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PRIMITIVE TEUTONIC ORDER OF WORDS.

I.

INTRODUCTION.

In striking contrast with our relatively precise knowledge of phonology is our ignorance of certain subjects in syntax, especially of the order of words. The phonology of primitive Teutonic we know with something like scientific accuracy; the order of words is still a matter of doubt and uncertainty. This uncertainty is strikingly illustrated by the number of different opinions that have been offered on the subject. For example, note the different theories as to the original position of the verb. Erdmann¹ and Tomanetz² maintain that in primitive Teutonic the normal position of the verb was second in the clause. A greater number, including Ries³ and Behaghel,⁴ believe that the normal position of the verb was at the end of the clause. An opinion different from both of these is that recently advanced by Wackernagel,⁵ who maintains that the differentiation of principal and subordinate clauses in modern German is no specific modern development, but is the direct lineal representative of the original Indo-European order of words. Braune⁶ takes a still different view, and believes that the order of words in primitive Teutonic was free. Wunderlich,⁷ practically in agreement with Braune, has recently expressed...

² Tomanetz, *Relativsätze bei den ahd. Übersetzern des 8 u. 9 Th.*, Wien, 1879.
³ Ries, *Quellen und Forschungen*, XLI. 4.
⁵ Wackernagel, *J. F.*, I. 333.
⁷ Wunderlich, *Der deutsche Satzbau*, Stuttg., 1892.
the opinion that in primitive Teutonic the speech-element coming first in articulation was the one that stood in the foreground of consciousness at the moment of utterance. Such is the diversity of opinion on this subject.

A final solution of the problem can be had only after a thorough investigation of the order of words in the oldest dialects of the Teutonic group. This field of investigation has been by no means neglected. Ries induces his theory, already mentioned, from the facts of word-order observed in the Heliand and in Beowulf. Tomanetz's theory is based on facts observed in the OHG. translations of the eighth and ninth centuries. Other investigators have been at work: Lohner, Starker, Rannow, Ohly, Erdmann, and Gering in OHG.; Friedrichs in Gothic; Kube, Todt, and Smith in Old English. But heretofore, if we except the passing consideration given the subject by Hermann, no one has attempted to collate the results of these separate investigations. It is my aim to take this further step, and from the results of the investigations mentioned above and of independent investigations of my own in Gothic, in Old Norse, and in Old English, to converge as many rays of light as possible on this obscure point and to determine whether the facts in the different dialects do not point to some one order of words in the primitive Teutonic speech.

But before proceeding to cite statistics and draw conclusions, I shall attempt to define my method by clearing up an ambiguity which has misled many writers on this subject. This ambiguity arises from the twofold meaning attached to

4 Ohly, Wortstellung bei Otfrid, Diss. Freiburg, 1888.
5 Erdmann, Syntax des Sprache Otfrids, Halle, 1874–76.
6 Gering, Causalsätze bei den ahd. Übersetzern des 8 u. 9 Jh., Halle, 1876.
7 Friedrichs, Stellung des pron. pers. im Gotischen, Diss. Terna 1883.
8 Kube, Wortstellung in der Sachsenchronik.
9 Todt, Anglia, 16.
10 Smith, Mod. Lang. Assoc. of Amer., 1893.
11 Hermann, K. Z. 33.
the phrase order of words. Order of words may refer to a subjective movement, to the order in which the thought-elements receive expression. In this sense of the phrase, the order of words is, or tends to be, always the same, in all languages, ancient or modern; or perhaps better expressed, the principles that determine the order of words, in this sense of the phrase, are universal, as valid for synthetic Latin as for analytic French or English. This general subjective order in the progression of ideas is from the known to the unknown. Of a thing known, something new, unknown, is predicated. That the new idea may be connected with ideas already in mind, the speaker begins with something known. This something known, from which the speaker sets out, called by Weil\(^1\) the "initial notion," by von der Gabelentz\(^2\) the "psychological subject," naturally comes first, the "goal of discourse," or "psychological predicate," coming last. The goal of one proposition may form the initial notion of the proposition following, making a continuous thought-chain. Only in case of passion or excitement, when the new idea or feeling rushes with violence to the foreground of consciousness, does it come first in the proposition. This departure from the rule, known as 'pathetic order,' is often made by persons in speaking of subjects with which they are very familiar or by persons under the influence of passion, as in poetry. The speaker in such cases is apt to jump from one point to another without giving the connecting thought.

At the cost of a slight digression I shall attempt to expound some of the universal principles that determine word-order in this first acceptation of the phrase. In the first place, word-order is influenced by the nature of the clause. Imperative clauses are quite different in nature from affirmative clauses, and this difference has its influence directly on the accentuation, indirectly on the order of words. For instance, in imperative clauses the interest is centred in the verb, which, accordingly, should have the position of greatest emphasis.

