFINITIVE.

After *think, me thinketh*:

me thought *it* right good 34/26.

After *know*:

I *knowe* our soverain lord the kyng of so hye byrthe, 38/5.

After *suffer*:

er I-shold *suffre* you in this sorow 70/10.

After *here*:

I have herde ofte *named* parys london akon and coleyn 42/3. (Ick heb dicke hoeren noemen...).

## Active or Present Participle.

### 1. Present Participle used as a Predicate.

In conjunction with the Verb to be:

... Yf ye wille be to me friendly and helpyng ayenst myn enemys in the kynges court 14/2; hit is not *fyttyng* to youre crowne to byleve thise false deceyvars 30/1; it were not *fyttyng* to me 96/14.

The Pple may form with *to be* a periphrase in order to express the continuity of the action: in the mene w(h)yлле that ysegrym *was* thus *spekyng* . . . 111/4.

In conjunction with verbs of motion and of rest:

The relation of meaning between the two verbs is variable. Instead of the Pple simply expressing a manner of going, standing &c., the first Verb sometimes loses its proper value and is more or less absorbed in the second; compare the use of the Infinitive in ,ye wyl goo synge complyn'; compare also O. Fr. *aller querant*, *aller tremblant*. (Einenkel, 272).

There is even an instance where the participle, like an Infinitive, expresses the aim of the action:

(Reynard) *wente* in the mydel of the place *stondyng* to fore noble the kyng and *sayde* . . . 29/33. (In Du: simply *ghinck staen*). Sprong out of the hool and *wente rollyng* and *wentlyng* towards the kyngs court 23/19; as I *cam rennyng* by his borugh at maleperduys he stode byfore his dore 54/31. I *wente dolyng*e on the heeth and wist not what to doo for sorowe 68/11,12. (Du: *ghinck dolen* 87,30) *wente saying* 10/26; *wente talking* 28/31; *cam walkyng* 65/ in fine; 69/17, 62/1 laye groning 99/35.

Mätzner (III, p. 69) quotes instances of *cuman*, *féran* + Pres. Pple in O. E. But instances with *gon*, *wen-*



*den* do not occur and it is probable that the French phrases already mentioned had some influence.

In conjunction with the subject or the object of the sentence, and expressing the simultaneousness of two actions:

I complayne to yow . . . *prayeng* you t(o) avenge it 18/35; he . . . folewed me *cryeng* 56/21; — shold have vyctorie . . . also ferre as he behelde it *fastyng* 82/34; — who that sayde devoutly this prayer *fastyng* shal not . . . be overcomen 108/2.

Notice that the Participle is often preceded by *all*: sayde to the bere *all lawhyng* 14/30 (Du: *al lachende* 19,7).

Isegrym wente *al laughing* to the dore ward 27/32 (Du: *al lachende* 35,25); many a yonglyng departed from thens *al wepyng* 31/30. (Du: *al screyende* 41,5); wente *al wepyng* unto . . . the kynge 111/25. (Du: *al screyende* 147,12); thus *al chydying* he cam to the ryver 17/34.

This is the only instance where the Du. text has not *all* (*dus sceldenne ende clagende* 23,14). We may look at the case as one of Dutch influence without *direct* imitation (for other such cases s. Muller & Logeman's *Reynaert die Vos*, Inleid. p. LII). I could not find any traces of this frequentative *all* in Chaucer, Langland, nor in the Paston Letters. — Compare the French use of *tout*, *tout en* before the Gerund.

Present Participle in a predicative relation with the object of verbs of sensation, perception, affirmation and factitive verbs.

Ye shal *fynde* there two birchen trees *standyng* alther next the pytte 41/28.

The construction remains the same in the passive: he was *seen coming* 18/26; I was *made connyng* 73/15.

The Pple in this function interchanges with the Infinitive (see above). In O. E. the construction was not so frequent and rather confined to the verbs of sensation (Mätz. II, 72).

## 2. Appositional use of the Pres. Pple

a) equivalent to an Adjective Clause :

Ther is none *lyving* unther the sonne . . . 41/7.

b) equivalent to an Adverbial Clause :

The Pple often in N. E. replaces a temporal, conditional, causal or concessive clause. Likewise in French we find the Pple where the German would rather introduce a proposition by means of *da*, *indem*. Mätzner (III, 73), says that this use existed in O. E. It was chiefly developed however, at a late period of the language and I found no instances of it in Caxton.

## 3. Absolute use of the Pres. Pple.

This construction, where the Subject of the Pres. Pple is different from that of the principal verb, does not seem to have been in favour with Caxton, any more than was the absolute use of the Past Pple. Instances will be found in a following paragraph on the prepositional use of the Pple.

## 4. Adjectival or Attributive use.

Cases where the Pres. Pple is used strictly as an Adjective are not frequent: *flatteryng wordes* 31/24, 30/10; *lying tales* 110/30; a *conyng man* 89/12, &c.

## 5. Pres. Pple changing into Preposition.

He hath ben advocate for the bysshop of cameryk ix yere *during* 68/16; ye shall alle your lyf *during* truste and believe me 96/20.

From this absolute use of the Pple it was easy to pass to a prepositional use, when the Pple was placed *before* the Noun it referred to. This formation was modelled on the French. Likewise, *notwithstanding* = Fr. *non obstant*. (S. Einenkel, 277).

Instances of the last word used as a *Conjunction* :

... was not the better *Notwithstandyng* he had wonnen the flycche of bacon with grete drede 8/7;

... and helde hym faste *notwithstanding* that he bledde 108/16.

The origin of the Preposition may also be a Pple used as an apposition, the connection of which with the word it refers to becomes looser, so that in the end its concrete meaning disappears and it simply denotes an abstract relation with a following word governed by it. So were formed: *saving*, *touching*, *considering*. (S. Einenk., 276):

How the kyng spack *touching* this complaynt 11/1. All they that desyred the kynges frendshyp were there *savyng* reynard the foxe 54/20. Late me thenne make amendis *accordyng* to the lawe 71/16. He is *passyng* reed on his heed 18/30. (Du: onmaten rood).

Ther is rosel a *passing* fayr theef 25/14.

*Passing* is used a Preposition by Chaucer: ,he syngeth and daunceth passing ony man'.

## The Verbal Noun.

Let it be remembered that a confusion of form brought about a confusion of functions between the O. E. Pres. Pple in *ende* (later *inde*, *inge*) and the O. E. abstract Nouns in — *ung* (*eng*, *ing*). The process was furthered by the O. E. use of Adverbs in *-unga*, *-enga*, *-inga* (Einenkel) and by the analogy of the French Pple in *ant* which did duty for a true Pple as well as for a Gerund (*chantant* representing both Lat. *cantantem* and Lat. *cantandi*, *cantando*, *cantandum*, s. Darmesteter p. 166).

The Verbal is really a Substantive in :

Tho helped the bere nether *flater yng* ne *chydyng* 15/5.  
Ther as *fyght yng* is we ben not woned to be aferd 79/2.  
We shal never be hurte by thou are ne *lyght yng*.

As a noun, it may take the sign of the *Plural* :

*lesynges*, 33/22, 61/27, 64/21, 64/23. (Du: *loghenen* &c);  
*tydings* 59/4. (Du: *iet nyewes*), 61/8. (Not Du.), *lettynges*,  
impediments 65/29. (Du: *wederstoet*); *lernyngs* 119/34. (Du:  
*leren*).

Cf. O. E. *leasung*, *lettung*, *leornung*; *tidinge* occurs in O. E. Homelies (s. Stratmann) and is of Scandinavian origin.

It may be preceded by *the Article*: a russhing 97/ *in fine*, the beginning 36/23, the dawning 20/19, the plucking 88/29, the renning 106/4, the connyng 104/1, the scattering 108/24, the avaunting (boasting) 118/22;

by *the Article and an Adjective*: a greter *lesyng* 57/37, an evyl connyng 65/23, the uncortoys departing 92/26, the thirde warnyng 19/20, all the offrynge 22/35.

by *a Possessive* my connyng 56/16, &c your steling and roving 25/32, their taking 60/34, his complyingng 69/37;

by a *Possessive and an Adjective*: his swete smellyng 83/17, his lowde crying 91/29.

by *Adjectives*: longe fasting 69/35;

by *Demonstratives, Indefinite, Negative Adjectives*: this spekyng, such manner waylling 58/36; such manner talkyng 65/38; ne desyreth *no* wynnyng 9/8.

In all the cases, it may be followed by an analytic Genitive with *of*:

the *ringing of* the belle 26/13 *the shynyng of* the stone 82/15 (Subjective genitive); the *makyng of* the pees 54/7. (Objective genitive).

It may be followed by other Prepositions and the verbal value is then better felt:

He coude not lete *the lokyng after* the polayll 29/6. He muste leve *renniyng after* hym 106/4.

It is even found with the Article, as a Noun, and at the same time with a *direct object* after it:

*The wythholdyng you fro it* can doo yow no good 24/14.

This construction is found in Shakesp. (S. Abbott, §§ 93 and 373).

The Verbal Noun, in the cases enumerated, may be moreover preceded by a Preposition and have a gerundial sense:

I gaf counseyl *of the makyng of* them (viz. the *lettres*) 52/16; His one hand by whiche he deffended hym sterte *in the fallyng* into ysegryms throte . . . 108/21.

A Preposition is still more frequent with the Verbal used alone, without Article:

*with craft and conning* 19/31; *with flatteryng* 30/30; *with grete facing and bracing* 115/6; *with ones over redyng* 4/18 (Du: met een overlesen); *without lettyng* 21/24, *wythout myssing* 62/39.

Tho trembled the foxe *by dissymlyng* as he had ben aferd 36/9.

He complayned to me that he lyvyd so straytly as *in* longe *fastyng* and many thingis redyng and syngyng that

he coude not endure it (Du. van langhe te vasten, 89,24, makes it probable that *fastyng* is here gerund, and longe, adverb).

(The foxe) was . . . angry and saide *In chydyng* to lantfert 17/30 (gerund).

There are instances of the Verbal Noun preceded by *in*, without article and followed by *of*:

And this booke is maad for rede and prouffyte of alle good folke. As fer as they in *redyng* or *heeryng* of it shal mowe understande etc. . . . 4/9. (Dutch: . . . op dat si daer in *lesende* sellen mogen verstaen, &c. 6/9).

ffor it is sette subtylly lyke as ye shal see in *redyng* of it 4/17. (Du: ghelijck als ghi al *lesende* vernemen sult 6,17).

The quene had pyte on hym and prayde the kyng to have mercy on hym in *eschewing* (= avoiding) of more harme 36/11. (The Du. has the Infin.: om meerre scade te scutten 46/22).

In connection with these passages, I must point out a mistake of some importance in Kellner's *Introduction to Blanchardyn*. Speaking of the various uses of the Verbal Noun, the author says (op. cit. p. LXXV and LXXVI):

,The Verbal Noun is used as a Verb: then it derives from the Present Participle.

,1. Governed by the Preposition *in*'.

,We now use *in* in connection with the Verbal Noun, where in O. E. the simple Participle was preferred . . . I suppose that *in*, imitated from the French, was grafted upon the old Participle, so that it kept its verbal function. Therefore it was not followed by *of* even in the earliest periods of its use'. (There follow instances from Maundeville).

,Caxton very often drops *in* . . . But even when it precedes the Verbal Noun, it is not followed by *of*':

If Dr. Kellner had not in his study on ,Caxton's

Syntax', disregarded one of the works of Caxton, viz. *Reynard*, he could not have made the last statement, as there are two cases in point in the very first page of the 'Storie' and as our references have shown, these facts are not due to an accidental Dutch influence.

But the author goes so far as to declare that the construction *in* + Verbal Noun + *of* was not found, even in the earliest period of the use of the Verbal. In reply to this, I refer to Einenkel *Streifzüge*, p. 269, where a sufficient number of instances in point from Chaucer, will be found. As our notion of the facts is different, our conclusion cannot be the same as Dr. Kellner's. It is by no means certain that the Verbal is here an old Present Participle, 'which has kept its verbal function'. Nor is it necessary to suppose that *in* was imitated from the French. For, in the first place, the French gerund was, until the 17<sup>th</sup> century, often used without the Preposition *en*: 'Assez est miels que morions *combattant*', Rol. 1475; and, secondly, when the Preposition *was* used, the French gerund was followed by an Object in the Accusative case, never by a Genitive, with *de*'.

A similar construction occurs after other Prepositions than *in*:

... leye it doun upon the grounde and springe thre tymes ther over *without bowyng of* your legges and without stomblyng 28/15, &c. (Du: sonder u been te bughen 36,31). al this I passe over *for losyng of* tyme 85/19, &c. (Not i. Du.)

The same use is found in Shakespeare: *By winning only of Sicilia*. North. Plut., 171 (Abbott, § 373).

The following case from *Reynard* is somewhat different:

I wyl goo for you to the holy grave and shal gete pardon and *wjnyng for* your cloistre *of* all the chyrches that ben in holy lande 108/37.

Probably *of* here means *from*. It is interesting nevertheless to find the Verb used as a Direct Object, parallelly with a Noun, — and followed by adverbial determinants. Caxton seems not fully to have understood the Du. text: ‚ende verwerven in *cloester winninghe* van allen kerken die int heyliche lant sijn’, 143,20. For the sense of *cloesterwinninghe*, see a note in Muller and Logeman’s *Reynaert* p. 200.

Caxton does not use in Reynard, before the Verbal Noun the Preposition *a* = *in, on*, which we find in *a two* 49/5, *a colde* 42/15, *a pylgrimage* 37/19.

It is sometimes difficult to decide whether we are in presence of a Noun or of a Gerund, as the following instance will make clear:

I made hym to lose his lyf ffor the foule kaytif said to me that he hym self was of the counseyl of *the lettres making* that were in the male 81/4,5. (Du: . . . dat hij den ract daer toe gegeven had dat die brieven ghescreven waeren diemen in die male . . . vant).

It is probable that *making* is a Verb, and *letters* its direct object. The preposition of the Object was the rule in O. French with the Gerund, and influenced the English (Cf. in Mod. Fr. *à mon corps défendant, argent comptant, chemin faisant* and cf. ‚his body diffendyng’ which Kellner quotes from *Aymon* and is probably wrong in assimilating to O. E. compounds like *domweorthung*, (Kelln., LXXV).

On the other hand the article may refer, not to *letters* alone, but to ‚letters making’ *letters* being then either the first part of a compound, or a ‚Saxon Genitive’. (Cf. *lordes courtes* 115/16). The Relative that follows is no absolute objection for we have seen a case of *that* referring to a word in the synthetic genitive, which was separated from the Relative by the governing word (See *Reyn.*, 28/20 & cf. Shakesp. *Hamlet* v, 1, 85: . . . as if it were Cains jawbone that did the first murder).

*Dwellyng place, offryng candel*, in the following ex-



amples are probably to be regarded as compound words, the first part of which is an original Abstract Noun :

Reynard had many a *dwellyng place* 12/9. (Du: woe-ninghe, p. 15). The preest toke to locken his wyf an *offryng candel* and badde her lyght it... 22/24. (Du: een offer kaerse 29,10); clyme up hastily and bynde the corde faste to the lynde and make a *rydyng knotte* or a strope 33,35. (Du: knoept aan die linde ende maket een strop 43,20).

Quite parallel to *offryng candel*, I find in O. E. *offringe-hlāfas*, Shewbread. It is possible however that *dwellyng*, *offring*, *ryding* were no longer felt as Verbal Nouns, but rather as Pres. Pples, the connection of which to the word referred to was a loose one, i. e. that the action predicated by the Participle did not belong to the Subject, but to some other word that was in the mind.

This is the case in such French expressions as: *couleur voyante*, *école payante*, *rue passante*, *café chantant* which had perhaps some influence on English.

## Passive or Past Participle.

### FORM.

Past Participles of Romance origin which have kept their original form and not been anglicised by the ending-*ed* are not very frequent in *Reynard*. Besides, it is very difficult to decide whether a word is to be regarded as a pure Participle or as a participial Adjective. An interesting case is the Pple *agravate*: ,ye reysed and accompanied your self with a cursyd and persone *agravate*' 43/23, — a latinism which is said by Skeat (*Principles*, II, 155) to make here its first appearance in the language.

### VOICE.

The Passive Pple may be used with an Active meaning or at least, without regard to voice.

*Woned, wont* = ,*assuetus*';

in: *ye have not be woned so to doo* 66/37 the word is still a Verb conjugated in the Passive. In the following passages it becomes an Adjective = ,having the habit': many a good flitche of bacon wherin I was *wonte* to fyl my bely 26/22. Cf. *woned* 42/28, 113/25, *wont* 76/24.

I trowe ye be wel *remembryd* therof 76/33.

I am brought in to a grete hevynes *undeservid* and not gyilty 68/26. — The analogy of ,not gyilty' and the Du. text (Ic ben overdiert ende sonder scout in dien groten swaren last 88,9) prove that the word refers to the Subject and means ,without deserving'.

Wyth a *dissymlyd* and sorowful speche saide the foxe . . . 81/29.

. . . *forhongred* houndes 114/18. (Du: *verhongert* 150,23 but Kellner, LXXIII, shows that the same use was very frequent

with compound verbs beginning with *for*: *forgiet*, *for-sworen*, &c.).

Thenne was he *aferd* to lese his hand 108/21 (= feared; *aferd*, P. Pple from *aferen*, O. E. *afaeran* is distinct from *affrayen*, O. Fr. *effraier*. S. Skeat, Etym. Dict.)

The participial suffix *ed* in this manner takes the value of-*able*: They be myghty and *doubted* 79/35 (= redoubtable, from doubt, fear).

In O. Fr. we find *juré*, *forsjuré*, *appris* (learned) used in a similar way; in vulgar Mod. Fr. *bu'* = drunk. So in Latin *juratus*, *potus*, *pransus*, *cœnatus*. But the O. E. already possessed *druncen*, *forsworen*, *forlogen*, *forworht*, &c. (S. Einenkel, 280), so that all O. Fr. influence could do, was to infuse more life into genuine expressions.

The fact that the Pple could be derived from *In-transitive* as well as from Transitive Verbs, in order to form the periphrastic tenses, may have given rise to this use.

Remember, moreover, that in the light of comparative grammar the Past Pple, weak or strong, is an original Adjective in-*to* or in-*onó*, — indifferent to voice.

#### FUNCTIONS.

*Adjectival and Attributive.* Some of the instances just mentioned show that Past Pples easily pass into Adjectives (*wont*, *dissymylyd*, *forhongred*). The transition happens, when, instead of considering an *action*, as entirely accomplished, we look at the *result*, as still existing and pertaining to a person or a thing. The distinction cannot always be exactly drawn. In the following instances the verbal value of the Pple is still more or less felt:

ye lawhed for ye were wel *plesyd* 92/15. Isegrym . . . was to hymward angry and *dysplesyd* . . . I fele my self . . . *encombred* in my stomak, therefore ete I gladly lyght mete 59/32.