1 Weil, Order of Words in the Ancient Languages, transl. by Super, Boston, 1887.
2 Von der Gabelentz, Zt. f. Volkerpsych., VIII. 1874-75.
Further, clauses of command are usually isolated and are, therefore, free from the influence of context. Interrogative clauses differ from affirmative clauses in that a question has not in itself the completeness that belongs to a statement of fact, but waits for a reply. This peculiar incompleteness, expectancy, influences the accentuation and, directly or indirectly, the order of words. Wunderlich has pointed out the essential difference between principal and subordinate clauses. He says (p. 91): 'In the principal clause consciousness and language work almost simultaneously; in the subordinate clause consciousness precedes speech. The principal clause builds itself up before the hearer in individual elements; the subordinate clause, on the other hand, introduces complete ideas with which the principal clause deals as with a unity.' This difference between principal and subordinate clauses has its influence on the order of words. For the subordinate clause the most appropriate construction is the 'locked construction,' the governing word, usually the verb, standing at the end.

Such internal forces undoubtedly influence word-order. Another potent influence is the consideration of emphasis. This has usually been regarded as the most important influence in determining the order of words. It is usually assumed that the first place in the sentence is the position of emphasis.

This is possibly true of isolated sentences; but, as was explained in the introduction, in context, if there is any absolute position of emphasis in affirmative clauses, it is at the end of the clause.

To form a more accurate notion of the influence of emphasis in determining word-order, we must bear in mind that this influence is an indirect one. The desire to emphasize first influences the accentuation and only indirectly, through the accentuation, influences the order of words. The principle of emphasis, then, influences word-order only in this way, that a writer or speaker always endeavors to place the word to be emphasized in the position that naturally has the stress, the next most important word in the position that naturally has the secondary stress, and so on, thus placing the ideas in perspective.
To determine the principles of accentuation, then, is necessary before one can understand the influence of the principle of emphasis on word-order. This has not yet been satisfactorily done. In making such a determination, the unit of language considered must be, not the logical unit, the sentence, but the spoken unit, the breath group. At present we know only that the accentuation is different in different kinds of clause, the interrogative clause differing in this respect from the affirmative clause, and that different languages have peculiar modes of accentuation. For example, in French the accent seems to fall naturally at the end of the breath group; in Irish it seems to fall naturally at the beginning. Note the peculiar influence of the different national modes of accentuation on the word-order in the following sentences: 'At such a time as this I wouldn't tell you a lie.' 'It's not a lie that I'd be tellin' you now.'

All that we can say at present about the influence of emphasis on word-order, is that the emphasis of any position is not an absolute one, but a relative one, depending on the language, on the kind of clause, and on the number of unemphatic words surrounding the position.

The consideration of force has a great influence in determining the order of words; but in word-order, as in the more general subject of rhetoric, the first essential is clearness. This influence, which heretofore has been almost entirely overlooked, is the most potent influence in determining word-order. Clearness is promoted by putting next to each other words which are connected in thought, and accordingly upon connection as well as upon emphasis depends the order of words. The element that stands at the beginning of a clause is not necessarily the element to be emphasized; it is usually the element that is associated, by likeness or contrast, with the last element in the preceding clause. The arrangement of words and phrases in a clause is determined primarily by the nearness of their relation to each other.

In addition to the above-mentioned principles determining word-order, must be mentioned the logical one, analogy. The tendencies which owe their origin to considerations of con-
nection or of emphasis have, by a levelling process, developed into fixed rules. The result is the fixed order characteristic of the modern analytic languages, in which different arrangements of words have different meanings.

It must further be noted that the order of words in poetry is quite different from that in prose. The functions of the two kinds of writing are in many respects different. Poetry expresses states of feeling that cannot easily be expressed in prose. It does this because it throws off the restraints of logical arrangement, and jumps from idea to idea more in the natural manner of thought. In the older Teutonic literature the usual arrangement of the essential elements of the clause is often departed from, the 'pathetic order' appearing in the form of inversion. In the later literature the same order occurs, but the real inversion is concealed through the use of a deputy subject (e.g., *es war* . . . etc.).