Notice further the Past Pples of Transitive Verbs derived from Intransitives by means of the prefix *be, by*:

*bebled* 17/35; *beswette* 59/3; *bypyssyd*; *byslabbed*, *byclagged* (Du: *beslabbed*, but *byclagged* is English. S. Muller & Logeman, *Reynaert*, Inleid. LI).

*Wo begon* 107/5, may be regarded as a single Adjective-expression from *bigan*, O. E. *bigangen*, to surround;

*bydwongen* (Du. word, s. Muller & Logeman, LI) is a Verb in: the frosshis...complayned that they had none lorde ne were not *bydwongen* 37/29. — But the following instance shows that the same Pple may be joined as an *Attribute* to a Noun: a *bydwongen* oth or oth sworn for force was none oth 50/12.

The close analogy between the Adjective and the Past Pple accounts for the formation of derived words in-*ed* which cannot be traced directly to a Verb, e. g. words beginning with *un*: *untold*, *unavysed* 64/29, or may even be derived from Substantives or whole phrases:

Oure *welwylyyd* frendship can not hurte you 80/5. (Not so in Du: onse *willige* vrientscappe).

Though he were al naked in a felde agayn an hondred armed men ge shold be *wel herted* and escape fro them 82/40 (Du: *edel haerdich*); *shood* 62/37, *easid* 69/4, *hongred* 68/32 are probably true Past Pples.

(S. Stratmann, M. E. Dict. i. v.: *schoin*, *aisien*, *hungren*).

*Appositional*. The appositive use of a Past Pple, referring to the Subject or the Object of a sentence, and being equivalent in sense to an Adjectival clause or an Adverbial clause was developed in M. E. on Latin, French and Italian models (S. Einenk. 238). A Pple with the Prefix *un* often replaces a negative clause.

The Pple refers to the Subject:

The lesyng oftymes cometh *unavysed* 64/29. (Du: ,valt *onversiens*', an adverb).

A pot may goo so longe to the water that at the laste it cometh *to broken* home 67/17. (Not Du.).

And therupon was leyde a marble stone *polysshed* as clere as ony glas 11/16. (Du: has an Adjective-Clause: een pollyst marmmersteen... die also claeer was...).

The Pple refers to the Object:

brought to me a lettre for to rede *sealed* wyth the kynges seal 10/4. All that I now leve *untolde* 6/12. He cam to the ryver where he fonde the beere sore *wounded*, *bebled* and right seke 17/35;

... suffre the foxe to saye *unberisped* what that he wolde 36/15.

### *Predicative.*

The Pass. Pple may be used as a Predicate not only after *to be* but after other Verbs which have no complete sense by themselves, such as *seem*, *stand*, *become*.

Ther *ben* many fygures playes *founden* that never were done ne happed 119/29;

there *leyth* the tresour unther *dolven* 41/30. (Du: daer leit die schat onder begraven, — but cf. O. E. *Valdend licgaf dreame bidrorene*, Cod. Exon. 291,8 and other O. E. instances i. Mätz. III, 86).

Instances with *stand* are frequent: I *stonde* a cursed and am in the popes banne 43/15.

To these instances I add some remarkable cases which are in all probability due to the influence of the Du. text.

Ryght as the cony had made an ende of his complaynt *cam* in corbant the roek flowen in the place... 55/17. Dutch: ... doe *quam* daer corbant die roek *ghevloghen* ... 71,4).

In '*cam* ... *flowen*' the important word is the second. 'Come' is here an auxiliary, a sort of stylistic device that shows us the bird in the act of flying.

Cf the Inf. and also the Pple after *come* and the Verbs of motion. Einkenkel (Streifz., 272), mentions

the O. E. ,cwom gefered' which he compares to Germ. ,kam geritten'.

The Passive Pple preceded by the Verb *to be* may have a temporal value instead of being simply adjective. (\*)

What have I to doo wyth the wulf, *hit is to fore clerly ynowh shewde* that he is a foule vylaynous kaytyf and an unclene beest 96/22.

Probably Caxton had in mind the Du. passage: *Tis voer claerlic wel bewyst dat hi een snode villeyne . . . was* 127,1, — and understood *voer* as a temporal Adverb (whether it really be an Adverb, or the Preposition *voer*).

In all the following cases the Past Pple has more or less the sense of an Inf. or of a Pres. Pple, because the action is not conceived as *entirely* past. In most of them *to be* is used impersonally:

And that ye blynded the kynge wyth suche lyes, *that was ryght evyl doon* (Du: *misdaen*, 63/37).

Is it not evyl *doon*. (Du: *has here simply quaet*) to sende to a lorde his servaunts heed 72/26;

O dere lorde this is to(o) moche *presented* to me 94/3. Du: Och lieve here dits te vele geboden 123,34. In French we may imagine a phrase like: ,*c'est trop d'honneur fait à un seul*'.

Was not this enough *said* ane *warned* 100/10. Du: was dit niet ghenoech ghewaerscouwet 131, fin., & 132.

It was alle payne *lost* 95/39. The Du. has a different order of words: *dat was verloren arbeit* 126,10.

But the sentence quite reminds us of the current French phrase: ,*c'était peine perdue*', which occurs as early as the ,*Chronique*' of Monstrelet, in the first half of the xv<sup>th</sup> century. (Monstrel. II, 151: ,*ce fut peine perdue*').

The Past Pple may also be used as a predicate in connection with the *object* of a sentence. This is

---

(\*) This is the case which has been studied by Stoffel for ,to be dead' = to die, to have died (Cf. *Taalstudie*, 1888, p. 98, &c); the author gives instances from Shakesp., M. E. texts and refers to *he wourd ded* in the A. S. Chronicle, but seems to believe that the case is restricted to the word *dead*.

espec. frequent after Verbs of sensation, perception, affirmation and factitive Verbs such as *get, have, &c.* Here again the sense of the Past Pple confines to that of an Inf. or a Pres. Pple for the reason already given above. Early M. E. and O. E. parallel cases will be found in Mätzner, III, p. 88.

I have *herde ofte named parys london akan and coleyn* 42/3.

Shal I *see you brought* fro lyf to deth or elles *exyled* out of the lande 58/25,26.

Cases with *have* deserve our special notice, as they are often difficult to distinguish from the simple use of a periphrastic tense formed with *have*. Generally the place of the object solves the question, but there are dubious instances, e. g.:

Ye *have* two murderars *arrestyd*; — the order of words may have been brought about by the Du. original (ghi hebt twee moerdenaers ghevangen 61,15.

In: (it) was judged that reynart should come and *have excused* hym hierof 6/4 we are at first inclined to see the Past tense of the Infinitive. Yet, 'to have oneself excused' may have been an idiom. Cf. in Mätzner *holde hym excused* (Town, M. p. 168) *have hem excused* (Piers Ploughman).

The interest of these cases is that they give us the key to the formation of the periphrastic past tenses. From the idea of *possessing* an object in a certain predicament it is indeed not difficult to pass to the notion of having *put* that object in the said situation.

The use of the P. P. as a predicate of a word preceded by a Preposition (*without his ransom paid*, Shakesp. I. Henry III, 3, 3), is a latinism (type: *post urbem conditam*) which seems not yet to have been developed in *Reynard*. (In Fr. we find it early: *après la pais conclue* Comines, 2, 9. See Einken. 77).

*Absolute use.* This construction was probably a late

feature of the language. Mätzner, indeed, refers to the O. E. dative absolute. It is true that in an instance like: ,þa geseah heo *openum eagum* . . . leaht cuman' we seem to have a genuine beginning of the absolute construction, where the Dative, like a weak instrumental, is not quite independent yet of the rest of the sentence. Kellner (Outlines, § 411) seems to think that the construction was spontaneously developed in the Germanic languages, as well as in Latin.

But if genuine, why was this use discontinued? The fact is that where a Dative absolute occurs in O. E. it probably was a translation from the Latin. (\*)

Instances of this use are scanty in *Reynard*, if we except such instances as ,*many years goon*'.

The next instance, about the only one I can quote, is by no means unmistakeable:

ther muste be two or thre atte laste to gydre and that they understande the right and lawe and *that don* (late the sentence gon) 76/10.

*Don* may be a pleonastic Personal Verb connected with *late* (Infinit.) See *do*, under *Auxiliaries*, where another interpretation of the passage is given.

The Du. is too different to throw light on the subject: laet daer ons twee of drye te samen horen spreken die hem des rechts verstaen het gae dan daert sculdich is te *gaen* . . . 97,33.

*Prepositional.* The development of a Passive Pple into a Preposition may be observed in the words *ago* (M. E. *goon*, *agoon*) and *passed*. The latter was the original case according to Einkenel (*Streifz.* 280) who gives the intermediate stages: *the prime is passed* —

---

(\*) This is the conclusion arrived at by the M. Callaway in his work on 'the Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon' (quoted by Wülfing, op. cit. I, 147), and corroborated by Wülfing's researches on the Syntax of Alfred.



*it is passed prime, &c.*, — and points to the influence of the Fr. ,*passé*'.

That courtoys hier complayneth of that is passyd many yeres *goon* 6/28.

I knew that wel xii yere *a goon* 42/24.

Now two yere *passid* cam a man and a serpent here in to this court 75/12.

## A D V E R B.

The adverbial use of Prepositions and the formation of separable or inseparable Compound Adverbs with *there, here, where* and a Preposition, replacing a Preposition + a Neutral Pronoun are treated of as a sequence to *Prepositions*.

Similar formations occur with *there, &c.*, and any adverbial expression:

*ther bysyde* was an hie montayne and lande and *there* muste brune *in the myddel* goon over 12/8.

A pleonastic Correlative Adverb is sometimes introduced in these connections:

*there* was he beten *therfore* 30/27; . . . *hier* behoveth other counseyl *herto* 31/31; and *there* she ete so moche *therof* that the wormes have byten a two her throte 69/20.

The correlative construction also occurs with other Adverbs:

*Affter thise wordes tho* torned hym reynart toward his castel 15/25.

The limit between Adjective and Adverb was not so sharply defined as it is now. The use of the same word in either acception was frequent. Adjectives, in adverbial functions, were found as well before Verbs as before other Adjectives, e. g.:

flowris *swete* smellyng 5/6; fonde the gate *faste* shette 12/13; made it *playn* (= quite) like to the other . . . 38/29; had don so *evyl* 44/3; they fal fro *hye* to *low* in grete shame and sorowe 114/26.

Especially frequent are the intensive Adverbs:

*sore* = Du. *zeer*, Germ. *sehr*: complayned *sore*, hasted *sore* &c. 5/20, 15/1, 56/16; *clene* 82/12; *dere* 67/35; *fayn*:

well, 97/19; *right*; *plat* in: *plat blinde* 105/37, which is very probably borrowed from the Du. *plat blinde* 139/6. (Cf. Logeman, *Inleid.* LIV). (\*)

The converse phenomenon, although rarer, occurs also. Just as in O. Fr. *quand*, *souvent* may be declined as Adjectives: *souventes fois*, *quantes fois*, we find the M. E. Adverb *oftymes* = *ofte*, the formation of which may be illustrated by the next passage:

... who that wyll have the very understanding of this mater he muste *ofte* and many *times* rede in this boke 4/15, Cf. *often tymes* 107/3, *how wel of tymes* 10/6, *oftymes* 64/2, 29. opposed to *somtymes* 66/6.

I see a similar case in: I thought by this a lyknesse whiche *hier a fore tyme* byfille to the frosshis 37/27.

The whole expression 'hier a fore tyme' (Dutch: hier voormaels 48,19) may be compared to the above 'there... in the myddel'. In 'a fore tyme', I regard 'a' as = on (Cf: 'go a pylgrimage' s. *Prepositions*) and 'fore' as qualifying 'tyme'.

We also find *to fore time*: I have get *here to fore time* gyven to you many a good counseyl 67/25.

With *a fore tyme*, cp. *a fore*: And what somever I have saide *a fore* or after, that is clerly al trouthe 96/12.

*to fore*: I herde you wel *to fore* 12/35.

The Adverbial use of Adjectives was still very free in the first part of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century, as well as in Bunyan, a little later. It was limited about the time of Dryden. Intensive Adverbs such as *arrant*, *excellent*, *hugeous*, *prodigious* were retained later. (Franz. *Engl. Stud.* xviii, 192). Cf. the modern colloquial and vulgar use of *precious*, *jolly*, &c., and the occasional use of *near*, *scarce*.

Among Adverbs derived from Nouns we find *a parte* = a little:

(\*) *plat* = flat, occurs also: 38/24, 106/19.

and that causeth me *a parte* to be hevy in my herte 25/4.

Conversely, Adverbs are used as Nouns:

I shal come to myn *above* 33/30. Cf. 108/9, 112/4.

A considerable number of Adverbs are based on an Accusative absolute. Thus, Demonstrative or Indefinite Adjectives or Pronouns in the Neutral Accusative serve to form *Adverbs of Quantity*, of *Negation* &c. A frequent idiom in *Reynard* is *,al that... he can, may'* = as much as:

they smote and stacke hym *al that* they coude 16/25.

I wil helpe therto *al that* I maye 56/38.

Besides *al that*, the simple *that* occurs:

I helped hym *that I myghte* 57/13.

*All* may also be intensive = quite, very:

were *alle* angry and sory. Cf. *al pale* 72/34, *al wery* 86/5, *al evyl* 99/36, *groned... al softly* 92/13.

It may be used in connection with *too*, in order to emphasize the Superlative: *we tarye alto longe* 21/33 — This is not due to the analogous Du. use, nor to the Du. *,al' = ,reeds'*. The corresponding passage has simply *wi staen hier te langhe*. It may be interesting to quote a parallel instance from Dryden (referred to by Franz. *Engl. Stud.* xviii), since the N. E. Dictionary does not especially treat of this use and only mentions the use of *all*, emphasizing the verbal prefix *to* (in *all-to break* = *break asunder*, whence *all-to* was considered an independent group and joined to other Verbs); — the following passage is the one referred to: *,Mr. Cowley had found out that no kind of stuff is proper for a heroic poem as being all too lyrical'* (Dryden, *Ded. Aen.* xiv, 222). Among Adverbs of Quantity we may also notice *any* before adverbial comparatives:

I wil not that ye goo *ony farther* with me 47/36.

*,Any further'* is quoted as a new phrase in the the *Babec's*

*Book*, ab. 1470 (Kington Oliphant, *N. E. I.*, 328). Mätzner does not mention this use of *any* (\*).

*Double*: and he clered hym of *double* so many playntes . . . 57/32.

As to *Negations*, we find *nothing* = not, which is derived, like *not* (*nought*, *na wiht*), from an Accusative: . . . and knewe *nothyng* what this myght be 15/13; that he toughte he fonde *nothyng*e 39/33.

Compare with the use of *none other thing* = not otherwise, not besides:

They knewe none other thyng why ne wherefore 113/24.

This sense of *nothing* still survives in the xvii<sup>th</sup> century:

„. . . which is nothing pleasant to hear'. Bacon. *Advt. of Learning* 251, 23 (Clar. Pr. ed.).

According to present use, two negations, except in constructions with *nor*, invalidate each other. Until the end of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century, two negatives had more force than one. The double negation is frequent in *Reynard*:

See wel to(o) that ye not mysdoo *ne* trespace *no* more 15/31. Cf. 38/25, 65/17, 73/22, &c.

A similar case is: ye nede *not* to shette but one wyn-dowe 109/32 (= you need to shut but one window).

*Never so* is used for N. E. *ever so*, in concessive clauses:

though it snowed stormed or frore *never so* sore 82/10, 82/32.

The use of *ne* preceding the Verb and anticipating some following negative (as in the French construction *ne . . . ni . . . ni*), is rare:

ther ne bleef nether man *ne* wyf 15/29.

*Never . . . more* is found used as a separable expression:

(\*) The *N. E. Dict.* gives as earliest instance, a quotation of ab. 1400: „or he come *ony nere* (= nearer) *Epiph.* 136. The next one is from Caxton.

I wil *never* doo so *more* 29/2. Cf. 61/4.

*Nay* occurs as absolute negation in answers:

Nay sire nay not for alle the worlde of rede gold 68/3. Cf. 62/11, 72/16; opposed to *ye(a)*: *ye* eme therefore muste ye resseyve suche maner payment 101/13; cf. 21/4, 37/38; - as affirmation, we also find *oy* 62/24 = Du. *jae* 80/24.

*Noo* is instead of *not* in the next passage:

Thenne he asked of them what they counseyllid hym, yf he sholde gyve the felde unto the kyng or *noo* 112/37. (Franz, in Engl. Stud. xviii, 393, 9, gives a few similar instances for the xvii<sup>th</sup> century).

Adverbs with *temporal meaning*.

*After* = afterwards:

I began to wexe hardy *after* 84/30.

*after* they repente hem, and thenne it is to(o) late 110/9.

*Algates* (= *always*).

I toke a glasse or mirroure and a combe whiche my wyf wold *algates* have 88/9.

*Bytymes* (betimes):

I wil to morow *bytymes* as the sonne riseth take my waye to rome 43/16.

*A fore*, a *fore tyme*.

*Oftymes*, see above.

Other connections with 'time' are *al in tyme*: we shal awake you in *al in tyme* 104/12 (in Du: wel in te tide wecken); *on a tyme*, *upon a tyme* (preserved in N. E. 'once upon a time'); *that time*, which may be better explained by the assumption of the dropping of *at*, *in*, &c., these Prepositions being before *that* in unstressed position:

My lord *that time* were ye...und alle your counseyl here wyth acombryd 77/6; *that time* was he above alle other bylevyd and herde in the court 77/16; Parys was *that time* an herde man and kepte his faders beestis 83/36.

The same use is found in Bacon:

I could wish there were a perfect course of history for

Grecia from Theseus to Philopoemen (*what time* the affairs of Grecia drowned and extinguished in the affairs of Rome). *Advct. of Learning* 92,27.

In formations with *'while'* we may observe how an adverbial ending arose out of adverbial phrases: *in the mene whyle, in a short whyle after* 54/12, *whyles* 39/25, 55/12, *otherwhyle* = sometimes:

I fele myself *other whyle* encombred in my stomak 59/31. (Du: bi wilen); Ther is no man so wyse, but he dooleth *other whyle* 65/32.

*Otherwhiles* occurs in the same sense in *Piers Plowman* 5, 557. The use of *other* may be explained by some mental comparison with another *other* to which it is opposed: *other . . . other* = *some . . . some*.

*Stoundmele*, from time to time, literally, hour by hour: the foxe loked on the kyng *stoundrele* and was glad in his herte 40/35. Cf. Chaucer, *Troil.*, v, 674; O. E. *stundmaelum, styccemaelum* (where *maelum*, like *wilum, wundrum* = adverbial Dat. plur.)

*Seeld*: ,An Enemys mouthe saith *seeld* wel' 7/26.

*long* = for a long time, since long:

Reynert the foxe whiche *longe* had not spoken 3216; Cf. Dutch *lange*).

For the sense of *long* in the connection ,to think long' = to long for a person's return which occurs twice in our text, see Stoffel (*Stud. in Eng.*, especially on p. 123).

He take leve first of dame ermelyn his wyf and of his chylidren, and saide *thynke not longe* I must goo to the court 61/6. My wyf shal *thynke longe* after me 99/25.

Note also the adverbial phrases *in an evyl tyme* 22/19, *in an evyl hour* 48/27, which mean as much as ,unhappily', *in the ende* 74/34, *at the ende of X days* 58/8, *to-day by the morrow* = to morrow 55/20.

*Adverbs with local meaning.*

*After* = behind 26/40, 85/41.

*Afterward from* = back, backwards:

his kynne and lignage drawe al *afterward from* hym 78/34.

*To fore* = forwards, in front 50/27, 78/22.

*Forth*:

Come *forth* 79/24; called him *forth* 79/22. Welcome my dere chyldren *to me forth* and stande by reynard your dere newew 89/23. (Not in Dutch: Willecome sproek vrouwe rukenauwe myn lieve schoene kindere *coemt* ende staet by reynaer uwen lieven neve 103,6).

In a derived sense, *forth* = further, moreover:

Lantfert cam... wyth the preest and *forth* with alle the parysshe 16/8. Now here how the foxe *forth* dyde (= continued) 45/4.

*Withinforth* = within: are ye *withinforth* as ye seme outward 72/16. Cf. 84/37;

*withoutforth* = outwardly: *withoute forth* on the ryngge stode a stone 82/11,12. Cf. 85/12.

The two words are found in Chaucer, Reg. Pecoock (Skeat's Specimens, P. III).

Besides *withoutforth*, *without* occurs: ... abode *without* (= outside) 98/11.

*Forthon* = henceforth: Eme see now *forthon* that ye doo good werkis 28/23. (Du: voert an).

*Nigh*:

I shal so answeere, that I shal touche somme *nygh* ynowh 59/38. I was *ny(g)he* al a swoun 55/6.

*Nigh* seems to be due to the Du. in the next passage:

Nay it is not so cleer, ne so open *now her nyghe* 72/17. (Du: Neen ten is soe slecht noch so claer niet *nerghens* nae 93,4).

*Overal* (ubique): 50/6, 54/12, 73/20, 1176, 117/30 is not due to the Du. (Cf. Logeman, Inleid. LIV).

Adverbs with *modal meaning*.

The connections with '*wyse*' again illustrate the passage of adverbial phrases into simple Adverbs:



I sorrowed that it myght happen us in *lyke wyse* 87/38; in *lyke wyse* as he was 77/30; but I myght *none other wyse* doo 99/30.

*Othercyse* is also found after an Indefinite Pronoun = ,else' :

we wyl none *otherwyse* send for hym 58/5.

Note ,right as' = ,just as' :

and *right as* the feest had dured viii days a bouthe midday cam in the cony 54/26. Cf. 55/16.

*So, also.*

*Also* is found in the meaning ,likewise', ,in the same way' (in keeping with the etymol. *call swā*, wholly so):

Hit is better to have prys honour reste and pees . . . than to have shame (hurte) unreste . . . *Also* it it lytyl worship to hym that hath overcomen a man thenne to slee hym, it is grete shame 110/15.

It may also imply a gradation: 'They ben many and *also* the moste parte that crepe after his waye and his hole 117/21. (In Du. simply: sie creepen *alle*, &c.).

*Also* serves as a correlative in comparisons a function which is not fulfilled by the abbreviated form *as* (*also, else, als, as*):

the mone shyneth *also* light *as* it were daye 20/27. I shal never *also* longe *as* I lyve have her frendship 81/10.

Cf. Chaucer: *also many*, (*Leg. of G. W.* 528); *also muche as* (*C. T., D.*, 2134). Note that the latest instance of this quoted by Murray dates from 1410.

*Also* = *so*:

I see that ye be *also* wery *that* the swete renneth down by your chekys 12/39; And thenne was his body *also* glat and slyper *that* the wulf sholde have none holde on hem 108/15.

*Also* sometimes has a conclusive sense similar to that of Modern German ,also' in:

Reynarde's frendes and lignage to the nombre of xl have taken *also* their leve of the kyng . . . 118/38.

*So* is found in elliptic concessive clauses with the same sense as the German ,*so . . . auch*' :

hier is none *so olde* that ever *so moche* sawe on one heep in alle his lyf 39/1. (Du: hier en is nyemant soe out . . . 50/14.

*So* as a weak conjunctive particle, introducing the principal Verb after an adverbial phrase occurs in a few passages where it is probably due to Du. influence, it must be added, however, that this use is not restricted to our text (s. Franz., *op. cit. E. Stud.* xvii).

Whan thyse wordes were spoken *so stode* there a lytyl hounde and was named courtoys . . . 6/16. (Du: onder deze woerden so stont daer een honde kij n ap ende hiet cortois).

Wyth this *so cam* Tybert the catte with an I was moed 6/33. (Dutch: onder dies soe coemt tybert die cate mit toernigen moed).

Especially after a conditional clause:

*Is it true* that men saye *so* was lantfert a stronge carpenter . . . 14/24.

*So*, in the formula *so helpe me god* 21/12 (Du: soe helpe mi god) may be explained as an Adverb of manner and reminds of the French ,*Ainsi Dieu me soit en aide*', but there was a parallel use. of O. E. *swá* (Mätzner II, 539).

*Thus* = *so* :

I knowe none . . . that I wolde labour fore *thus sore* 14/16.

*Unnethe* = hardly, scarcely (O. E. *uneápe*, not easily):

The foxe . . . lawhed *so sore* that he *unnethe* coude stonde 23/5. Cf. 35/10, 46/7, 63/24, 91/35, 95/14. Also in the form *unnethis*: 39/22.

Note the phrases with *that is* ,that is to say' 113/25. 114/34; *in especyal* = especially, 26/1.

As to the functions of the Adverb in the sentence we may notice the use of an Adverb in the sense of an Imperative, with ellipsis of a Verb expressive of motion: *to me forth* 79/23 (not due to the Du. in this passage).

An Adverb or Adverbial Preposition may also be used attributively and be equivalent to an Adjective clause:

He stopped the hole... and made hit... playn lyke to the other grounde *by* 38/29. (Cf. the Modern use of, *hard by*).

The place of the Adverb in the sentence will be studied later on.

Among the many tautological constructions which occur in our text, we may mention here that of a Verb with an Adverb of cognate meaning:

*he ofte was wonte* 12/21, *I was wonte many a tyme* 26/22, (as in English of the present time we may still hear, 'he often used to invite people'); *answerd agayn* 8/4, *mysfylle* ... *evyl* 55/26, *escaped away* 113/36, *tarye longe* 117/6.

## PREPOSITION.

### Prepositions denoting Origin, (answering to the question *unde*).

OF.

*Of* expresses separation, origin, cause, instrument or agency, lastly reference; its use is rather extensive in Caxton and partly encroaches on the present use of *from*, *for*, *by*, *on*, *about*.

*Of* denoting movement from an object, = from, out of, off:

He brak a rodde of(f) a tree 28/12. Wyth moche payne cam I *of* his clawes 50/3.

Arber wrongly adds an *f* in the first instance; the distinction of meaning between *of* and *off*, which were first two various spellings, belongs to a later period. (S. Mätzner II, 276).

*Of* denoting origin, — transition between local and causal meaning:

I had foure grete holes in my heed *of* his sharpe nayles 55/5.

A frequent case is of before country names; we may see an analogous case in: ‚alle them of the court’ = belonging to, depending on the court.

In Chaucer, *of* is used especially to denote causes of diseases: ‚He knew the cause of every maladye, were it of colde, or hete, or moyst, or drye’. Ch. II, 14. (Einenkel. p. 160). — The following instance is similar in appearance (causes and effects of diseases being apt to be confused); but we may also explain *of* *pricking*, &c., as a *genit. qualitatis* with the value of an apposition:

What man loked in the glasse had he ony disease of pricking or motes, smarte or perles in his eyen he shold be anon heled of it 84/30.

*Of* denotes the agent in passive constructions:

How brunne the beere was sped of Reynart the foxe 12/1.  
He shold have been murthred *of* his owen folk 35/38.

This *of* was developed at the extense of O. E. *fram* under the influence of Fr. *de* (O. E. *of* only in *acenned of*, *geboren of*; O. Fr. *par* only in special cases, see Eienkel p. 162). For Shakesp. s. Abbott, § 170. Caxton also uses *by* with this function.

*Of* is used after Verbs of anger, repentance, wondering, to denote the cause of the feeling: ‚I have grete *mervaylle of* you’ 74/36 reminds of O. Fr. *se merveiller de*; but O. E. *wundrian*, *wafian* were found with the Genitive; so were many Verbs denoting affections of the soul and impressions of the mind. Ct. Wülfing, I, p. 15 and p. 19 &c.

To have pity is found with *of*, but not more frequently than with *on*.

To *think* is also used interchangeably with *of* and *on*.

*Of* is found after Verbs meaning blame, accuse, condemn. Likewise in O. Fr. I was not able to trace back this use to the oldest periods of the language:

Yf the scolers were not . . . *reprised of* their truantrye they shold never lerne 8/23; though one falle ofte . . . he is not *therof* dampned 74/7.

*Witnes of* in the following passages is perhaps due to the confusion which frequently arose between *of* and *on*. To *witness on* = ‚to take example of’, was a usual idiom in Chaucer. For the explanation, see Eienkel, p. 184.

The foxe saide my lord ther ben many that complayne, that yf they sawe their adversarye they wold be styлле and make no playnte, *witnes now of* laprel the cony and Cor-

bant the roek which have complayned on me to yow in my absence, but now . . . they flee away 72/3.

*Of* is found before the thing — Object after *pray*: ,I pray you of a bo(ome)' 34/5. This use is old. Cf. Genitive after *acsian*, *biddan*, Wülfing, I, p. 14

Note the phrase *have right of* quite equivalent to the Fr. ,avoir raison de' :

I caste to thee my glove and take thou it up, I shal *have right of thee* or deye therfore 102/5.

*Holde of* in the following passages is due to Du: influence:

Ye muste . . . avenge you in suche wise as men may fere and holde of you 56/6. Du: soe doet hier alsulcke dapperlicke wrake van ende rechtinghe dat men *van u houde* 72,3.

*Holde of* seems to be here a synonym of *fere* and possibly Caxton understood *houden van* as = ,keep from'. But in the second instance in point, the sense reminds us of the Mod. Du. ,van iemand houden' and the case is the more interesting, as the expression is not found in the corresponding Du. passage:

I pray and commande alle them that *holde of me* and desire my friendship . . . 56/33. Du: Ic bidde ende ghebiede alle die ghene die myn vrientscap ende myn hulde begheren . . . 73,1. Possibly Caxton put in *holde* as a sort of random translation of the Du. *hulde*? (\*)

*Of* may express conformity, agreement or, in general, *manner*.

The two senses are closely related:

Yf I durste I wolde pay you *of mercy* 32/35; . . . as he ought *of right* to doo 57/25; *of right* we ought to thanke yow 98/37.

*Of* may also mean *about*, *concerning*, viz. denote reference:

Ther stode also in that myrroure *of* the wulf how he

(\*) *Reyn. II*, 964, has also *hulde*.

In Chaucer, *to ben th-olde to som wight* = to be devoted, to have obligations. But this use is again different. A last hypothesis is that ,them that holde of me' = vassals, viz. ,tenants'.

fonde ones upon an heth a dede hors flayn 88/14; herde the foxes wordes of the Iewellis 93/16; *herof* he can saye naye 94/37. Likewise in titles of books, chapters: A fayr parable of the foxe and the wulf ca. xxxiii.

The following cases may be referred to the same use:

That *is of them* (= is the case of them) that ben wouthe to murdre and robbe 76/25. Have ye not herde the complayntes that here have ben shewde of hym of murdre of theefte and of treson 74/29. (Du: die claghen dye hier op hem gaen . . . 97,2).

This use was modelled on French and Latin *de*. The French must also had influence on the use of *of* denoting *manner*; remember however O. E. adverbial genitive such as *ponkes, unponkes, gewealdes, ingewealdes, &c.*

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish *of* denoting reference from the simple Objective Genitive with *of*.

Compare: ,he fledde wyth grete *fere of his lyf*' 87/36, and ,I gat counseyl of the *makynge of them*' 52/16. We may view in the same light the phrase *make an end of* something:

Ryght as the cony had made an ende *of* his complaynt cam in corbant, 55/16. (The phrase *make end of* occurs as early as R. de Hamp. *Pricke of Conscience*. S. Kingt. Oliphant, New Engl. I, 33).

The Subjective Genitive is also often rendered by *of*, even with Personal Pronouns (Cp. the modern phrase ,not for the life of me' or the Fr. ,en l'honneur de moi' and see; for various other instances in Mod. colloquial English, Storm, *Engl. Phil.* 681).

. . . forgaf the foxe alle the mysdedes and trespaces of his fader and *of hym* also 40/39.

After Adjectives *of* is used to denote cause, means, instrument consistency:

*pale* and *lene of* prayeng and wakyng 9/11; an hawe

whyche was *thyck of brembles* 97/38; he is yong and *grete of frendis* 71/5. (Du: hi is jonck ende *groet van maghen* 91,16).

In ,ye muste ete the lyver of a wulf of VII *yere old'* 90/19, we have the exact equivalent of the Fr. expression *agé de*. The genuine E. construction is with an Accusative of measure.

One of the most important and primitive functions of the Genitive is to denote quality. (Cf. Grimm. *Deutsche Grammatik* iv, p. 552). It is then very much like an Adjective and may be used attributively. Closely related to the attributive use, is the appositive use of the Genitive. Of course we consider only here cases of analytic Genitive, viz. of Genitive with *of*. (*the land of England; the Mountain of Nebo; the vale of Glencoe, &c.*).

I have suggested that in the passage already quoted: had he ony disease of pricking &c. 84/30, the Genitive might be regarded as an apposition.

The appositive *of* may be kept where it no longer immediately follows a Noun, viz. where it is used with the Predicate:

Whom gladly I wold not bewraye *yf the sorow were not of the helle* 36/2.

I understand this as meaning ,if the pain I had to expect for my silence was not the hell'; and from the presence of the Definite Article *the*, I am inclined to believe that the construction is due to the analogy of the connection ,the sorrow of the hell', meaning, not Reynart's care or fear of hell, but the hell as a punishment. A few lines before, Reyn. expresses the same idea: ,I wil not leoparde my sowle, and yf I so dyde I shold goo therfore in to *the payne of helle'* 35/36.

Analogous cases:

the rame... wente to the awter and sange in his bookes and radde... over reynart, whiche lytgl sette ther by, sauf



that he wold have the worship *therof* 47/5, i. e.: except that he would enjoy 'this worship' — the honour which these prayers constituted for him. For the sense of *worship*, cp. 78/14, 119/10.

I wyl gyve hym *the fordele therof* (= that 'fordele') 97/25.

For instances of appositve Genitive in O. E., s. Wülffing I, p. 45.

A special use of the appositve Genitive is found in such expressions as *a devil of a fellow*, where the Substantive which governs the Genitive denotes a quality. Cp. the French *diable d'homme*, *drôle de corps* (where *drôle* is Substantive, cf. Darmesteter, p. 194). I did not come across any such instances in *Reynard*, although Kellner quotes some from Malory. In the following case, where there was an opportunity for this use, a different construction is employed = *The fool my wyf* supposed he had said trouthe' 94/28, not: 'that fool of a wyf'.

*Of* is used in connection with other Prepositions or Adverbs with which it forms compound prepositional expressions:

... set up *above of* every man 117/28; the fynest gold that ever cam *out of* arabye 56/2.

*From*, *Fro* is not of such frequent occurrence as now, as its use is encroached on by *of*, *out of*. It has nearly always a local meaning. *From* is used before vowels, *fro* before consonants (*brought fro lyf to deth*, &c.), but the rule is not without exceptions: 'the wythholdyng you *fro it*' 24/14.

In connection with other Prepositions, Adverbs:

his kynne and lignage drawe al *afterward from* hym 78/34; eche man laboureth to put other *out fro* his worship 118/2.

In the next instance *froward* is used with separable elements, quite on the model of *toward*:

They leep and ronne faste *fro* them ward 87/15.

**Prepositions denoting rest in a place,  
(answering to the question ubi).**

ON.

*On* is often the equivalent of *in*; this is probably due to analogy of Fr. *en*, the influence of which may have been facilitated by its outward resemblance with the proclitic form *an*:

we wylle syngen here vyglyie and brynge her worshipfully *on* erthe (= bury her) 11/10; who that hath nede of helpe shal fynde *on* her grete frendship 70/32; now ye shal here of the mirrour, the glas that stode *theron* (= *in it, to it*) was of suche vertu that . . . 84/27. (Du: dat glas dat *daer oene* stont 110,30). Cf. 86/20.

*On* denotes the object to which the activity expressed by the Verb is directly applied, or which bears the consequences of the action . . .:

I am he that now ye wille doo *on* me what it shal please you 32/38; knowe not ye how ye mysdeled *on* the plays whiche he threwe doun fro the carre . . . and ye ete the good plays allone 7/35; that ye love us wel that have ye wel shewde *on* the cony and *on* corbant the roek 67/14.

In the corresponding Du. passages we generally find *an, aen*.

*On* denotes reference, = as to, about, concerning, especially with verbs of *saying*:

spack wyth afelle moed ylle wordes *on* the foxe 44/37. The first *complaynt* made Isegrym the wulf *on* Reynart 5/22.

*On* is used after Verbs of *belief*: ,hi bileveth not *on* god' 82/1; after *to see*, &c.: ,looked shrewdly *on* me 20/23; it is used, like *of*, after *to think* 99/7, 103/12; *to pity* 5/28, 10/40, 36/10, and other Verbs of feelings or

related Substantives: ,*on* whom Reynart had grete *envye* 10/5.

It is mistaken for *of* in:

yf courtoys had ony parte *hieron!* 6/31; they take heed of nothyng but *on* theyr synguler prouffyt 87/6.