The order of words representing the order of ideas, as we said above, is governed by the same general principles in all languages, ancient and modern. Note the difference of meaning in the two following different arrangements of the same sentence: 1 'To escape from his misery, he slew himself; He slew himself to escape from his misery.' The choice between these two arrangements would be determined by the context. The principles of connection and emphasis would operate. The speaker would begin with the known, reserving the new element for the end. Note exactly the same effect of order in the two following Latin sentences: *Quia natura mutari non potest, idcirco verae amicitiæ sempiternae sunt; Veræ amicitiæ sempiternae sunt, quia natura mutari non potest.* We have another illustration in the stock example, *Romulus Romam condidit.* The order of words in this proposition will depend on the context, on the thread of the discourse. If the subject under discussion is the founding of cities, the 'initial notion,' or 'psychological subject,' will be the founding, and the order will be: *Condidit Romam Romulus; the founder of Rome was Romulus.* If, on the other hand, the subject in hand is the founder, the order will be: *Idem Romulus Romam*

---

1 This and the following two examples are quoted from Weil.
condidit; The same Romulus founded Rome. If the subject is the cities founded, the order will be: Hanc urben condidit Romulus; This city was founded by Romulus. In each instance the principle of connection operates; the idea connecting with what precedes, comes first; the new idea comes last. In other words, the progression is from the known to the unknown. Or, expressed in still different terms, the 'psychological subject' comes first in each instance, the 'psychological predicate' last.

Order of words may, however, have a second, very different meaning. It may denote an objective movement. It may refer to the relative position of the essential terms of a proposition. As Bergaigne\(^1\) has maintained, there are but two essential relations between the terms of a proposition,—the predicative and the dependent. Consequently there are but three essential terms,—the subject, the predicate, and the object. The history of the proposition with three essential terms is probably as follows: We express our thoughts by means of words grouped into sentences or propositions. Originally the groups most commonly occurring were those expressing action. For such expression, if complete, there are essential three fundamental terms: one to express the actor, another the action, a third that acted upon. Though not all groups had actions to express, propositions expressing action occurred so frequently as to become the dominating type, so much so that to this model were conformed the less frequent expressions not describing action, so that in the end all propositions, whether expressing action or not, became constituted with three essential terms called subject, object, predicate. Though in many instances the subject is no longer the actor, as in passive constructions, this pattern is the one used in all propositions. The question as to the order of these terms, it will be readily seen, is quite different from the question as to the order of words representing the order of ideas.

It is apparent that the order of words representing the order of ideas, since it is the same in all languages, ancient and modern, is not a subject for historical consideration.

\(^1\) Bergaigne, *Mem. Soc. de Linguistique*, III.
The matter of the relative position of the syntactical terms—subject, predicate, object—is different. In uninflected languages the order of words is an important means of indicating syntactical relations. It shows not only the order in which the words presented themselves in the mind of the writer, but it serves to indicate the person or thing acting and the person or thing acted upon. Even in inflected languages there will gradually establish itself a traditional order of words. Ideas become associated with forms of expression, and in consequence the order of words becomes fixed. Speech custom is developed. For example, in Malay, Polynesian, Siamese, Anamese, the attribute follows, by preference, the word modified; in Teutonic, Chinese, Tartar, Japanese, it precedes. In modern English also, in principal clauses, idiom demands that the grammatical subject precede the grammatical predicate. Within these restraints the principles, above mentioned, of connection and emphasis must operate. When these principles demand that the person or thing acting stand at the end, there must be some way of evading the fixed law of order. This evasion is usually effected by the use of the passive, or by the use of a deputy subject. One instance must suffice. In the sentence, 'There came about a revulsion of public sentiment,' the principle of emphasis prescribes that revulsion of sentiment should come last. This desired order is obtained without violation of the fixed principle that the grammatical subject should come first, by the use of the deputy subject, there. Here, then, we see the psychological principle of emphasis operating within the restraints of a conventional order of grammatical terms, or order of words as we shall henceforth use the phrase.

By making this distinction between the two different meanings of the phrase, order of words, we have accomplished two results. In the first place, we have eliminated certain theories as to the primitive Teutonic order. When Wunderlich asserts that 'the order of words is determined by the order in which the different thought elements present themselves in consciousness,' he is probably right as far as he goes; but he leaves still undetermined the order of the syntactical parts
in a proposition. His theory, then, has no bearing on our dis-
cussion. Braune's 1 recent discussion of the subject is open to
an objection of the same kind. In his paper he considers only
the position of the verb, and considers practically only three
possible positions. His discussion narrows itself to this: Did
the verb occupy the first, the second, or the third position of
stress in the clause? He concludes that the verb was free to
occupy any one of these three positions. His conclusion is
probably right. But was not this position subject to one of
the general principles mentioned above? Did not this freedom
of position exist, as in modern German and in modern English,
within the restraints of a fixed order of syntactical terms?
This is what I shall try to determine in the following pages.

The second result accomplished is the exact definition of
our subject. I shall now proceed to discuss the relative
position in primitive Teutonic of the grammatical terms,
subject, predicate, object.