*On* might be explained as = *about*, but seems to have been influenced by the Dutch ,*an'*, in:

he range so sore that the folke . . . mervaylled *what myght be on the belle* 28/17. (Du: *wat an die clocke waer* 34,3).

*On* is used emphatically instead of *to* in:

ther is none lyyng unther the sonne that I vouchesauf berer my tresour *on* than *on* you bothe 41/8.

It expresses aim and is equivalent to *after*, *for*, in: one shal alway *seke on* his frendis 70/33. (Not in Du: Een sal sijn vrienden alle weghe besucken . . . 91,3).

Sometimes an idea of motion is implied by *on*:

howe come I *on* this campyng 102/7; how the foxe dyde (the shoys) *on* his feet for to goo to rome 2/12; how sholde I thenne take it *on honde* (= undertake) 19/28.

For the phrase ,to bere (something) *on hande'* (to somebody) = to accuse of, which also occurs in passive constructions, see *Passive*.

*On* has a modal meaning in such adverbial expressions as:

his visage was *alle on a blood* (= ableeding) 101/4, probably influenced by the Du: *sijn aensicht en was anders niet dan met enen bloede overloepen*, 133,5. Cf, also *on fire*, Fr. *en feu, en sang*.

#### A.

This weakened form of the older proclitic *an* = *on* which was often confused with *in*, occurs in *a two*: ,the foxe had byten his throte *a two'* 49/6, 69/21; in *two* also occurs: ,my herte wyl breke *in two'* 93/11; *a swoun*: ,he fyl doun half *a swoun'* 69/10; goo *a fote*

69/25; *a pilgrimage* 37/19, 48/34. For *a* before the Gerund (,go a hunting') s. Participle.

In *a colde*: *kywart ar ye a colde* 42/15. (Du: *Cywert hebdi coude*), *a*, according to Murray is of different origin. It represents, as in O. E. *acélan*, an original intensive prefix *ar* = Germ. *er*, which we find in O. E. *ar-æfnan*.

In *a curse* we have the same prefix which was later confused with O. Fr. *a* and Lat. *ad*, *ac*, whence *accurse*. In the Past Pple this *a* has the appearance of an Indef. Article and in fact, it seems, from the next passages, that some confusion arose between Indef. Art. + *cursed* and *acursed*, the Pple of *acurse*:

men shold saye ye reysed and accompanied your self with *a cursyd* and persone agravate. The kynge saide sith that *ye stande a cursyd* in the censures of the chirche yf I wente wyth yow men sholde arette vilonye unto my crowne 43/22-25.

*A paid* 29/15, Fr. prefix: *apaier* = *apease* (Stratmann); *an hongred*: ,I am an hongred and am wery' 68/32. *An* is explained by Murray i. v. *an hungred*, *an hungry*, as = *a* before vowels, and as having the same intensive value as O. E. *of* in *of-pyrsted* (Cf. N. E. Dict. *An* pref. 5).

*A right* in ,I saye for *a right*' 77/35, may be the Indef. Art. + Subst. *right*, but may also be = *of right*, *a-right*.

#### UPON.

Is used very much like *on*, but seems to be preferred to the latter after *sicere*, 37/20, *answere*: ,answerd upon Reynard's excuse' 67/6 *all*: ,called upon your good grace' 76/39.

*Upon* denotes local relation, either in the proper sense:

satte upon hys tayl, — upon hys hammes 18/22; she was leyde in the pytte and *ther upon* was leyde a marble stone . . . 11/16;

or with a figurative meaning:

seke every man *upon* his feblest and wekest 64/34. (Du: soecken een yeghelijck op sijn wecest 83,12); the contra-verse was sette *upon* parys 83/35.

Note the following instances, where an idea of motion is rendered by *upon*:

This thyng fyl down upon the floer 22/33;  
the foxe lepe upon hym wyth al his might 111/20.

IN.

*In* is first used to express the rest of a thing, in the limits of' another thing, — then, more generally, the remaining in a certain situation: ,the foxe . . . laye in a wayte to doo harme' 54/21. From the idea of a situation it is easy to pass to a notion of manner: ,the fowles and byrdes syngen melodyously in *their armonye*' 5/9. (Not in Du.) Hence adverbial connections such as *in scorne* 8/4, *in secret* 37/24.

To the local meaning belongs the use of *in* + Reflexive Pronoun to denote that something is shut up, so to speak, in its own limits: ,the foxe laughed in *hym self*' 41/15. We should prefer to day to (*by*) *himself*. This use is old. Cf. Mätzner II, 369. Besides the original sense ,in the limits of'. a less definite local meaning was developed very early by *in, on, at*:

He smote the wulf in *the heed* 108/2; he caught hym in his feet 106/33 = under his feet, *feet* being considered as a whole. (Du: in sine poten).

O. E. instances in Mätzner, II, 364. The same phenomenon occurs where *in* is applied to *time*: *in an evyl hour* 48/27; *in an evyl tyme* 54/3; note also the absolute expression *in time, al in time*: we shal awake you *in al in time* 104/11.

*In* is, of course, nearer its old meaning when the word denoting time is in the plural:

,the lyon wolde... *in the holy dayes of thys feest* holde an open Court' 5/11.

For older instances, s. Mätzner II, 372; for Shakespeare, Abbott § 161.

It is interesting, with regard to this use, to compare various versions of the Gospels; *in* will be found to be very frequent in *Wycliffe*: Luke, II, 41, Anglo-Saxon (995): ,And his magas férdon aélce geara to Hierusalem on easter-daeges freolstide, — Wycliffe (1389): ,*in* the solempne day of paske'. — Tyndale (1526): — ,*att* the feeste of ester':

Mark x, 34, Anglo-Saxon: — ,and he árist on þam priddan daege': — Wycliffe: ,and *in* the thridde day he schal ryse ayen'. — Tyndale: ,and *the thirde daye* he shall ryse agane'.

For curious survivals of *in* = *on* (local or temporal) in Mod. American Engl. cf. Franz. *Engl. Stud.* xx, 79.

*In* sometimes denotes reference, = in the case of, with regard to:

... it shold not be thought *in* hym, that it were ynowh... 7/31.

With various Verbs and Adjectives *in* denotes the sphere of action, or the objects with regard to which the quality is shown. *In* in these cases has often a causal meaning and becomes very much alike to *of*. As to Verbs, Mätzner mentions in particular those meaning to *thrive*, *prosper*:

He wynneth *in* the spyrituel lawe and temporal also 65/1; — They *studye* so moche *in* the connyng and science that they therin doole 63/22, my fadre cam fro skole fro Montpellier, where as he had fyve yere studied *in* receptes of medycynes 89/39; — he *brenned in* the desyre and covetyse therof 35/16; — he is *guilty in* alle the trespaces that ben leyd ayenst hym 23/33.

Besides denoting rest, *in* may be used after Verbs of motion or at least, after Verbs expressing a tendency towards a certain direction. *In* may then have a pregnant meaning = *into*: the flatte vlycche of bacon ... that ye allone *ete in your bely* 8/3;

therof shal ye fyrst have the choys er ony *come in* my body 109/10; yet myght this thyngis wel chaunge and *come in* theyr old state 67/32; See Emme thus *come I in* the wordes and I am leyde in the blame 69/15; I shall *brynge* them alle *in* the popes curse 70/39; — she *fyl* down in a swoune 50/35.

To this use corresponds the O. E. *in* with the Accusative (Mätzner II, 370) and the Mod. constructions *to set in motion, to fall in love*. Cf. also the Americanisms *get in the stage, come in town*. (Storm. Engl. Phil. 885).

#### AT.

There was an old, M. E. and O. E. (also Gothic and Old Icelandic) use of *at, aet* = from, which stil survives in the Mod. expression 'at the hands of' S. Mätzner II, 409. I found no trace of this use, — which seems already to have died out in Chaucer, — in our text, unless we must refer to this origin *out at*, which has the same sense as the expressions *out of, out fro*, already quoted:

He ete so moche withoute mesure that he myght not come *out at* the hole where he wente in 26/26.

But the passage is best explained as a case of the *instrumental of* which is treated of by Mätzner, II, 415. For more instances of *out at*, s. Mätzner II, 280. *At* is also found in connection with *in, down, behind*, (Einenkel. 119). It must be remembered that *at* = from, was more especially used after Verbs meaning take, receive. As to the transition of a local into an in-

strumental sense, notice that we have the same phenomenon in the corresponding Du. passage: ...dat hi ten gate daer hi ghecomen was niet weder uit en mochte. (\*)

*At* in the local sense is sometimes = *in, on*:

Alas what payne suffred I tho *at my herte* 95/2. — It may be used of persons as well as of things: I shal neither hate hym ne have *envye at hym* 88/9.

I may here mention the construction of *at* with the elliptic Genitive of some personal name, wheresome such word as *house, church* &c. depending on *at* is omitted:

have ye ought forgotten *at lantferts* 18/3. — Mätzner (II, 407) points to a similar use in O. Icelandic, Du: ,tot lantferts'.

*At* referring to time:

I a wayted *at al tymes* as nygh as I coude 38/19 (= in all occasions). Du: tot allen stonden 49,24.

*At* is also found in adverbial connections. Note *atte longe*, of which I could find no other instance.

*Atte longe* it shal be wel knowen 78/32. (Du: om lanck, 101,6).

*At stade* in *holde an open Court at stade* 5/12 is a translation of the Du. *te stade* 7,5 and it is dubious whether Caxton exactly knew what the word meant. He kept the Du. spelling which is due to a confusion between *stade* and *staet*. S. Muller & Logeman's *Reynaert*, Notes, p. 159.

By.

This Preposition has two principal meanings, viz., the local and the instrumental or causal meaning.

*By* in the local sense may denote simple proximity:

Myn Eme hat *leyn by her* 8/13; *a byde* this nyght here *by me* 20/31; *here by* dwelleth a preest and hath a barne

(\*) We have a similar case in the Vulgar French „il est arrivé au train, au bateau de 5 heures" = „par le train".



*by* his hows 20/39. (Du: *hier bi* woent een pape ende heeft een schuyre *an* sijn huys 27,7); *hier by* is a gybet 32/4. (Du: *hier bi* is een galghe 41,15.

With a figurative meaning: dar not *abyde by theyr wordes* 72/6.

With Verbs of motion, *by* takes the sense of *along*, *about*, *through* :

the swete *renneth down by your chekys* 12/38; yester morow as I cam *rennyng by* his borugh... I supposed to have *passed by* hym peasily... 54/32.

Figuratively, *by* may mean *in addition to* :

*he hynge an* the foxes necke a male... and a lytil palster *therby* 47/9. Note also the phrase *sette by* = value; cf. 47/4 and see *sette* under *Verb*.

It is easy to conceive how from the meaning *along*, we may come to the meaning *through*, in other words, how from the idea of 'way' leading to some place, we may pass to the more general idea of 'way' conducting to some aim. Hence the use of *by* denoting manner, conformity with, instrument, agency: The sense 'according to', 'with' is found in:

*by your counseyl* 19/19; *by your leve* 79/3; I biseche you to considre *by your wysedom* alle thinge *by right and lawe* 67/1; he shal lawhe *by mesure* 14/12.

The original local meaning is still more apparent where *by* = 'concerning': every man curse them and *saye evyl by* them... 114/30.

*By* in temporal expressions:

*by day or nyght* 44/11; *by the morow tyme* 55/20.

*By* has a pregnant sense in the next example, where it belongs to a parenthetical clause and refers to some Verb which has to be supplied:

... ye remembre litel *by* the wordes (= to judge by) I her of yow 92/35.

We have here a case of what M. Bréal aptly calls

the 'subjective element' in language (Bréal, *Sémantique*, p. 254).

#### WITH.

*With* has the two same essential meanings as *by*. The primitive sense is '*contra*', Mätz. II, 437. Later it denotes accompaniment, manner, instrument, cause. It is used to indicate some physical or other quality in appositive phrases equivalent to a surname:

Syr bertolt *with the longe fyngers* ... In the next passage the first *with* has a similar sense, while the second means manner, cause: ... this preest that sytteth her *with* the bloody crowne he lost his skynne *wyth* the uncortoyts departyng of the swyn 92/26.

The idiom *what with* ... repeated, is represented in:

*What wyth* the devels helpe and crafte *and for* my faders richesse they concluded and swore there the kyngys deth 37/5. Note that we have *what with* ... *and for*; *for* is earlier in this connection, but *with* ... *with* already appears in Gower.

After words denoting a friendly or an unfriendly disposition *with* precedes the object to which this disposition applies: *wroth with* 47/31, 58/16.

Note the expression *to be grete with*. We might at first be tempted to supply some word like *friend* after *grete*:

she was *grete* wyth the quene and wel beloved 73/4. Du: Dese was mitter coninginnen *zeer lief* ende wel ghemint 94,5.

But the Adjective again appears alone in:

they thought that the wulf was better withholden and *gretter wyth* you than I was ... 113/23. Du: hem docht dat ysegrym bat met u ghesien was dan ick arme knecht 149,18.

Applied to *time*, *with* denotes simultaneousness and is found in the compound Demonstrative Adverbs *therewith*, *herewith* (= with this):

*herewith* he departed = with this, or *after* this he de-

parted. — Note also: ... *wyth* the first messenger that shold come... they shold be redy 39/28 (concrete expression = ,with the coming of').

Note the expressions: *meet with* 68/14, this occurs in Layamon (Mätzner II, 441) but in O. E. *métan* was always transitive; In ,*I fonde hym with the dede'* 94/37, *with* probably expresses contemporaneousness as when we say: ,*I arose with the dawn'*.

*With* is found before personal Nouns, with Verbs expressing a situation, e. g. with *be* used impersonally: me thynketh you are not wel wyth your self 68/17.

#### FOR.

The original sense is the local one = before. This meaning is still felt where *for* = *instead of*:

How dame rukenawe answerd *for the foxe* to the kynge 73/1.

From this idea of substitution, *for* may come to denote the price of some service:

O dere reyner lede me thyder *for alle* that I may doo for yow 21/3.

*For* = as, is further used before appositions or ,second objects' :

I telle you *for trouth* 24/16. And thenne Iudge they *for right and lawe* that smale thevis... shold be hanged 78/14.

We may see a reminiscence of the local sense in the next passage:

he hath ben *advocate for the bysshop* of cameryk ix yere 68/15. The Du. has here simply the Genitive: *des bisscops advocaet* 87,32.

*For* expresses the *aim*, thus, after Verbs of motion: ... the first messenger that shold *come for them* 39/28.

In other instances where no idea of motion is included, the connection of *for* with the preceding Verb is less intimate and the expression is similar to an Adverb:

I advyse you *for the leste hurte* that ye and my lady goo bothe thyder 41/24.

*For* shares with, *of*, *by*, *with*, the meaning of origin, cause, instrument, *quoke for fere* 47/2. This function survives up to recent times, although *for* is rather superseded by *of*, *from*. Dr. Johnson's theory was: *for* before a privative (,to die for thirst') and *of* before a positive.

The causal *for* is frequent in Reynard:

An oth sworn *for force* is non oth 50/12; he wiste not whatto doo *for joye* 17/23; old wymen that *for age* had not one toeth in her heed 15/36; he myght not see *for the blood* which ran over his eye 16/7.

Out of this meaning will have developed the sense *in spite of* which we find in ,for all that'.

The foxe understood theyr menyng wel, he thought towards them but lytyl good *for al that* 93/28.

*For* = for fear of, to prevent: ,al this I passe over *for losyng of tyme*' 85/18.

See on this sense of *for*, which is not referred to by Koch or Mätzner, — Stoffel, *Studies*, p. 18.

#### BESIDE.

A Lytel *besyde the waye* 28/30.

Cf. O. E. *be sidan*, Caedm. II, 547.

#### NIGH.

Whan he saw her so *nygh* hym 55/28. How shold I come so *nygh* her 69/25. It shold goo to(o) *nyghe* myn honour and worship 95/26.

*Nigh*, like *next*, as a rule immediately precedes the Noun it governs. *Nigh to* is quite exceptional.

**Prepositions denoting motion, direction,  
(answering to the question quo).**

To.

*To* is probably used without an idea of motion, although in the local sense in: ,they camen to *his burgh to Maleperduys*' 119/7. We might connect the second *to*, like the first, with *camen*, but it is better to consider *to Maleperduys* as well as the corresponding Dutch passage ,*tot Maleperduys*' as an apposition = *of Malep., at Malep.* ,*Tot*' is not unfrequent in Du. in geographical appositions. It may be explained as indicating direction, without implying a material motion.

The motional sense is felt in *brynge to the lawe* = *summon*, 19/28, in ,*haste you ye be sette therto*' 32/22.

*To* = *up to* :

And the wente in the myre *to* the bely *to(o)* 94/29. (Du: *Ende ghinc ten buke toe in dat slije* 124,23), they were . . . byclagged to their eres *to(o)* 98/30. (Du: *totten oeren toe* 129, in fine).

Note that *to* in this sense is used in connection with another *to* which is Adverb and borrowed from the Dutch, as the quotations show.

There are several instances of *to the number of*, where *to* may have had primitively an analogous meaning.

The Du. text shows no such expressions. K. Oliphant, (*New English* I, 154), quotes an instance from Trevisa (about a century before Caxton). Compare Wycliffe, St. Mark, v, 13: ,the floc was cast down in *to* the see *to tweyne thousynde*, and they ben strangelid in the

see'. The A. S. Gospel has the simple apposition, *tróá púsendo* while Tyndale uses a periphrase: *they were about* ij *M. swyne*, and they were drowned in the see. — The idiom is probably due to the Fr. *au nombre de*, although O. E. *op* was also used before Numerals (Koch, § 424).

*To* is used to express about the same relation as the Genitive, both with a more concrete shade of meaning: *to the feigned mirror*, 85, *title* (Cf. in Mod. E. the difference between *the key of* and *the key to*, Sattler, *op. cit.* xvi).

*To* may be used like *on* to denote the object to which some feeling or action applies: *he hath grete envye to yow* 59/14.

*To* also expresses direction, after *see*, *look*: *'look to me'* 110/33.

*To* denoting aim: I love my sowle *to(o)* wel *therto* 88/5.

*To* introducing the 'second object' after Verbs like *take*, *have*, &c. *'Tho toke I ermelyne my wyf to helpe* 39/3.

The phrase *late . . . to hyre*, seems to be a similar case: *late their tonges to hyre* 65/21. (Du: *verhueren*), other instances of *hyre* as Substantive: *'our lorde god shal ones rewarde them their hyre'* 30/7.

The adverbial expression *to foot* in *'the foxe sprang from hym lyghtly. For he was lyghter to fote than he'* 105/30 is probably due to the Du. *'want hi was die lichtste te voete'*, 138/32.

*To* denotes fitness, adaptation: *'what saye ye hereto'* 58/12 (in reply to this).

*To* = as to, with regard to:

he had for to answere *to* many a fowle feet and theft that he had doon 29/20.

Finally, *to* serves to form the analytic *Dative*. Let it suffice here to mention that the *Dative* with *to* was

more frequent than now, espec. after Verbs like *give*, *tell*, &c.

To . . . WARD.

As a separable Preposition, common in our text:

*to you ward* 14/15, *to maleperduys ward* 20/8, *to him ward* 98/11, *to the dore ward* 27/22, *to the court ward* 28/28, 29/17, *to the galowes warde* 33/9, *to the village ward* 33/34, *to the bataylle ward* 104/28.

*In to ward*: tho wente the force agayn *in to* his borugh *ward* 23/14. Instances from Layam., in Mätzner II, 330. —

Cf. *unto Paris ward*, Shakespeare, I Henry vi, 3,3.

*Toward* = with regard to:

he thought *toward* them but lytyl good 93/28.

UNTO.

*Unto* is an emphatic form of *to*, implying a continuity of direction. Caxton, however, often uses it quite as an equivalent of *to*;

*hurt unto the deth* 18/31; he come to court *unto* the plee 19/17, I see noman but I have trespaced *unto* 34/21; I gyve it *unto* you 41/12.

It will be seen from these examples that *unto* represents not only O. E. *tó* but the *to* of the periphrastic Dative. As to the etymology of this Preposition, see Mätzner, II, 327. (The first element of *unto* is compared to Gothic *unte*, O. E. *op*, &c.). *Unto* does not regularly appear in literary language until the 14<sup>th</sup> century and was probably introduced from the Northern dialects.

For the use of *unt* in Mod. E. cf. Mätzner, *do*.

INTO.

This Preposition properly denotes introduction of an object 'inside of' another. But in *Reynard*, it is often used like *unto*, to express the mere direction, with the sense of *to*.

I wente in to the village 26/28; Now wil reynard goo over the see in to the holy lande 46/32.

Applied to time, = *up to, until*: in to thys daye 54/1.

The original meaning of *into* is quite lost in a case like:

and tho clamme he upon an hye tree *in to the toppe*, under the levys 87/25.

Note also: Our lord the kynge . . . wyl that this batayl be ended, *he wil take it in to his hand* 111/26.

#### AGAINST.

Denoting direction = *obviam*, after Verbs of motion: ye cam fro ferre out of a grove agenst us 91/30. (Du: ghi quaemt van verre . . . in onse gemoete 120,19). This is the original sense. See Mätzner, II, 357, 358.

In temporal expressions:

He muste faste and make hym redy *ayenst the hye festes* 69/2. Du: die sal hem *teghen* die hoechtiden bereyden 88,22. — But this use is old: *Tögeanes Eastron* (Sax. Chron. 1095). Mätzner, II, 359. Also in the form *agayn*: Also though he were al naked in a felde *agayn* an hondred armed men 82/39.

#### THROUGH.

*Thurgh* is always used in Reynard in the local sense, e. g. 27/4, 29/30.



**Prepositions denoting some more definite  
relation than the preceding.**

**BEFORE, To FORE.**

*To fore* is generally used in the local sense of *ante*: Isegrym cam and stode to fore the kynge 5/25. Instances abound.

*Be fore* is much rarer: he stode byfore his dore 54/32.

*To fore* is not frequent in the temporal meaning: to fore midday 52/5; to fore this 67/31.

Note the expression: *here to fore tyme* (= before this time) 67/25.

*To fore* is found as an Adverb in Shakesp., Cf. Abbott, § 72.

**AFTER.**

After *to look*, &c.: ,the loking *after* the polaylle' 29/16. (Du: nae den hoenren sien 37,33, Mätz. II, 485); after *to search, long, call*: *creyd after helpe* 50/30. (Du., differently: Soe riep hi lude help mi 65/3). Mätz. d°.

Denoting agreement, = according to: *after the sentence and Iugement* of your men' 7/14. (Du: nae 9,17).

,*After my Jugement*' (= in my opinion) 85/38, *ther-after* 75/9, 93/4. Mätzner II, 487. — ,*After the rate*' for ,at the rate' is frequent in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

**OVER.**

The proper meaning is that of ,going beyond', with an idea of motion. — *Over* may also denote a point of space, = above: ,over his eyen' 92/6.

Figuratively, denoting domination:

made hym soverayn and grettest *over* al his landes 115/25.

The proper meaning of superposition is found in: *began to rutsele over his tayl* 18/23. — Du: *began te rutselen over sinen stert* 24,7.

*Over* = about, concerning: (the rame) . . . sange in his bookes and radde suche as hym thought good *over* Reyn. 47/4. Cf. 103/4, 104/7, 104/16, 24/15.

For mod. instances of this use, s. Mätzner II, 490.

The proper sense is found in *over alle his body* = all about, all over. Note that in the Mod. 'all over', *all* is Adverb, whereas it is an Adjective referring to the next word, in the passage quoted:

ther receyved tybert many a grete stroke *over alle* his body 22/27. (Du: *over al sijn lijf* 29,12).

The same expression, with *all* made into a neutral Noun becomes the Adv. *overal* = ubiquitous, utrobique, which must not be regarded as an imitation from the Du. — Cf. Muller & Logeman, *Inleid.*, LIV. I am not quite certain, however, that the local Adverb is meant in the passage in point (116/6) and from the context, a possibility remains that 'overalle' would mean 'in' or 'about' all matters:

(Du: *ghi sult over al mine woorden houden* 152,22. — Caxton: *ye shal over alle speke and saye my wordes.*

#### WITHIN.

Is used of space: *wythin lystes* in the felde 102/2; or of time, like Du. *binnen*: *with in five dayes* (= at the end of) 61/19.

WITHOUT. Is found in the sense of *outside*:

Parys . . . kepte his faders sheep *withoute troye* 83/38 . . . drewe hym . . . *wythoute* the village 27/12.

The local sense is now quite absolute. Traces in Shakespeare, Abbott, § 197 in Bacon, Bunyan, s. Franz, *op. cit.* Engl. Stud. xx, 102; — in Mod. American English, *do.*

*Without* = ,without mentioning', ,besides' :

there in were wretton xi:c' of ysegryms lignage by name  
*without* the beres, the foxes, the cattes and the dassen  
39/26. Cf. 27/2.

SAUF.

*Sauf* = save 109/27. — Adverb: 94/10. — also Con-  
junction: 86/21.

*Saving* :

And alle they that desired the kynges frendship were  
there *savyng* reyn. the foxe 54/20. —

*Saving* is to be regarded as an absolute Participle.

UNDER.

Occurs in the meaning of ,*inter*' :

And we hadde gotten *under us bothe a swyne* 91/28. —  
The Du. has differently: ,te samen' 120,16. — This use is  
old. Cf. Mätz. II, 499, *infra*.

## Connection of Prepositions and Adverbs.

We have seen in the Syntax of the Relative Pronoun that a Preposition + Relat. Pron. could be replaced by such adverbial compounds as *wherein, whereof, &c.* Similarly, Compounds Adverbs may be formed with *here, there* and a Preposition, in order to avoid the repetition of a Demonstr. or a Pers. Pron. These connections appear in all periods of the language but are generally disliked in N. E. (Mätzner III, 111).

In *Reynard*, they are still extremely frequent e. g.:  
*therin* 12/11; *here in* 59/26; *therof* 17/36; *herof* 14/7;  
*ther by* 20/36; *here by* 20/38; *therto*, often = ‚moreover‘  
35/22, 35/9; *herto* 31/22; *theron* 55/24; *therat* 16/12; *ther-  
wyth* 13/26; *herwyth* 28/18; *therover* 28/15; *therup* 27/20;  
*ther besides* 12/7; *here without* 48/22; *ther after* 75/9;  
*her against* 75/9; *therthurgh* 98/26; *ther, her, with alle*  
108/14.

These Adverbs may be governed by some Preposition: *out therof* = out of it 65/9.

They are separable: And *ther* stode a faldore *by* 27/19. Though ye be not grete *ther* lyeth not *on* 19/30; ... to tho byrchen trees shal ye goo, *there* lyeth the tresour *unther* dolven 41/29.

Besides the construction of a Prepos. + an Adverb, e. g. *out ther of* (cp. *from above, from thence*), we find a Prepos. + some adverbial phrase containing a Preposition: *from off thy feet, up to the fort.* (Mätzner II, 585). — Of course the Prepos. may be placed after, or separated from the word belonging to it and is then no longer to be distinguished from an Adverb; it is in this way I should explain the passages already

quoted under *to*: wente in the myre *to the bely to* 94/29; byclagged *to the eeres to* 98/30.

### Adverbial Prepositions.

Most of the Prepositions we have examined appear as Adverbs when used absolutely, without reference to a following Substantive. But as a Substantive may be supplied from the context so that the prepositional sense is partly retained, I mention the case in the present Chapter. The adverbial *to* presents some peculiarities. Besides the usual sense which appears in: ‚I have none of my kyn that I truste so moche *to* as to yow’ 20/21, there is the more emphatic meaning of the two passages just quoted (*to the bely to*; *to the eeres to*) which we have explained above by the influence of Dutch *toe*.

The following is an analogous case:

I knowe but one wyle and *theder must I too* 87/24. (Du: Ic en weet niet dan enen raet *daer moet ic toe* 115,1).

*To* is also found in the predicative meaning of closed, shut up: ‚the grynne wente *to*’ 22/7. We find in Du: ‚die stricke ghinck *toe*’, but cf. Chaucer: ‚... clapt the wyndow *to*’ (*Cant. Tales* 3738); Dickens: ‚The wind has been and blown the down *to*’ (Little Dorrit, 177).

Probably we have a kindred meaning, used figuratively under Du. influence in:

but the moste parte of alle *cam to* by the vertue of the wood 85/19. (Dutch: Ende dit quam al meestendeel *toe* by des edelen woudes crachte 112,3).

The phrase ‚*see to*’ probably originated in an ellipsis where some noun was implied after *to*:

*see now wel sharply to* 14/31. (Dutch: Siet nu nauwe *toe* 19,7). — Grimbert said *he shold see wel to* 24/6. (Dutch,

differently, ,voer hem sien'). Cf. I betake you my chyldren *that ye see wel to hem* 25/12. (Du: dat ghi daerwel toe siet).

,*Put to*' :

every man wil be ther at and *put more to* (i. e. contribute to the beating of Bruyn).

Cf. in Present English various idiomatic uses of *put to, come to, bring to*.

*Of*:

*Sytte of* 86/4 = get down (from horseback).

Note the use of *On* in:

I am nevertheles *yl on* ynough 17/11. (Ic hebbet nochtan quaet ghenoech 97,34).

Probably some Verb ought to be supplied, as with *of and on* in the next instance:

but the sores were so open that he (the wulf) myght not wel renne, and the foxe myght better *on and of(f)* than he 107/18. (Same expression in Du: Ende reynert die mocht bet an ende of 141,16)

*Up so doon* = the modern ,*upside down*'.

Me thynketh this court is al torned up so doon 74/19.

As to the origin of this idiom, Einenkel postulates a primitive *of so up so doune* which he refers to the French ,*de si haut en bas*'.

Note the sense of *by* in the next passage:

I axed hym *how cometh that by* 69/22 (very likely also originated by the Dutch: hoe moet dit *bi* coemen 89,11).

*Up* is often used pleonastically after *arise* Instances of this are: 22/18, 25/8, &c. For similar redundancies, see Adverb, *in fine*.

*In*: ,the stork *swolowed them in*' 37/34.

As regards the position in the sentence of the adverbial particles *of, up, out, in*, the rule is that they immediately follow the Verb. But in a few cases, they are prefixed to it, e. g. in the P. Pple *thurgh soden* 113/36, 114/10. — Note the position of *to* in:

Tho begonne they Placebo domino with the verses *that to longen* . . . (= that belong to it) 11/13. (Dutch: *mitten veersen daertoe dienende*).

Sometimes these particles are separated from the Verb by intervening objects. Thus besides *outrun*, inseparable, we have:

*he gate out his heed* 16/1; yet ought ye to *here my wordes out* 67/25; he *smote* the catte an eye *out* 22/28; *holpe* his wyf *out* 96/9.

N.B. The two elements of the Preposition *out of* are separated in the next instance; *of* is treated as a Preposition governing 'the tree'; — *out*, as an Adverb connected with 'brak': Reynart . . . *brak out* the betle *of* the tree 15/4. (Du: . . . *brac die beitele uter eycken* 19,20).

The insertion of the Verb or Predicate between a Noun and the Prepos. referring to it (Kellner's 'Dependent Preposition' Outlines, § 445), which gives the latter the appearance of an Adverb, is frequent in Caxton, espec. in relative clauses:

the beestys departed and wente *to their places that they came froo* 116/37.

Sometimes, by a curious mixture of constructions, the Prepos. is expressed twice, viz. at the beginning of the clause before the Noun or Pronoun, and, again, at the end:

Alas *in* what daunger be ye comen *in* 58/24. This is an evyl connyng, *of* whiche lyf, scathe and hurte may come ther *of* 65/24. He shal charge none *to* whom he hath gyven his saufgarde *to* above the right and lawe 73/21.

For instances of the same use in Mandeville, &c., see Mätzner II, 530. (\*)

The use of rejecting the Prepos. at the end of a sentence or clause is frequent in M. E. as well as in N. E. It was avoided in 'elevated style', under the

(\*) An older use, however, was to place the Preposition before the Verb: *Villelm þe we embe sprecaþ Sax.' Chron.* 1087.

influence of Latin, by some writers of the xvii<sup>th</sup> century, but rehabilitated by Addison and his contemporaries.

*With* may be inserted between Verb and Object: two shoes *for to accomplysh wyth your hye pylgrimage* 45/26. This use of *with* is old (Kellner, *Outlines*, § 445).

The avoidance of the repetition of the same Preposition before several words is a modern tendency in the language (Mätzner II, 537), but Caxton strikes us as being, in this respect, in advance of his time. Instances like the following are not rare:

I fere that *for* the grete falsenes thefte robberye and murdre that is now used so moche and comonly, and also (*for* omitted) the unshamefast lecherye and adoultrie god wyl take vengeaunce... 118/24.

The second term may even be preceded by a negation or any other determinant: ,this was *to* his hurte and *no* prouffyte' 26/13.

In older times the Prepos. was repeated not only before independent words, but before a Noun followed by its apposition: ,And come *to Brandight to the cite* (Octavian, quoted by Mätzner, *loc. cit.*). This is the only explanation that can be applied to the next passage, unless we simply consider the second *to* as a misprint: ... ,answered *to eche to* them' 31/13, (the Du. throws no light on the point).

Prepositions may be used predicatively and placed on the same line as Adjectives: *contrarye or agenst this* 37/11.

Here is an analogous case in a compound word: ,here ben so many *by* or *side* holes' 50/4. — *By*, in this instance, has an attributive function.

Another instance of *by* = ,*side*' in compounds is *bypath*, e.g. 12/6. The oldest instance of these formations with *by* referred to by Murray dates from 1637.



## CONJUNCTION.

### Coordinative Conjunction.

#### AND.

Although a tendency towards so called 'hypotaxis' is manifest in M. E. syntax, especially in a predilection for relative constructions, yet the primitive 'parataxis' still is used here and there.

Coordinative construction may be 'asyndetic' or 'syndetic': in the latter case *and* is mostly used as a connective word. By means of it, what may be considered as a single, but complex idea is disjoined into separate ideas. Thus, where we see various phases of an action, or an action with its modalities, and are therefore inclined to use adverbial clauses, Caxton often expresses several actions and juxtaposes verbs with *and* or without any outward link.

The peculiarity has already been considered as far as Verbs of motion are concerned (see Verb). Such phrases as: 'Noble the kynge *wente and stode* upon an hygh stage of stone' 43/35, have been compared to the modern idiom 'Come and see me', and we have wondered whether 'go sing', 'go see', were to be looked upon as subordinate or as (asyndetically) coordinate connections.

With these cases we may compare the following, where instead of *and* + a verb we should now prefer some adverbial determinant, say a Participial construction; whereas *and* with Verbs of motion usually ex-

presses succession and has a *final* sense, here on the contrary, it denotes *simultaneousness*:

The *spack grymberd and salewed* his eme and his aunte *and saide* to reynart eme beware . . . 24/10; — these words were not good to the foxe, and he *sayde* wyth an angry mode, *and dissymyled and saide* 42/8; — *He laye and bledde* (= he lay bleeding).

As the modalities of an action may be considered apart from the action, the attributes of a substantive notion may also be looked upon independently and placed on a line with the Noun they refer to, e. g.: ,When the lion invites people to come to his ,*feest and court*'; this is of course a redundancy, one of the many ,doublets' of our text, but it has a distinct character: ,feest of court'; means as much as ,courtly feast', in about the same way as our modern ,carriage and four' means carriage *of* four, or *with* four horses'.

Similar instances are:

the kynge *sayde*, ha reynart how wel can ye your *falacye and salutation* (= fallacious salutation) doon but your fayr wordes may not helpe you 67/10; — I sawe hym bynethe my wyf shoving and stekyng as men doo whan they doo suche *werke and playe* (= pleasant work) 95/1. Du: als men sulcken spoel pleghet 125,3.

Murray only mentions the similar ,hendiadys' which occurs in familiar speech with certain adjectives: *nice and warm, cut it nice and thin* (N. E. Dict. i. v. *And* B, 4).

An interesting case of Coordination instead of Subordination, which may be opposed to the tendency towards relative construction mentioned in a previous chapter (Cp. Relative Pronouns) is afforded by the use of *and* where we should expect to find a Relative:

In the west side of flauders ther standeth a woode *and* is named hulsterlo 41/19. Tho *spack grymberd* the *dasee, and* was Reynarts suster sone with an angry moed . . . 7/28.

In the corresponding Dutch passages, *ende* is used. — But a development of meaning may very well have taken place spontaneously in English. Instances of Personal Pronouns expressed after *and* may be regarded as transitional constructions:

Ther sawe they goo a rede mare *and she* had a black colte or a fool of iijj monethis olde 62/2. Moreover there are instances of the same use in O. E.: *Tantun ond* (= *Tantun that*) Ine aær timbrede (Cosijn, Kurzgef. Gramm. p. 59).

*And* introduces adverbial clauses, and is used in the sense of *but*, *without*:

Late us . . . departe in somme other foreste . . . there that we may lyve vii yere and more and (they) fynde us not 49/21.

*And, and if* = if:

The foxe saide my lord there ben many that complayne, that *and yf* they sawe their adversarye they wold be styлле and make no playnte 72/2.