As already mentioned, many different theories have been
advanced. Wunderlich's we may leave out of consideration
after the discussion above. The theory that the order of
words in Indo-European was free, if it refers to the order of
syntactical parts, cannot have been true for any long
period; for besides the natural association of ideas with
forms of expression, it seems probable, from the evidence
of compounds, that the IE. parent speech in its earliest
stages was uninflected, and therefore dependent on word-
order for the indication of the syntactical relations between
the terms, subject, object, predicate.

One might infer on a priori grounds that in the case of a
proposition with three simple terms, the natural order would
be; subject, object, predicate. This is the order followed in
the language of the deaf and dumb; but it is difficult in this
matter entirely to eliminate the influence of custom and to
say with certainty that the order subject, object, verb is, from
intrinsic reasons, the natural one. We must, then, search for
further evidence.

1 Braune, Forschungen zur deutschen Philologie, “Festgabe für R. Hildebrand,”
Leipzig, 1894.
Some of this further evidence is supplied by compounds and by inflected forms of speech. From inflected verbal forms, in which the verbal root precedes the pronominal element of the ending, and from compounds in which qualifier precedes qualified, we infer that in the primitive form of the IE. language the predicate preceded the subject. From compounds in which governed precedes governing, we infer that in primitive IE. the object preceded the predicate. The primitive norm of order, then, would be; object, predicate, subject.

Further evidence on this subject is supplied by the earliest monuments of the different languages of the IE. family. This evidence seems to point to the fact that in the parent language the predicate came last in the proposition. In Greek, in Russ., in Armen., and in Celtic, traces of this original order are relatively few. Also in early Teutonic it remains to demonstrate conclusively that this was the original order. But in Lith. and in Lat. the tendency is most noticeable. In Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic war, 2d book, if we leave the verb be out of consideration, there are only fifteen instances in which the verb stands elsewhere than at the end of the clause. Further, in O.Pers. and in Skt. the verb at the end is the regular order. In the Brahmanas, even in the locative absolute, the most primitive form of the proposition, the verb stands last, though in this same text the qualifiers regularly precede the qualified. It is to be noted that the relation between an adjective and its substantive is the same as that between subject and predicate; the adjective and its substantive is equivalent to a subordinate clause. To adopt Bergaigne's conclusions, the order of subject and predicate seems to have been inverted in principal propositions in order to distinguish these from subordinate ones, the original order being represented by the position of the attributive adjective before its substantive. The relative position of subject and object in Skt. prose and in oldest Lat. was evidently variable. But the tendency was to place the subject before the object, which in turn directly preceded the predicate. This was no doubt due to the logical
dualism of the proposition, according to which the subject formed one part, the predicate and object a second. Naturally, then, when the primitive order was inverted, the subject placed itself first, forming the first part of the proposition, while the predicate, preceded by the object, formed the second part. To the type of order, then, _object, subject, predicate_, may be added a second type, probably used concurrent with the first, and probably soon becoming dominant, _subject, object, predicate_.

Further strong evidence in favor of this position of the verb at the end, is supplied by Delbrück. He shows that the regular position of the verb in Skt. was at the end, and that the enclitic accentuation of the Skt. verb was probably due to this position. He further shows that the accent of the Greek verb is that of the Skt. verb, only modified by the law of three moræ. He concludes that this accent is pro-ethnic, and that consequently the final position of the verb, the cause of the accent, is pro-ethnic.

Evidence, both _a priori_ and _a posteriori_, seems to indicate that originally in IE. the verb stood at the end of the clause. The question, then, arises, whether the order of words in Teutonic is descended directly from that of the parent speech or is a new development. The former supposition seems much the more probable, since the Teutonic could hardly have been entirely independent of the parent language in this matter. External evidence, then, would lead us to expect that in primitive Teutonic the regular position of the verb was last in the clause.

It remains to bring internal evidence to bear on the solution of this problem.

II.

WORD-ORDER IN GOThic.

In making an historical study of Teutonic word-order, we naturally direct our attention first to the oldest language in

1 Delbrück, _Syntaktische Forschungen_, IV. p. 148 ff.
the family, to the Gothic. Unfortunately there are preserved in Gothic only two works of sufficient length to be of any value in the study of word-order; the translation of the Bible by Wulfila, and the so-called Skeireins, fragments of a commentary on the Gospel of John.

For the study of word-order, Wulfila is of little value, owing to the slavish way in which he followed the Greek order. Friedrichs, in his investigation of the word-order in Wulfila, explains the exact correspondence of the Gothic order with that of the Greek original, as resulting not from slavish imitation on the part of the translator, but from the natural similarity of word-order in the two languages. But so exact a coincidence in every phrase is hardly to be explained in this simple manner. Although many of the Greek idioms belong also to Teutonic, and actually do occur in other ancient Teutonic monuments, it is absurd to assume between any two languages a natural similarity in word-order as striking as that between the Gothic translation of the Bible and the Greek original. Consequently the statistics gathered by Friedrichs show not the word-order of the Gothic of that period, but that of New Testament Greek, and the only evidence afforded by the translation of Wulfila is that offered by those passages 1) in which the Gothic employs more words than the Greek does and, therefore, necessarily has an independent arrangement, or 2) in which the word-order of the translation differs from that of the original.