The queene tho spak nay reynart the kyng shal lete you have your lyf and shal al to gydre forgyve you, *and ye* shal be frohens forth wyse and true to my lorde 40/12. (Dutch: *ende ghi selt voert vroet wisen* 52,8).

According to Murray *and* was older than *and if* in this sense. The earliest instances of *and* quoted in the *N. E. Diction*, dates from 1205; of *and if*, from 1394. About 1600, *and*, in this connection was regarded as an indispensable word and spelt *an*, especially before *it*: *an 't please you, an 't were*. From *an if*, was developed dial. *nif*.

Murray rejects the etymology O. N. *enda* and believes that the sense *if* developed independently in English as well as in O. G. *unde*.

The intermediate stages are not well illustrated in the *N. E. Dictionary*. Perhaps the passage I have quoted may be regarded as a transitional phase be-

tween the adversative and the conditional meaning of *and*: 'the king will forgive you, *but* you shall be wise' &c., viz. *and* introduces a condition, the non-execution of which is not even contemplated, so that it is put in the affirmative form.

*And* has a pregnant sense in:

that shal he dere aby(d)e *and* alle his lignage (= and so shal) unto the ix degree 40/33; therof shal ye fyrst have the choys *and* your wyf and your chyldren 109/9.

Note the expression *and that*, denoting gradation:

And that shal I prove and make good on thy body wythin lystes in the felde *and that* body agenst body 102/2. (Cp. Chaucer, C. T. Prologue 43: a knyght ther was *and that* a worthy man).

There are instances of a parasitic *and* after verbs denoting speech or after substantives of kindred meaning.

My father trusteth on the promise that eche made to other *and that* he wolde for no nede departe fro hym 87/18.

*And* is difficult to account for in the next passage which seems to be a random translation of the Dutch:

And so it were better that I helde my pees and suffre, *and* the beste that I can doo for to amende myself now in this tyme 118/29, &c. (Dutch: Aldus soe ist my nutter dat ic swyghe ende wil hier mede lyden dat beste is dat elck dat beste doet in sijne tijt tot synen profyte. 155/22).

It may be finally noticed that *and* is often repeated before several terms of an enumeration instead of being expressed only before the last. As it serves moreover as a general coordinate conjunction = *then*, *for*, *but*, &c., the frequent occurrence of this word is a feature which strikes the reader of Reynard, as of other old English narratives.

#### COORDINATION IN NEGATIVE SENTENCES.

*Neither . . . nor* have in contemporary English repla-

ced the older connections *nor . . . nor, neither . . . neither, ne . . . ne*. Mätzner III, 380.

The oldest use was *ne . . . ne*. Cf. the well known passage of the ‚Phoenix’: *Ne maeg paér rin ne snaw, — ne forstes fnaest, ne fyres blaest, — ne haegles dryre, ne hrímes dryre — ne sunnan haétu, ne sincald, — ne wearm weder, ne winterscur etc.*

Another construction was *nawper ne . . . ne: ne ete ge naper ne rysel ne blód*. — Out of this was developed the usual E. M. E. construction *nather, nother . . . ne, no*. — The same occurs with *nether . . . ne* in *Reynard*:

Tho helped the bere nether flateryng ne chydyng 15/14;  
ther ne bleef nether man ne wyf 15/29.

Besides the construction *nether . . . ne* we generally find the simple negative form with *not, noman, never* in the first member of the sentence, while *ne* in the second has the sense of *nor* and, in the double negation, of *or*: That were *not* good ne honeste 57/16. Cp. 70/40, 72/12, &c.

The negation may be omitted in the first member of the sentence:

He coude not get out wyth myght ne with crafte hede ne foot 15/8; — the skateryng of the dust, thy pysse, thy mockyng ne thy diffence, ne alle thy false wyls may not helpe thee 108/25.

The use of *ner, nor* (contracted forms of *nether, nother*) instead of *ne*, in the second member of the sentence, is rare:

that alle maner beestis and fowles shold doo none harme *ner* scathe to ony other 10/17. This is so grete a wylderness, that ofte in an hole yere man *ner* wyf cometh therin 41/22. . . My lord the kyng saith . . . that my fader *nor* I dyde hym never good 89/33.

The form *no* occurs once: ‚he had not moche mysdon *no* trespaced 8/15’. — *Nor* does not appear until

the M. E. period (the earliest reference to it in Strattmann's Dict., is from the Romance of *Will. of Palerne*, about 1350).

### Conjunctions of Subordination.

#### THAT.

*That* was a 'general Conjunction' which could be added to almost every other, give conjunctive force to preceding Adverbs or Prepositions, replace several Conjunctions, express nearly all the relations between sentences. It will therefore afford us an opportunity of completing the Syntax of the Sentence, part of which has been dealt with in the chapter on Relative Pronouns. It has been shown under that head how from a demonstrative meaning we pass to a relative one, i. e. how in some such instance as 'I know a man . . . that (man) is very clever', *that* becomes gradually more intimately connected with, and is finally absorbed in *man*, while coordination is changed into subordination.

Now, the history of *þe* (*þæt*) as a Relative is linked with that of the same word used as a Conjunction. — There is an especially close affinity between Relative clauses and certain Adverbial clauses. Such are those where a temporal expression was followed by *that*, so as to almost form a Compound conjunction:

*syth the time that, unto the time that, in the mene w(h)yлле that* 111/4. (Cp.: O. E.: *on þære ylcan tide þe, þa hwile þe . . .*

and all the cases where *that* expresses a somewhat loose relation to a preceding word, which relation is afterwards precised by additional determinants, e. g.:

ffor the man cam and threwe hym in a sacker *that* he scarsely cam out wyth his lyf 8/9; — the tree *that* the glas stod in 85/21 &c.

Einenkel considers *that* in these and analogous cases as a Conjunction (Paul's Grundr., *Engl. Synt.* §§ 144, 145). It must however be observed that the function of the clause beginning with *that* in such instances as the preceding ones, is identical to that of an Adjective Clause. If we consider *that* as a Conjunction, then we must look in the same way on *which* in the vulgar phrase: 'Mrs. Boffin, which her father's name was Henery' (Dickens, *Our Mut. Friend*, I, 75). — If we regard *that* as a Relative the construction rests essentially on the same psychological process as so many 'anacoluthiae' which occur in our text. The O. E. and M. E. writer first expresses the idea which stands foremost in his mind and then completes or restricts the statement by means of addition. If a relation has to be expressed, he will first of all indicate by the use of *that*, *which*, &c., that there *is* a relation and afterwards tell us what sort of relation it is. (See above the use of a Supplementary Pronoun after Relatives and the Modern use of *which* in colloquial speech, Storm, *Engl. Phil.* 302). Moreover the question whether *that* is a Conjunction or a Relative Pronoun is of comparatively slight importance; the main point to be noted with regard to the history of the language, is precisely the mixed character of the word, which makes us uncertain about its nature.

Of one thing we are certain, viz. that both the conjunction and the relative use of *that* are derived from a demonstrative meaning. The question as to the priority of either development may be left aside, as we already find in O. E. a great variety of con-

structions with *þe*, existing one besides another. (\*)

Besides 'unto the time that', we find: *in suche wyse that, to the intent that; because that; sence that; how that; — in that, by that, for that, after that, &c., — when that* and many similar conjunctions which I shall only consider here in their relation to *that*. This conjunction may not only give a conjunctive force to Adverbs and Prepositions, it may even be added to another Conjunction (e. g. to *if*). For *as that*, see below.

All connections with *that* cannot be placed on the same line; in some of them, *that* is old; in others, it has been added by analogy; in some it represents an original Relative, in others an original Demonstrative after which a Relative has been dropped. The question as to the omission or non-omission of the Relative occurs again here (Cf. the Chapter on Relative Pronouns) and has to be decided according to each particular category of cases. In *unto the time that, that* is a Relative, and this Relative may be omitted:

A man of worship shold not lyghtly bileve ne swere gretly *unto the time he knew* the mater clerly 57/7.

In other similar connections *that* is demonstrative, but the Relative may still be extant besides it, as is plainly shown in the following passage:

I have truly holden the foxe for good and *upon that that* he wente no falsehede I helped hym that I myghte 57/13.

We have the same phenomenon, disguised under the present form of the word in *since that* = O. E. *sip þan þat* (Cp. Skeat, Principles I, 430); — likewise in *after that, for that*, where *that* corresponds to the

(\*) The following statement of Eienkel had therefore better be looked upon as an hypothesis: 'Als ältestes Relativ wurde benutzt die (oben behandelte) Konjunktion *þe* die ursprünglich für alle Kasus stand, der man später jedoch um Undeutlichkeit zu vermeiden das Personal Pronomen in dem betreffenden Kasus nachschickte' (Paul. Grundriss. § 147).



declinable Demonstrative *pam* of O. E. *after pam þe, for pam þe.* (Wülfig, § 304, 11).

Ther with alle must I be content not *for that* I had so grette nede ffor I have so grette scatte . . . 35/12. — N.B. *For*, in the sense of *because* long survived in the connection *for because*, an instance of which, from Smollet's *Humphrey Clinker* is quoted by Franz, *op. cit.*, *Engl. Stud.* xviii, 422, &c.).

*Of that* in used in about the same way: ‚yet his feet ben sore *of that* ye made hym to lose his shoes’ 103/37.

*That*, in such connections as ‚because, after, since that’, disappeared definitively in the xviii<sup>th</sup> century. *How that* was among the connections that survived longest. *Now that* is of comparatively late formation (Franz, d<sup>o</sup>). (\*)

Conversely there are in *Reynard* cases of simple Conjunction where we should more likely use *that*, e. g.: I have lever hange yow *than* I shold so moche praye you for it 46/39.

For the development of the *Substantive Clause*, the starting-point was once more the demonstrative meaning of *that*. In: ‚you see that, I am composed’, *that* must have been originally a Demonstr. Pronoun connected as Object with ‚see’. An intermediate stage between mere ‚parataxis’ and subordination was that where the two parts of the sentence were linked by the repetition of *that* in each of them: ‚*that* I am composed you see *that* (\*\*)

(on the formation of the Substantive Clause, see Kellner, *Outl.*, § 104). — This stage is represented in our text by such instances as: ‚*that* ye love us wel *that* have ye wel shewde on the cony and on corbant the roek’ 67/14. — Perhaps

(\*) Many similar connections are still found in Mid. Dutch: *omdat, opdat, &c.*

(\*\*) This stage is well represented in Mid. Dutch, e. g. in Maerlant: *Dat dit waer is proof wel dat* (*II Martyn*, 287).

we may see a reminiscence of this state of things in a repetition of *that* which occurs in Caxton (and in other authors, as late as the xvii<sup>th</sup> century), when a Substantive clause which has been interrupted by some inverted clause or adverbial expression, is resumed again, by means of a second *that*:

Ye shal see *that* wyth in thre dayes *that* your hows shal be byseged al aboute 24/18; It happed so *that* on a morow tyde erly *that* grymbert my newew was of wyne almost dronke, *that* he tolde it to dame sloepcade 87/14.

The same repetition occurs however in adverbial clauses, where the first *that* is of different nature:

In suche wyse *that* where somever ye fynde them in felde or in wode *that* ye may frely byte and ete them . . . 53/26.

The following passages contains a more complicated instance of Substantive clause where *that* is repeated several times:

I fere *that* for the grete falseness thefte robberye and murdre *that* is now used so moche and comonly and also the unshamefast lecherye avoultrye bosted blowen a brood with the avaunting of the same *that* wythout grete repentaunce and penaunce therfore, *that* god wil take vengeance and punysshē as sore therfore, whom I humbly beseche and to whom nothyng is hyd *that* he wylle gyve us grace to make amendes to hym therfore, and *that* we maye rewle us to his playsyr 118/19-27.

I quote this long passage as it affords a good instance of periodical style and shows an accumulation of *that* — conjunction or relative —, which would be avoided at the present time in good prose, but may be exemplified by other passages from *Reynard*, e. g.:

He cursed and banned the hony tree. ande the foxe also *that* had so hetrayed hym, *that* he had copen therein so depe *that* he loste boothe his hood and his eerys 17/12 &c. — the sonde and pysse clevyd under his eyen *that* it smerked

so sore that he muste rubbe and washe it a way 106/5.

The omission of *that* in Noun-clauses is frequent. This omission also occurs in Chaucer, as well as in O. E. In some cases it is only apparent — as we have there the Noun-clause in its oldest stage of asyndetic coordination. We may find *that* expressed and elided in the same sentence:

he thought the choys was worth ten markes and *that* he muste saye that one or that other 108/31.

As to the order of words, it may be noticed that, while the Verb is generally placed at the end in Adjective clauses, this position is exceptional with adverbial and Noun-clauses:

What prouffyteth bruyn the bere that he stronge and hardy is 15/9 (Dutch: dat hi nu wel stare ende coen is 19,25). he sawe wel that he begyled was 15/11 (Dutch: dat hi bedroghen is 19,27). In suche wyse that it no shame were unto your lordship 43/6. (Dutch: dat u heerlicheyt daer gheen scande of en had 55,21).

Although the construction was not foreign (in O. E. it was even the rule), it is probable that Caxton would not have used it but for the analogy of the Dutch text.

A peculiarity of construction which sometimes occurs in adverbial and Noun-clauses is the attraction of the subject of such a clause or of some demonstrative word announcing it, as Object of the principal verb. This is especially frequent in sentences introduced by *how*. The case in point is only an aspect of a far-reaching tendency of Early English Syntax, viz., the preference for concrete instead of abstract constructions. In: *yf ye had seen reynart how personably he wente wyth his male and palster* 47/27, it is 'Reynard acting' rather than the action of Reynard which is kept in view, exactly the same difference as there is

between ,after the sunne goyng down' and ,after sunset'. A similar phenomenon appears in the construction we postulated for the development of the Substantive clause in its present shape and of which we found an instance in *Reynard*: That ye love us wel *that* have ye wel shewde, &c.' – to which I add the following passages:

I knewe that wel xj yer a goon, wher that stondeth 42/25. the foxe wil telle it how! it byfel 97/24; our chapelayn tolde us al the mater how it happed 72/28; I shal name to yow, thise Iewellis what they were 81/30 &c., &c.

The psychological feature common to all these examples is that the whole subordinate clause cannot be grasped as the abstract object of the principal verb but is provisionally replaced by the subject or considered as an indefinite ,thing' represented by *that*, *it*, or by a Noun. Such constructions may be looked upon as an interesting link between coordination and subordination.

From its capacity of being added to preceding conjunctions, *that* came to be regarded as the conjunction ,par excellence' and was used to *replace* other conjunctions the force of which it had, so to speak, absorbed, especially to avoid their repetition in coordinate sentences. After temporal expressions, it has the sense of *when* and the function of a Relative Adverb:

It was aboute the tyme of penthecoste or whytsontyde, *that* the wodes comynly be lustig and gladsom . . . 5/5.

or the sense of *since*:

hit is more than a yere *that* he hath eten no flessch 9/4.

It may also be used as a substitute for a preceding *if*:

Dere lady *yf* the kynge wil bileve me and *that* he wil pardone and forgyve me . . . 40/16.

*that* = but, but that:

he loveth noman so wel . . . *that* he wel wold . . . 6/35.

Causal clauses are nearly related to noun clauses and *that* has sometimes the sense of *as, because*:

I thanke ye cosyne *that* ye remembre me 104/24. — Woo to me kaytif *that* ever I was born 81/6. (Cf. O. E. construction: wá lá wá . . . þæt . . . Mätzner III, 447). *That* is here almost equivalent to a Relative.

*That* very often has a consecutive meaning = *so that*:

smote the beere on the heed *that* he ne here ne sawe 16/33. Cf. 11/5, 55/6. Instances abound.

Traces of this use survive in the Early Mid. E. period. Franz (Engl. Stud. xviii, 425), has found an instance as late as 1638.

#### As.

This conjunction is one of the most important after *that*, with which it has much affinity. Like *that*, it may be used both as a Conjunction and as a Relative. In the latter function, it is now confined to those cases where the antecedent is *such*, but the popular use goes far beyond these limits. (s. Storm, *E. Phil. Vulgärsprache*, 803, &c.) — As a Conjunction, it shares with *that* the faculty of being added to other Conjunctions, Prepositions or Adverbs. Thus besides *where*, we find *whereas* in a purely local sense:

in a forest *were as* reynart had a bypath whan he was hunted 12/6. — Thus wente they to the place *where as* they wold be 21/25.

Quite in a similar sense we find *there that, there as*, for the transition from demonstrative into relative or conjunctive meaning is by no means restricted to *that*:

late us departe . . . in somme other foreste, where we may lyve wythoute fere . . . and *there that* we may lyve vij yere and more and they fynde us not 49/21; . . . to the place *there as* the felons ben wonte to be put to the deth 33/15.

Besides in *suche wyse that* 5/15, we have *in suche*

*wyse as* 15/7 = *so that*. The second Conjunction may also be altogether omitted:

he had smeten two betels therin one after that other *in suche wyse* the oke was wyde open 14/28.

Note also *so as* = *so that*:

I complayne to you mercyful lorde syre kynge *so as* ye may see how that I am handled . . . 18/19.

*So . . . as* occurs once instead of a simple *so, such*, which sometimes concludes a sentence by seeking the cause of which the preceding clause expresses the consequence:

I were over moche a fool yf I shold . . . be mercyful to the(e) *so* many a confusion and shame *as* thou hast don to me 110/37.

*As* with a final meaning also occurs before an Infinitive:

I am oftymes rored and prycked in my conscience *as to* love god above alle thynges 64/2.

*As* before the Infinitive after comparative expressions such as *so, such, too* occurs, but may also be left out:

I trowe that ye be too wyse *so to* doo 110/10.

*As* with a meaning nearly related to that of a Relative in:

a lytel besyde *the waye as they wente* stode a cloyster of back nonnes 28/31 (Dutch: *besiden de wech al daer si hene gingen* 37,13).

*As*, denoting simultaneousness:

and *as* he wente he saide himself 58/23.

*As* = *when*, is used instead of a coordinative conjunction (Mod. *when* is used in the same way):

Now is brune goon on his waye toward the foxe wyth astowte moed . . . *as* he cam in a derke wode 12/6.

*As* is often equal to *as if*:

tho loked he toward the kynge *as* he had ben sorowful to departe and fayned *as* he had wepte right *as* he hadde yamerde in his herte 47/10. Cf. Abbott, § 107. The same use must be recognised in Mod. E. *as it were* and in the

idiom *as who says* which has been dealt with in the chapter on Relative Pronouns.

*As* is found as a mere particle emphasizing or rather specifying some relation: *as for me* it skylleth not 72/8. (Mätzner III, 5, 4, 7).