Such passages are not numerous. In the fragmentary translation of Matthew, if we leave out of consideration differences in the position of the particles, we find less than a hundred. Of these passages three-fourths are, 1) instances of Gothic circumlocution and only about one-fourth are, 2) instances of departure from the Greek order.

The few general tendencies revealed in these passages I will point out.

(a) The position of the Gothic particle usually corresponds to that of the Greek particle, e.g.:

\[ fugkei\theta \text{ im auk} = \delta o\kappa o\theta o\nu \gamma\rho, \text{ vi. 7}. \]
But frequently the Greek post-positive particle is represented in Gothic by a particle standing first in the clause, e.g.:

\[ \text{Ib huzdjaip izwis} = \text{Θηρανιχστε δε ὅμων, vi. 20}; \]
\[ \text{unte jabai fijaip ainana} = \text{ἡ γὰρ τὸν ἑνα μισησω, vi. 24}. \]

(b) The object pronoun follows the verb.
1) Independent of the Greek, e.g.:
   \[ \text{fugkeip im auk} = \text{δοκούσιν γὰρ, vi. 7}; \]
   \[ \text{ogeip izwis ins} = \text{φοβηθῆτε αὐτοὺς, x. 26}; \]
   \[ \text{ataugidedun sik} = \text{ἐνέφανώθησαν, xxvii. 53}. \]

2) In disagreement with Greek order, e.g.:
   \[ \text{ibai han aigibai buk} = \text{μηποτέ σε παραδη, iii. 25}; \]
   \[ \text{Mihanei is rodida pata du im} = \text{ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ix. 18}. \]

Note. — There is one exception, due no doubt to counter-tendency (f).

\[ \text{ik in watin izwis daupja} = \text{Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὄμως ἐν ὀδηγί, iii. 11}. \]

(c) The possessive adjective (pronominal) follows its substantive.
1) Independent of the Greek, e.g.:
   \[ \text{bo giba peina} = \text{τὸ δώρον, iii. 24}. \]

2) In disagreement with the Greek, e.g.:
   \[ \text{haubip pein} = \text{σον τὴν κεφαλήν, vi. 17}; \]
   \[ \text{waurdma meina} = \text{μον τοὺς λόγους, vii. 26}. \]

(d) On the other hand the demonstrative adjective precedes its substantive.
1) Independent of the Greek. No instances.
2) In disagreement with the Greek, e.g.:
   \[ \text{in jainai heilai} = \text{ἐν τῇ ὀρφεί ἐκείνη, viii. 13}. \]

Note. — In one instance a numeral follows its noun in disagreement with the Greek order. \[ \text{bi heila niundon} = \text{περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐννάτην ὄραν, xxvii. 46}. \]

(e) The dependent genitive precedes its substantive.
1) Independent of the Greek. One instance,
   \[ \text{in Tyre jah Seidone londa} = \text{ἐν Τίρω καὶ Σειδώνι, xi. 26}. \]
2) In disagreement with Greek order. One instance, 
afstassais bokos = ἀποστάσιον, iii. 31.

(f) There is a tendency in the case of verbs to place the governed before the governing word.
1) Independent of the Greek. The past participle always precedes the finite verb, e.g.:
gamelib ist = ἤγειράττει, xi. 10;
wrohipis ist = κατηγορεῖτο, xxvii. 12;
πατεί δυ σταναὶ γαταύης ἤκαου = ὁτι κατέκριθη, xxvii. 3.

In a similar manner predicate nouns precede their verb, e.g.:

ni skuld ist = ὤκ ἔκεστι, xxvii. 6;
uskunb was = ἐφάνη, ix. 33;
hrain warp = ἐκαθαρίσθη, viii. 3.

Note. — This does not hold true of imperative clauses, e.g., wairp
hrains = καθαρίσθη, viii. 3.

The verb may stand at the end of the clause.
1) Independent of the Greek, e.g.:

sumaih ban losam slohun = οἱ δὲ ἐρράπισαν, xxvi. 67.

2) In disagreement with Greek order.
it in watin izwis daupja = Ἔγγο μὲν βαπτίζω ὑπὸς εὖ ὑδατί, iii. 11.