In the next two passages *as that*, as a separable conjunction, seems to be modelled on the Du. *also dat*:

It was so that in the begynnyng of appryl whan the weder is fayr *as that* I (*w*)*as* (\*) hardy and prowde 9/35. (Dutch: *Alsoe dat* ick koene ende hoemoedich was . . . 12,21) — he complayned to me that he lyvyd so straitly *as* in the fastyng and many thvngis redyng and syngyng *that* he coude not endure it 69/35. (Dutch: hi elaghede mi hi had so swaren leven van langhe te vasten ende van vele te lesen *also dat* hijs niet ghedoen en conde 39,24).

Among connections with *as*, we may note *as ferre as* = provided:

I shal be to you a tryew friende and abyde by you *as ferre as* ye helpe we that I may have a parte of this hony 13/23. — Cf. *also ferre as*, 82/34.

*for as much as*, with the same meaning:

I have gotten of hym *for as moche as* I made hym to fylle his bely, that he sware that he wolde be myn helpe an hole yere 27/15.

## Various Conjunctions.

### CONJUNCTIONS OF TIME.

#### *When.*

It has been said that, in the development from demonstrative into relative or conjunctive meaning, an intermediate step is that where the connection between the two members of the sentence is outwardly

(\*) The second *as* in this passage must evidently, as the Du. text shows, be read *was*.

shown by the correlative repetition of the same word. Cf. the O. E. use of *þær þær, þá þá*. — A trace of this practice may be discovered in the correlative use of *when . . . then* or corresponding words instead of the Present simple *when*:

*Whan* reynart herd bruyn *tho* wente he Inneward in to his hole 12/22. — *Whan* bruyn the bere sawe that they ranne alle from hym . . . *tho* sprange he in to the water 17/5.

We even find *thenne whan . . . tho* (O. E. *þá þá . . . þá*): *thenne whan* Isegrym was unshoed, *Tho* muste dame eerswyn his wyf lye down in the grasse with an hevy chere 45/34. (Dutch: Doe ysegrym ontscoeyt was doe most wrou eerswijn sijn wijf legghen gaen in dat gras . . . 58,28).

This correlative use of *when . . . then* still occurs in Bunyan: ‚how when the shepherds had shewed them all these things then they had them back to the Palace . . .’ 267, 11. Pilg. Progr. (Clar. Pr. ed.).

*When* = if: ‚what is that to me *when* he ete hony at lantferts hows’ . . . 30/26.

*When that*: ‚*whan that* ye wylle we shall alle goo with you’ 58/13.

### *Where.*

The transition from the local into the temporal meaning may be observed in: ‚I ranne to the preest *where* he sat at the table’ 26/30. — *Where* is perfectly equivalent to *when* in:

The foxe wysily kepte your noble honour and worship . . . *wher* hath the beer or the wulf don ever to you so moche worship 78/11.

*Where* denoting opposition = Mod. *whereas*:

for thenne wold I goo to the court and excuse me, *where* now I dar not 70/7. (Du: So ghinck ic ende verantwoerde mi . . . *ende nu* en dar ics niet bestaen 90/3.

*Or* = before: ‚*or* he can theder it was fayr day . . .’ 23/19, 50/40.



*Or*, especially in *or ever* is still in use in the xvii<sup>th</sup> century.

*Er that* = rather than: ,yet had I lever *er that* the kyng... shold fare amys, that... 91/5.

*Since*, always in the form *sith*, *syth*: 61/22. 61,39.

*Sith that*: 81/17, 110/25.

*With that* = while: ,And *with that* he tasted... the cony smote russel to fore his mouthe' 69/7.

*Til that*, 71/1, 93/33.

*So long... that*, *so long... til* = till:

this dyde he with grete payne *so longe til* atte laste he cam to the court 18/25.

*After that* 61/10; *after* = according as: *after* he had need 12/26.

With regard to *local Conjunctions*, we notice again the construction with a correlative Adverb. The next instance reminds us very much of the O. E. use of *paer paer*:

my waye laye *ther by there that* I herde this songe 7/6.

Note also: so lide me theder where the myes ben 21/8.

#### CONCESSIVE CONJUNCTIONS.

*Al* = although:

and then shal ye wynne my love ye(a) *al* had ye slayn my fader moder and alle my kyn 21/9 (Dutch: ghi crighet daer myn hulde mede *al* hebdi minen vader ende mijn gheslachte gheslogen ter doot). Cf. 8/34, 8/37. *Al be it that*... 92/38.

This use is not mentioned in the *N. E. Diction*. We might be tempted to look on it as a bold 'Dutchism', if we did not come across a similar use of *al*, *al be*, *al be that* in Chaucer, e. g. ,*al sholde I therfore sterve*'. *Troil. and Cress.* I, 17. Probably this construction was modelled on a similar use of Fr. *tout*. (Einenkel i. Paul's Grundr., p. 912).

*How*. The adverbial *how* may, like *all*, assume the value of a Conjunction in certain connections, with a Subjunctive. *How be it* may be used absolutely as ‚nevertheless‘, e. g.: 66/34; but also as ‚although‘. ‚*How be it* they have gretly trespaced, yet I had for your sake pardoned them‘ 72/10. Note also: *how* it ever goo 49/33, *how that* I doo 67/22, *how wel that* 38/36, with indefinite sense; and the correlative use of *how more . . . how more* in: *how more* forsworn, *how more* forlorn 50/10. This is probably due to the Dutch: hoe meer ghesworen, hoe meer verloren 64,16. But it is worth noticing that *hú* was found in O. E. before comparatives: *lenge hú geomor* (*Cod. Exon.* 110, 18, quoted by Mätzner II, 551).

*How* standing for the modern *whether*, introducing an indirect question, or for *what*, as object of ‚would‘ in:

And he ranne to the mare and axed her *how* she wold selle her fool or kepe it 62/32.

*Though* has a more pregnant meaning than usual in: syre kynges how make ye suche a noyse ye make sorow ynough *though* the quene were deed 52/32 (= as much sorrow as if the queen were dead). Dutch: al waer de coninghinne doot.

The ‚concessive‘ meaning is often weakened and the clause introduced by *though*, equivalent to a Noun-clause:

*though* the kynges and many one be upon me angry, it is no wonder for I have wel deservid it 33/25.

#### HYPOTHETICAL CONJUNCTIONS.

*If that*. 119/26.

*If = lest*:

the foxe was in grete drede *yf* hym myshapped 33/18 (Dutch *of*; Reynaer die hadde groten anxt of hem mischien mochte 43,1).

*If* has a pregnant meaning in the next two passages:  
Bruyn the bere and ysegrym the wulf sente alle the  
londe a bouthe *yf* ony man wold take wages, that they shold  
come to bruyn, and he wolde paye them 39/10.

A verb such as 'to say' must be understood. (Cf. Dutch:  
Bruyn ende ysegrym seynden *brieve* alle die landen doer  
*of yemant waer die* ... 50,24). (\*)

Also I shal take somme money with me *yf* I rede ony  
70/19 (Dutch: ... of ick des yete te doen hadde 90,17).

*But if* = *unless*:

I wil not doo litil ne moche herin, *but if* ye save me  
harmles in the spiriuel court ... 46/35.

*But that* after a temporal expression may mean  
*until, when, before*:

ye shal not longe tarye *but that* ye shal catche myes by  
grete heepis 21/32.

This meaning is not very frequent in the language.  
Here is an instance from Bunyan's Pilgr. Progr. 103:  
,Now I beheld in my dream that they had not jour-  
neyed far *but* the river and the way for a time parted'.

The transition between the coordinative and subor-  
dinative sense of *but* may be observed in: ,I shal not  
reste nyght ne days *but* ronne and praye' 93/31. The  
clause introduced by *but* is equivalent to a Noun-clause,  
or to an Infinitive in:

Ther was apoynted ... that he *lefte* not for ony cause.  
*But* he cam in to the kynges court 11/25.

*Without*: ,... to doo what he wolde *wythout* he  
shold be blamed' 119/5.

*So that* = provided:

They reche not whos(e) hows brenneth *so that* they may  
warme them by the coles 78/25.

(\*) There is a similar ellipsis in a passage of Wycliffe (Mark XI, 13). — whereas the corresponding passage of Tyndale, as well as of the A. S. Gospels show the full construction: Wycliffe (1889): And whanne he hadde seyn a fyge tree afer havynge leovys *he cam if happily he schulde fynde ony thing thereynne*. — Tyndale (1523) ... and *wente to see whether he myght fynde any thinge there on*. — Anglo-Saxon (996) ... *he côm and sôhte huæper he } par on aht funde*.

*Than* = but: ,herof knoweth noman than me' 71/30.

CONJUNCTIONS DENOTING MANNER, COMPARISON.

*Lyke, lyke as* :

hys eyen stared and his tonge henge longe out of his mouth *lyke an hound had ben deed*, 55/23 (Dutch: als een hont die doot ware 71,10).

We are inclined to supply a Relative after *hound* as in the Dutch. Nevertheless it is probable that we must regard *lyke* as a Conjunction = *lyke as* which we find in: he drough is breth *lyke as* one sholde have deyde 17/17, and that *as* in this connection must be explained like the ,as' of ,as who says', viz. as having the pregnant sense of *as if*. Instances of *lyke as* in this sense are:

ffor suche be so woo *lyke as* they had loste theyr Inwytte 68/24. — ...pylle the peple and eten them *lyke as* they were forhongred houndes 114/18.

CONJUNCTIONS DENOTING PURPOSE.

*to the entente that*: ,not to th(e) entente that men shold use them' . . . 4/11.

The same expression still occurs in xvii<sup>th</sup> century English (Franz, *op. cit.*). — *Entente*, as a Substantive = intention, 91/8. — (Cf. Bacon: ,with an intent in man to give law unto himself': Advanct. of Learning 6, 3. — *Clar. Pr. ed.*).

*Because* = so that, in order that:

I have buryed myn owen fader *by cause* the kynge sholde have his lyf, my lorde saide the foxe, where ben they that so wolde doo, that is to destroye them self for to kepe yow, 39/40.

The oldest instance quoted in *N. E. Diction.*, is from Caxton's *Paris*. The *Dictionary* adds that the same use is still frequent in dialects.

## ORDER OF WORDS.

It is in the order of words that Caxton perhaps most deeply and most constantly varies from the present use, so that to bring these differences under definite heads is to explain no small bulk of the peculiarities of language that strike the reader unaccustomed to M. E. prose literature.

The settled position of the terms of the sentence (1) Subject, (2) Predicate (Verb), (3) Object, is a consequence of the decay of case-endings. The greater freedom which reigns in our text is found in all the works of the period. It is not restricted to Middle English but occurs as well in Old and Middle French: ,la misericorde (Object) perdit assi (ainsi) li hom'. (Subject) (Serm. de St. Bernard 148). Similar changes in the fundamental constitution of the language effected a similar evolution in the outward arrangement of words.

We shall examine (1) the relative position of Subject and Predicate; (2) the place of the Direct Object; (3) the place of adverbial determinants, including the Indirect Object.

### SUBJECT AND PREDICATE.

The inversion of the Subject after the Predicate occurs chiefly when some other word is put at the head of the sentence. Kellner indicate the inversion after *and* (Kellner CI, § 43,2). In *Reynard*, it is much more frequent after such adverbial particles as *tho*, *thenne*, *now*, *thus*, *so* which play the part of coordinate conjunctions. ,Tho spack he', ,said he' are

phrases of continual recurrence. These generally render the Du. 'doe seide hi' but it must be noticed that Caxton has a predilection for connective particles and often uses them where they are omitted in the Du. text :

Then spak Panter 6/32 (Du. Panther die sprak); — tho spack Reynard 15/20 (Du. Reyn. sprak).

Instances where, according to the modern rule, the Subject precedes the Predicate, are exceptional. Here again the Adverb *tho*, *there*, may or may not be found in Dutch :

and *Chaunteclere tho seyde* 9/31 (Du. Ende Chant. die seide); *Brun tho spack* 13/19 (Bruin die sprack); *Reynard saide thenne* 14/13 (Reyn. die sprac); *thenne the kyng saide* 19/15 (Lioen die coninc seide); *then he ran* (In Du. with Adv. and inversion: *soe ontliiep hi*).

The inversion of the Subject also occurs after *there* and Demonstrative Adverbs formed with *there*, *here*, as well as after Relative Adverbs such as *whereof*, *wherin*, (= of this, in this):

Ther recyvid tybert many a grete stroke 22/26; ther muste Reyn. fynde . . . the meanes 24/37; there fonde he tubbes 26/24; *herof* laughed Reynard 14/7; *therefore* wylle I go to rome 43/29; — *whereof* is mucche harme comen 10/29; *wherupon* was a day sette 6/3; — also after Preposition + which: they brought forth the booke *on whiche sware the wulf* that the foxe was a traytour 105/4.

After other Adverbs and Adverbial locutions: *nevertheless* yet was I 34/21; *In lyke wyse dyde* ye 8/2; *at laste* cam he 10/13; *thenne* were I out of my wittes (,thenne' here = ,in this case') 40/10; *wyth these wordes* arose the preest 22/29. *Now two yeres passid* cam a man . . . into this courte 75/12; *And in alle my lande* shal ye be above alle other 116/7; *In a sorowful countenance* spak the foxe to the quene 35/33.

The inversion is also found after a whole adverbial clause:

*Whiles they thus spack sprange up bellyn the rame 30/39; ryght as the cony had made an ende of his complaint cam in corbant the roek &c. 55/17.*

The word or phrase placed at the head of the sentence, and which causes the inversion, need not be adverbial, it may be the Object of the sentence:

*the first complaynt* made Isegrym the wulf on Reynart 5/22; *this sawe* . . . the asse 86/18.

But the inversion of *the* Subject in this case is no absolute rule: ,nevertheles *this she saide*' 46/18.

The Old French use is nearly parallel to this. Thus, in Froissart, we find: ,*Et estait envoiés en France li dis cardinaulz* . . . iv, 123,2 ,*Lors commencièrent li arcier l'un à l'autre traire*' iv, 23,7; ,*Puis corna li dis menires Guillaume Douglas un cor*' II, 52,30; *Si passèrent li dis contes de Tankeville et li mareschaus le mer et arrivèrent à Boulougne*' v, 179,29. (*Riese*, Etude syntactique sur la langue de Froissart, p. 3).

In Old English we find both the inversion of the Subject: *pá waes Matheus . . . comen* (Andr., 41); — *pá cwaedon pá englas* (Gen., 19,12). — *Hér for se here to Lundenburig* (A. S. Chron. 72); *þy ilcan geare slogon East Engle Beornvulf* (d°. 823); and the other construction: *nu ic eow sende* (Math. 10,16); *pá se halga hêht* . . . (Caedmon 2034). *Oft ic sceal viþ vaeged vinnan* (Cod. Exon. 398, I) &c.

#### DIRECT OBJECT.

The inversion of the Direct Object is found with Nouns and Pronouns, in principal and in dependent clauses. I tried to gather such instances where the inversion is not rhetorical, viz. where it is not used for the sake of special emphasis, as it can still be now. It will be noted that where Auxiliaries are

included, the inverted Object is inserted between the Auxiliary and the Infinitive or Participle:

al *had* he *cortoy*s *hanged* whan he fonde hym with menowr, he had not moche mysdon ne trespaced 8/34; whan he *had ony proye brought* home 12/27; she *hath* the *rys do blossom* 80/23; ye *have* there *two morderars aresty*d 47/38; — he *hath us alle begyled* 57/37; I *had al* forgotten 29/1; *they have* you *nothing coste* 100/29. — If you *would al thing overse*e wel 92/36; we *wyl none* otherwyse *sende* for hym 58/5; — they swere . . . that he *coude none gete* of them 10/6; ha reynart how wel *can* ye *your falacye and salutacion doon* 67/10; — a man *shal* love his frende by mesure and not *his enemye hate* over moche 75/5.

See especially on the before-putting of *this*, *that*, the chapter on the Demonstrative Pronoun.

The inversion of the Object is old, see Mätzner II, 599, al. 3. It seems to have been especially frequent in clauses before Past Pples and Infinitives. For the special construction with auxiliaries, see *ibid.* al. 10, 11.

As regards Auxiliary Verbs, we may note here that they sometimes *follow* the verb they govern:

I wote wel yf ye wolde ye myght now slee me, but and ye so *don had* what had ye wonne 110/2. (Not Du: . . . ghi mocht mi wel doden mer wat laghe u daer aen 145,12. — Tho muste I doo that I not *doo wold* gladly 109/18 (Not so in Du: Doe moeste ic doen dat ic node dede 144,11).

What we have said of the place of the Subject and of the Object with Auxiliaries also applies to the Predicate connected with *to be* or analogous verbs (e. g. become):

Yet said he to me . . . that he *was a cloysterer . . . be comen* 10/18 Cf. Kellner, *ciii*, § 44. — Dere lorde remembre not ye whan my lord your fadre and ye *an Jongling of two yere were* 89/37; — ye be *so wyse called*, helpe your self, ffor ye have nede 87/33.



## PLACE OF ADVERBIAL ADJUNTS.

The Adverb in Caxton as a rule precedes the Predicate. Often it is inserted between Verb and Subject. This still occurs to-day, especially with modal and temporal Adverbs. In Caxton this use is more general and applies to adverbial locutions, prepositional complements, gerundial expressions (as *fer as they in redyng or heeryng of it shal mowe understande . . .* 4/9). The adverb may also precede both Verb and Subject. In this case it generally occasions inversion of the Subject (see *above*). But instances of a different word-order occur:

*Alway* I prayd god that he wolde kepe our kyng in worship . . . 38/14; — I dowed the cony bytwene his eerys that *almost* I benamme his lyf from hym 61/35; — especially with *also*: also I have trespaced gretly ayenst chanteclere 26/5; *also* I have bydryven wyth dame erswynde his wyf 27/38. — And *also* he swange his tayl wyth pyse ofte under his eyen 107/19.

When auxiliaries are used these may be separated from the Verb they govern, by some complex Adverbial locution:

a man shal not *wyth ones over redyng* fynde the ryght understandyng 4/18; he muste *ofte and many tymes* rede in this booke 4/16; he is *in murdre and treson* al by wrapped 94/14.

On the other hand, in cases where we might insert the Adverb between Verb and Auxiliary, in Caxton, it precedes either:

I crye out harowe on them that so *falsely* have belyed me 66/33; I have gyven to you many a good counseyl . . . and *in nede alway* have byden by yow 67/27; ye have stolen many a lambe and now *falsely* have appeled me 106/12.

In the case of two Auxiliaries with an Active Verb, where the Adverb must, in present English, fall be-

tween them, Caxton sometimes has a different construction:

I *shold* not *conne wel* go thyder 13/7 (Not Du: dat ik niet wel en sal mogen gaen 17,6). Contra: ye shold not *thenne wel* conne go... 15/22.