The favorite position of the object pronoun, then, seems to be after the verb. It must be noted, however, that the pronouns occurring are mostly reflexives, and further that in none of the instances cited above does the pronoun have a direct reference to the preceding clause. Consequently in none of these instances was there any special motive for giving the pronoun a position early in the clause, and the instances may not represent the general tendency.

The possessive adjectives follow the substantive, and since they are all pronominal, perhaps there is some connection between this position and that of the object pronoun. The fact that the Greek post-positive particle is frequently represented in Gothic by a particle at the beginning of the clause
indicates that the initial place in the Gothic clause is not as much as in Greek a place of emphasis.

But the most noticeable fact is the evident fondness for the synthetic order (governed preceding governing word). This construction is favored in the position of the demonstrative adjective before its substantive, in the position of the dependent genitive before its governing noun and in the position of the finite verb in relation to objects, to participles, and to predicate nouns.

The evidence, then, afforded by Wulfila is not comprehensive enough. The value of the Skeireins for determining the word-order is diminished by the consideration that this work also may be a translation.

That it is not a translation, at least not a slavish translation, from the Greek seems probable from the order of words. One feature of the Skeireins is the citation of biblical passages upon which the comments are made. These passages are probably taken from Wulfila, and the word-order is, of course, that of Wulfila. The statistics for the word-order in these passages cited agrees essentially with those gathered by Friedrichs from Wulfila direct, if we make allowance for the fact that Friedrichs considers only clauses with pronominal subject. Friedrichs's statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics that I have gathered for the citations in the Skeireins are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these sets of statistics represents Greek order. Note now the difference in the statistics for the independent part of the Skeireins:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Marold, *Die Schriftcitate der Skeireins*, Progr. Königsberg, 1892.
The order of words, then, in the Skeireins proper, effectually dispels any idea that the Skeireins is a slavish translation, from the Greek at least.

That the Skeireins is not a translation from the Latin is by no means certain. In certain peculiar features the word-order resembles that of Latin. For instance note the frequent separation of adjective and substantive by verb, e.g.: po ahmeinon anafilhands daupeins, III. b; pana laist skeiris brukjands waurdis, V. b; posei ustauhana habaida wairpan fram fraujin garehsn, I. b.

But in other respects the work shows idioms which seem to be peculiar to itself. For a list, vid. Bernhardt, Wulfila, p. 612. On the whole, in default of any further evidence to the contrary, we will assume that word-order in the Skeireins proper represents the Gothic word-order of that time (probably the fifth century).

A. Principal Clauses.

I. Affirmative Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

It is a difficult matter to determine with any degree of accuracy the frequency of inversion or the laws governing its occurrence, owing to the fact that in 47 instances out of 76, the total number of principal affirmative clauses, the grammatical subject is unexpressed. The favored order, however, seems to be the 'direct.' In the 29 clauses with grammatical subject expressed, the order is 'direct' in 20, e.g.: patuh wesi wipra pata gadob, I. c; po nu insakana wesun fram Iohanne, IV. d.

Furthermore, in many of the clauses with long transposition, the order could hardly have been inverted if the subject had been expressed, e.g.: at allamma waurstwe ainaizos anabusnais beidip, V. a; jah swa managai ganohjands . . . ni patainei ganauhan paurftais im fragaf, ak filaus maiso, VII. b.
Even in clauses with introductory adverbial phrases, the order is not always inverted. Three instances of 'irregular-direct' order occur:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Inuh pis} ... \textit{nasjands} ... \textit{anastodjands}, \textit{ustaiknada pana} ... , II. a; \textit{patuh pan gipands} \textit{aiwaggelista ataugida ei} ... , III. a; \textit{pata nu gasaihvands}, Johannes \textit{posei} ... , \textit{mib sunfaj qah}, I. b.
\end{itemize}

In this same category are to be placed other clauses with introductory phrases, in which the subject is not expressed but in which the order corresponds to the 'direct' order, \textit{e.g.}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Inuh pis nu jah leik mans andnam}, I. d;
\item \textit{Inuh pis bairhtaba uns laiseip qipands}, III. d.
\end{itemize}

Usually, however, in clauses with introductory phrases, when the subject is expressed, the order is inverted; when the subject is not expressed, the verb stands next to the introductory phrase, as it would stand in an inverted clause, \textit{e.g.}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Inuh pis qam gamains allaise nasjands}, I. a; swaei \textit{sijai daupeins Johannes}, III. d; \textit{gadob nu was mais pans} ... , I. c; \textit{patuh pan insok kunnands}, V. a.
\end{itemize}

In all, there occur 9 instances of inversion, some in clauses with introductory phrases, like those quoted above, others with the verb at the beginning of the clause. Two instances of the latter occur:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Skulum nu allai weis}, V. c;
\item \textit{Wasuh pan jah frauja} ... , III. b.
\end{itemize}

There are not enough instances of clauses in the apodosis, to enable one to determine what is the regular order in such clauses. There is one instance of inversion:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Bigitan was hpe hlaibe ib. tainjons fullos}, VII. c.
\end{itemize}

We conclude, then, that the usual order is the direct, but that the inverted order also occurs, especially after introductory phrases. The following table will show the frequency of the different arrangements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject not expressed</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{1 Direct order after an introd. word or phrase other than subject or verb.}
2. Position of Verb with Relation to Dependencies.