The complement in the analytic Dative is often placed before the Predicate:

I shall be *to you* a trewe frende 13/22... If ye wille be *to me*... helpyng 14/2; hit is *to her* grete shame 28/1; he was alway to hem unmercyful 37/35; though it be *to me* vylonye and shame 43/8... whiche was *to yow and youre* right doubtful 75/14: as ferre as he be of as good birthe as i am and *to me* lyke 71/19; and this by right ought *to noman* be warned 80/9; this market came *to hym* evil 16/5.

When there is a Direct Object, the Indirect Object generally precedes it:

he had done *to you* no good servise 12/37; thys dyde *to the bere* more harme than al the other 16/18; thise wroughten *to the bere* so moche harme 16/23; he gaf *to hymself* better hope... 20/7. The kyng and the quene... toke *to them* reynart 40/5 who can gyve *to this lesynge* a conclusion 65/12.

The Instrumental complement of Passive Verbs is often inserted:

ofte *by hym or them* deceyvid 81/25... my cotype whiche was in dutsche and *by me* William Caxton translated, &c. 120/8.

And *wyth lesynges* am put out of your grace 66/30; *wyth false lyes* thus to be deceyvvd 94/13.

Instances with *wyth* in the Active:

*wyth suche flateryng wordes* hath reynart thise two flatred 48/16. I hope *wyth subtylte* to begyle hym 50/17, that they *wyth their counseyl*... helpe me 56/35.

Causal complement:

ye wold not that a man shold *for* his gentilnes and kyndenes be luded to deth 77/8; my newew was *of wyne* almost dronke 37/15.

Modal, local and various other circumstantial complements:

that tyme was he *above alle other* bylevyd and herde in the court 77/16 (he) is moche greet and *above his neighbours* hath power and myght 91/5; the first that *on us* complayned 48/38; though the kyng and many one be *upon me* angry 33/25; — ye shal have *of the kyng* grete thanke therfore 51/17.

Instances of inverted analytic Genitive:

I slewe *of them* tweyne 34/29; they be *of theyr age* the fairest that ever I sawe 98/34.

Compound Adverbs formed with Prepositions may of course also be inverted:

we tasted and felte his bely but we fonde *theron* no lyf 55/24; *therwyth* 32/10 *therin* 63/23.

Other Adverbs:

*fast bounden* 45/2; *fast* shette 12/13; he shal bryng forth *so* hys maters that it shal be supposed for trouthe 35/32; The foxe promysed that he wold *so* doo 28/27; I am glad that I see *now* hym here 94/16.

For cases of inversion of the adverb in O. E. cf. Mätzner, III, 606, &c. Note the place of the negation in:

He thanketh *not* me of the kyndnes I dyde to hym... 88/36. The construction is unusual s. Mätzner, III, 612. (Du: hi en dancte mi des doget niet 116,22).

In interrogations, the negative particle precedes the inverted Subject:

remembre *not* you 89/36; art *not* thou pryamus sone 84/6 (Cf. Chaucer: *ne* hereth *nought* thou what the carter saith? Mätzner III, 136).

The rule according to which Adverbs, as well as other qualifying words, must be placed as near as possible to those which they qualify, is often sinned against in our text. The Adverb separated from the word it refers to may either precede or follow it:

I saide ye *ynowh* come nere 68/34; And *so* I counseyle

every man to *doo* 118/32; *suche mete . . . as we gladly wold not ete* 13/16; and *almost* he had *loste* his one ere 101/4.

The *spack* Grymbart the *dasse* and was Reynarts suster sone *with an angrey moed* 7/23-24.

### Order of Words in ,contracted Sentences'.

When a word stands in the same relation towards several other words, it is in Modern English expressed but once. This economy of expression is called by Kellner ,Contraction' (*Outlines*, 300 &c., *Introd. to Blanch.* cviii). Thus, instead of saying, ,the father came and the son came', we say, (the father and the son) *came*. In Caxton, the usual arrangement in such cases is, ,the father came and the son', viz., the order of words is the same as if the full construction were used. It remains dubious whether this really is a transition between the present construction and ,the repetition used in primitive tribes' (Kellner). The fact is that in O. E. we find not the ,primitive repetition' but exactly the same arrangement as in Caxton. Should we rather not compare the peculiarity to such as ,the kinges sune Henri' = (King Henry's) son, and attribute it to a certain want of synthetic capacity, according to which an idea was not grasped and expressed at once in its entirety, but was completed by way of addition or ,after-correction', a process which also accounts for many *anacoluthiae*.

There are various species of contraction:

Two attributes and one Noun:

I have . . . gyven to you many a *good counseyl and prouffyttable* 67/26; he *wynneth in the spyrituel lawe and temporal* also 65/1.

Two Verbs for one Subject; this is a frequent case of which some instances have already been given as cases of omission of the Personal Pronoun:

yet *spak he and said* 32/33; thenne *departed he thens and ran* to the village ward 38/34; how *tremble you and quake* so 42/15; Thenne *was I glad and mery and also toke none heed* 10/27; therin *dwelleth he and hunteth* no more 9/7; Alas there *ravysshyd he and forcyd my wyf* 94/34.

We find, on the contrary, the repetition, with 'chiasm' in:

See Eme *thus come I* in the wordes *and I am leyde* in the blame 69/15;

One Predicate for two Subjects:

Whan the *vigilye was don and the commendacion* 11/14; *That shal he dere abyte and alle his lynage* 40/32;

One Object for two Verbs:

there shal none *areste you ne holde* 60/8; *loosed hym and unbonde* 77/24; *he gaf you no more proffred you* 92/4. — Ye may *siede me or roste hange* or make me blynde 30/34.

The last instance shows that the modern word-order also occurs:

he shal thynke how he may *begyle deceyve and bringe you* to some mockerye 11/82; I have taken it fro a fowler, *take and ete it* 104/22;

One adverbial determinant for two Verbs:

I herde hym *crye sore and howle* 100/41 *he promysed to Cwuaert and said* 42/29.

One Infinitive governed by two Auxiliaries:

here what *I shal say and must needs*.

Contraction is sometimes found together with anacoluthia. One term of the Sentence, say, an Adverb is used as if referring to two other terms; — with one of which its sense *cannot agree*:

I hope and knowe you bothe my lorde and my lady for so wyse and directe, that ye be not *ledde nor bileve* such lesyngis ne false talis *out of the right waye* 66/35.

## S T Y L E.

Style will only be considered here as far as it is connected with Syntax, that is to say from the point of view of Logic.

The absence of sharp delineation between distinct ideas, of discrimination between that which is essential and that which is incidental, the general want of precision and of critical sense displayed in our text is remarkable when contrasted with the higher standard of style represented by poetical works of much earlier date and might induce a reader unacquainted with the literature of the period to believe that Caxton *does not* really represent English prose at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, and that the writer was hampered by the faithfulness of the translator. (\*)

But Prof. Logeman's remarks (in Muller & Logeman's ,Reynart') teach us what we must think of Caxton's *piety* as a translator. As the author of the said remarks has come to the conclusion that the Du. text he has published *was not* the original of Caxton's Reynard (the true original being lost), — we must perhaps not lay too much stress on the first argument. However it appears that Caxton was not more faithful to his French originals (Kellner, cxii, cxiv). Moreover Dr. Kellner peremptorily shows in a paper on ,Abwechselung und Tautologie' (Engl. Stud. xx) and in the final chapter of his *Introduction to Blanchardyn*, that the two principal features of Caxton's

(\*) This is the opinion of Miss. O. Richardson, editor of the *Four Sonnes of Aymon*, quoted by Kellner, p. cx, and by Logeman, ,Reynaert', Inleiding, xlii.

style, tautology and anacoluthia, are not peculiar to our writer but exist to the same extent in the works of Peacock, Malory, and others.

#### TAUTOLOGY.

Instances of tautological expression have already been given under *Adverb* and *Adverbial Prepositions*. But the most interesting cases are those couples of synonyms which strike us at first perusal (*used and had, nede and prouffyte, eschewe and kepe hym from, joyous playsant* p. 4, *penthecoste and whytsontyde, commysion and maundements, facty and gylty, &c.* p. 5, by which often a single Dutch term is rendered, — just as it happens in translations from the French (Kellner, cxiii). This practice appears throughout the M. E. period and even in the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. It was already in full bloom in Chaucer's *Meliboeus* and may be traced back to the alliterative groups in *Beowulf*. A detailed study on these 'doublets' will be found in Dr. Kellner's article already referred to, where they are divided into several categories, — alliterative doublets being left aside. I may add that I came across very few alliterations in *Reynard*: 'I shall *thynke* and also *thanke* you 41/5, *free* and *franke* of alle his enemyes 41/2, goo wyth us to the *place* and *pytte* 43/2 are about the only instances I can adduce. It is probable that what seems to us a mere pleonasm was, at the time, a stylistic device and that, as Kellner says, 'to convey an idea through the medium of as many words as possible was considered a beauty of style'.

In connection with this, I mention the rhetorical repetition of the same word, in the following passage, which stands rather isolated in our text:

And thenne the wulf *departed* as he was wonte to doo, *departed* and toke that on half for hym, &c. 91/37,38 ,deylde' in Du. expressed but once 120/27). Perhaps the repetition is a mere misprint?

#### ANACOLUTHIA.

To submit a passage of *Reynard* to logical analysis is often an awkward task and I believe would not have been less so for Caxton himself. The writer, in the middle of a sentence, continually loses sight of the beginning. He seems reluctant to put a stop to a sentence and to start a new one, so, that in many cases, the same member of a phrase, may be connected indifferently with what precedes or what follows; this applies, e. g. to the words *not ones to rede it* in next passage, from the first page of *Reynard*:

Ffor it is sette subtylly, lyke as ye shall see in redyng of it, and not ones to rede it ffor a man shal not wyth ones over redyng fynde the ryght understanding ne comprise it wel (but oftymes to rede it shal cause it wel to be understand).

By a theory which is ingenious, but which I cannot help thinking paradoxical, Dr. Kellner has tried to reduce tautology and anacoluthia (as well as double genitive, double comparison, double negation) to a common principle viz., the striving after variety: ‚So wie zwei Wörter von mehr oder weniger gleichem Inhalt gerne gebraucht wurden um dem Ausdrücke Fülle und Mannigfaltigkeit zu geben, so wurden zwei mehr oder weniger gleichwertige grammatische Formen und Constructionen verwendet um Abwechslung in die Rede zu bringen'. (Abwechslung und Tautologie, E. Stud. xv, p.p. 1—4).

There certainly *are* tautological anacoluthiae' for which this explanation might be the right one:



It were *agrete shame and not honeste* 18/6; yf he wold have ben *false felle and a lyar* 40/28; yf there were ony . . . that wolde be *contrarye or ayenst* this 37/11; alway to *mysdo* . . . that ys *evyl and a devily lyf* 73/32; ffor the *vy-tailler and he that sorowed for malperduys* was goon his way 25/20;

But what strikes us in the most frequent type of these anacoluthiae, is less the variety of constructions than their mixture, I should almost say their entanglement; and this is rather to be ascribed to slovenliness and want of logical acumen, than to be regarded as a 'conscious sin.'

In order to realise these features of Caxton's prose the best way is to read a few pages of his work. I shall only quote here two passages which are both short and characteristic:

it was so that in the begynnyng of apryl whan the weder is fayr, as that I as harde, and prowde (bycause of the grete lynage that I am comen of and also hadde) ffor I had viii fayr sones and seven fayr doughters wiche my wyf had hatched and they were alle stronge and fatte and wente in ayerde wiche was walled round a boutte . . . 9, *in fine* and 10.

(The asse) said to hymself, how may this be and what may my lorde see on his fowle hound, whom I never see doth good ne proffyt, sauf spryngeth on hym and kysseth hym. But me whom men putten to laboure, to bere and drawe, and doo more in a weke than he wyth his xv shold doo in an hole yere and yet sytteth he nevertheless by hym at the table, and there eteth bones flessch and fatte trenchours, and I have nothing but thystles and nettles, and lye on nyghtes on the harde erthe and suffre many ascorn, (I wyl no lenger suffre this) 86/20--28.

The general character of these passages is that principal and subordinate clauses are woven into an intricate knot. A substantive clause may be placed on the same line with a simple noun:

commanded *syllence* to alle the bestls, *and that* they shulde sytte down 43/37;

or be set in parallel with an Adjective:

Dere cosyn ye be right trewe and named right *wyse and that* ye gladly furthre and brynge your lignage in grete worship 99/4,5;

or with an Adverbial Relative Clause:

er I had felowship wyth ryn the hounde (whyche made me escape many a daunger *as he coude wel tell* yf he were here *and that I never I my dayes trespased* agenst the kyng 42/32;

or with an Infinitive:

*ther muste be* two or thre atte leste to gydre *and that they understande* the right and lawe 76/9. I pray yow to *have pite* of me *and that* ye wyl punyssh this false traytour and morderar 55/10.

Direct speech may interrupt an indirect one; the next instance, with an Imperative, is striking:

Reynart saide *that wiste he wel*, now herke dere cosyn what I shal saye 25/33.

We may explain in a similar way the passages hereafter, where an Object-clause depending on 'pray' is followed by an independent sentence:

And prayd the man *that he wolde helpe* hym out of the snare *or ellis he muste there dye* 75/20; — Parys herde this venus whiche presented hym this grete Ioye and fair lady and prayd her *to name* this fayr lady that was so fair and *where she was* 84/18.

I lastly mention a remarkable case where a positive sentence is coordinated with an interrogative one:

Art not thou pryamus sone and hector is thy brother whiche have al asyl under their power 84/6. (In Du., we find one interrogative sentence. Is priamus dyn vader niet ende hector dyn broeder die alle dit land . . . bedwonghen hebben 110,5).

The last instance is interesting also as regards *Concord*,

viz. the logical agreement of the Verb with the Subject, in Person and Number. Here the Verb of the Relative Clause is in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Person (as proved by the use of the Pron. *their*) although one of the Subjects referred to, that of the first principal sentence, is in the 2<sup>d</sup> Person, and although this is recalled in the other principal sentence by the Pronoun *thy*.

Agreement in Number is not strictly observed by Caxton. This cannot be proved by instances in the 3<sup>d</sup> Person, as Caxton still uses here and there the Southern plural ending *-th*, which is identical with that of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Pers. sing. (Römstedt p. 46). But such instances as the following are unmistakable:

The rulers and kepars of the felde *was* the lupaerd and the losse 105/2; thenne *goth* (singular, vid. Römstedt, p. 50) worship and prouffyt al to nought 89/3.

#### CONCRETE INSTEAD OF ABSTRACT EXPRESSION.

Such a sentence as ,I shal name *these jewels what they were*' is more concrete than the present ,I shall name what these jewels were'. I have treated of these cases when explaining the formation of adverbial and substantive clauses (see Conjunction *that* and Demonstrative Pronoun *that*).

## Synthetical or Analytic style?

I use the words as I should say 'coordination or subordination', 'parataxis or hypotaxis'. The same principle which in synthetical tongues produces flexion, by which an object and its relation are expressed in a single word, gives rise, in style, to the 'period' where several ideas are united into one system. Thus Modern English and French style is analytic, while Modern German style is partly synthetical. The position of Caxton, in this respect, is a curious one. We have studied, in the chapter on Relative Pronouns, his use of relative subordination instead of demonstrative coordination. But although Caxton is fond of subordinating logically coordinate sentences by means of *which*, *wherof*, *wherefore*, this is but the outward apparel of synthetical style; our preceding paragraph on anacoluthiae plainly shows that Caxton had none of the mind of classical writers and was hardly capable of 'organizing' a period.

On the other hand, our author sometimes shows a preference for coordinate sentences. The Conjunction *and* plays a prominent part in his style and we have seen, when treating of this Conjunction, that Caxton even uses it where we should prefer the relative construction. His prose teems with *tho*, *thenne*, *thus*, *now*, *therof*, *therefore* which are often *not found* in the Du. text. (See *Order of Words*). Caxton does not know the difficult art of inward transition, by which each small sentence seems to be brought forth by the preceding and again, to originate the next.

To term his style 'analytic' in the passages I am thinking of, would be doing too much honour to it, (\*) Caxton has so little of analytic power that he often attaches as much importance to a parenthesis as to the principal idea (Remember, our first example of anacoluthia, above).

---

(\*) E. g.: *Tho wente reynard thens saying his Credo and leyde hym under an hawthorne. Thene was I glad and mery, and also toke none hede and wente to my chyldren and clucked hem together and wente wythout the wal for to walke* 10, al. 3.

THE END.

## I N D E X.

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	v
LIST OF WORKS . . . . .	xv
ARTICLE.	
Definite Article . . . . .	1
Indefinite Article . . . . .	5
NUMBER AND GENDER . . . . .	12
CASES.	
Nominative . . . . .	13
Dative . . . . .	13
Accusative . . . . .	14
Vocative . . . . .	15
Genitive . . . . .	17
ADJECTIVE . . . . .	25
PRONOUN.	
Personal . . . . .	29
Emphatic with „self” . . . . .	36
Reflexive . . . . .	36
Possessive . . . . .	38
Demonstrative . . . . .	44
Interrogative . . . . .	48
Relative . . . . .	50
Relative in the Sentence . . . . .	63
Indefinite . . . . .	73
Numerals . . . . .	81

VERB.	
Impersonal . . . . .	82
Transitive and Intransitive . . . . .	87
Auxiliary . . . . .	97
Reflexive and Passive . . . . .	101
Tense . . . . .	107
Mood.	
<i>Subjunctive</i> . . . . .	116
<i>Infinitive</i> . . . . .	118
<i>Active Participle</i> . . . . .	140
<i>Verbal Noun</i> . . . . .	144
<i>Passive Participle</i> . . . . .	150
ADVERB . . . . .	158
PREPOSITION.	
Denoting Origin . . . . .	168
" Rest . . . . .	174
" Motion . . . . .	185
Other Prepositions . . . . .	189
Connections of Prepositions and Adverbs . . . . .	192
Adverbial Prepositions . . . . .	193
CONJUNCTION.	
Coordinative . . . . .	196
Subordinative . . . . .	202
ORDER OF WORDS . . . . .	217
STYLE . . . . .	226



## ERRATA.

This work was finished before the publication of Franz's *Shakespeare Grammatik*, Halle, 1900, — which accounts for the absence of any reference to that work in the Introduction and the Bibliography.

---

P. v, l. 21, read *book* instead of *look*; — P. vi, l. 10, *dates* instead of *date*; — P. xvii, l. 23, *99* instead of *90*; — l. 30, *des* instead of *der*.

---