There is a marked tendency to place the verb, if not last in the clause, at least after one or more of the adverbial dependencies. An instance of partial transposition is:

\[ jah \ swa \ managai \ ganohjands \ldots ni \ hatainei \ ganuwan \ haurftais \ im \ fragaf, \ ak \ filaus \ maiso, \ VII. \ b. \]

An instance of especially long transposition is:

\[ unto \ bata \ qibano \ ei \ldots, \ ni \ ibnon \ ak \ galeika \ sweriba \ usgiban \ uns \ laiseib, \ V. \ d. \]

But though the tendency is to place the verb after other members of the clause, there is everywhere evident a great freedom of arrangement. This freedom was noticed in the position of the verb with relation to the subject; it is also manifest in the verb’s position with relation to its dependencies. For instance, in the same page, in Balg’s edition, in expressing similar ideas the writer employs different arrangements of words, e.g.:

\[ \text{inuh pis bairhtaba uns laiseib qipands, III. d;} \]
\[ \text{inuh pis laiseib uns qipands, IV. a.} \]

Words to be emphasized are free to stand first in the clause, e.g.:

\[ \text{mahtedi swepauh jah im \ldots I. b;} \]
\[ \text{gadob nu was mais pans \ldots I. c;} \]
\[ \text{naudipaurfts auk was jah gadob wistai, II. d.} \]

The following table will show the relative frequency of the different positions of the verb with relation to its dependencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Imperative and Interrogative Clauses.

There are no instances of independent imperative clauses, and only two of direct questions. In one of these latter the
verb stands first, although with no subject expressed. In the other the transposed order occurs:

nei auk puhtedi pau in garaihteins gaagwein ufargaggan po faura ju us anastodeinai garaidon garehsn, I. c; hvaiwa stojan jah ni stojan sa sama mahtedi, V. b.

B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Verb.

The regular order in subordinate clauses is the direct. Only four instances of inversion occur.

Afar patei matida so managei, VII. c (Temporal);
in pisei ju jah leikis krainino inmaidih was sidus jah . . . III. b (Causal);
hardizo pize ungalaubjandane warp hairto, VI. c (Causal);
swaei stijai daupins Johannes, III. d (Result).

2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

There is to be noted in subordinate clauses the same tendency as in principal clauses to place the verb after its dependencies.

For subordinate clauses the statistics are:

a. PURPOSE CLAUSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.:

jah ni missaqibaina, V. a (Neutral).
ei galaisjaina sik bi pamma twa, V. a (Normal);
ei, . . . pisos manasedais gauwarhtedi usluncin, I. a (Part. Transp.);
ei fraujins mikilein gakannidedi, IV. d (Transp.).

b. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.:

patei is was sa sama, VII. d (Normal);
ataugida ei so garehsns bi ina neha andja was pairh Herodes birunain, III. a (Part. Transp.);
patei swaleikamma waldufnja mahtais nauhs ustaiknida westi, I. b (Transp.).
c. INDIRECT QUESTIONS.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   2     |     1  |        0     |     0

ni kunnandins hvaðar skuldtri maíza, III. a.

d. CLAUSES OF MANNER.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   2     |     1  |        0     |     0

e.g.:
swe silba is qîbî, VI. a (Neutral);
analeíko swe Fillîppus gasakada . . ., VII. a (Normal).

e. CAUSAL CLAUSES.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   0     |     1  |        3     |     2

e.g.:
in þisei ni attauhun ina, VIII. b (Normal);
in þis eí mîthpan frumist hausida fram laisarjá, II. b (Part. Transp.);
in þisei wistai manna was, IV. c (Transp.).

f. RESULT CLAUSES.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   0     |     0  |        1     |     2

e.g.:
eípan garaihtein warb bi swiknein sokeins gawagida, III. b (Part. Transp.);
eípan waila ins maudeîp, VI. a (Transp.).

g. RELATIVE CLAUSES.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   2     |     3  |        1     |     3

e.g.:
þatei aflifnoda, VII. c (Neutral);
swe wilda andnimian ise, VII. c (Normal);
saei in aubida ·m· jere attans ise foidida, VII. d (Transp.).

h. CONCESSIVE CLAUSES.

---------|---------|--------------|--------
   0     |     0  |        0     |     1

þaukhjábaí us himina ana airbai in manne garehsnais qam, IV. d.
\[\text{i. Conditional Clauses.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ib\ nu\ ains\ jah\ sama\ wesi\ bi\ Sabaillaus\ insahtai,\ V.\ b\ (Part.\ Transp.)\;\]
\[jabai\ in\ leikai\ wisan\ buhta,\ IV.\ c\ (Transp.).\]

\[\text{j. Temporal Clauses.}\]

Only one temporal clause occurs; that one is inverted.

\[afar\ patei\ matida\ so\ managei,\ VII.\ c.\]

Summing up, we have for subordinate clauses the following statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that the order, as in Wulfila, is substantially the same in principal and in subordinate clauses. In both kinds of clauses the favorite order is the transposed. A particularly striking instance of transposition is the following:

\[ei,\ swesamma\ wiljin\ jah\ swesai\ mahtai\ galeikonds\ bamma\ faurpis\ gaqiujandin\ daupans,\ (silba,\ gaqiujan\ daupans)\ gahaitands\ pize\ ungalaubjandane\ brasabalbein\ andbeitands\ gasoki,\ V.\ b.\]

\[\text{C. Participial and Infinitive Phrases.}\]

In participial and infinitive phrases there is manifest the same tendency as in principal and subordinate clauses, to place the verbal form at the end, or at least after one or more of the other members of the clause. Classifying these phrases according to the position of the verbal element, we obtain for the Skeireins proper the following statistics:

\[\text{1. Participles stand.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>First.</th>
<th>Middle.</th>
<th>Last.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Infinitives stand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under 'First' are included those clauses in which the participle (or infinitive) precedes all its dependencies, *e.g.*:

- gasaljands sik faur uns hunsl jas sauf gupa, I. a.
- du afargaggan anabus gufs, I. c.

Under 'Middle' are included those clauses in which the verbal element follows some of its grammatical dependencies, but precedes others, *e.g.*:

- anduh pana laist skeirs brukjands waurdis, V. b;
- skulum . . . weis . . . andsatjan bauranana, V. c.

Under 'Last' are included those phrases in which the verbal element stands at the end, after all its dependencies, *e.g.*:

- ni ibna nih galeiks unsarai garaihtein ak silba garaihtei wisands, I. a;
- nu du letilai hveilai galaubjan, VI. a.

Under 'Neutral' are included those phrases consisting of verbal element (participle or infinitive) alone, *e.g.*:

- ei frauja qimands mahtai, I. c;
- pana anawairpan dom, II. c.

For the sake of convenience the present and past participles have been considered together. But among the instances considered, the present participle occurs most frequently (ninety-three out of ninety-eight). In fact, the frequent use of the present participle, which is used but sparingly in the other dialects, is a very noticeable feature of the Skeireins. A still more remarkable feature is the use of the present participle for the present indicative, *e.g.*:

- afaruh pan po in wato wairpands hrain jah hyssopon jah wullai raudai ufartrausnjandans, III. c.
The past participles that occur are usually combined with auxiliaries to make compound verbs. In Wulfila it was noted that in compound verbs the participle preceded the finite verb. The same is true in the Skeireins. In the Skeireins proper, among eleven compound verbs there is but one instance in which the participle follows the auxiliary, and in that instance the reason is self-evident.

*eipan garaihtaba warp bi swiknein sokeins gawagida, II. b.*

In the same way a predicate noun or adjective precedes the copula, e.g.:

-silba garaihtei wisands, I. a;
in þisei wistai manna was, IV. c;
ains jah sa sama wesi, V. b;
gub wisandin, V. d.

Exceptions occur, but only three out of twenty, e.g.:

-at ni wisandein aljai waihtai, VII. b.

The personal pronoun object in the Skeireins is an unstressed word, and like the particles, is free in its position, with the exception that it usually stands next to the verb. That is to say, it may follow or precede the verb. It was noted that in Wulfila the object pronoun preferred the position after the verb. This preference may be discerned also in the Skeireins. But usually the position of the pronoun object is determined by the context; it is used, like the Greek particle, to separate two successive words which are to be emphasized, e.g.:

-ei laisareis uns wairbai pisos . . ., I. d;
inuþ pis bairhtaba uns laiseip gipands . . ., III. d;
eipan waila ins maudeip gipands, VI. a.

When the clause is transposed, the unstressed pronoun never follows, but precedes, thus adding to the emphasis of the verb in the final position, e.g.:

-unte pata gipano . . . uns laiseip, V. d;
ganohjands ins wailawiznai . . . im fragaf, VII. b;
swa filu auk gamanwida ins wairpan, VII. c.
Reflexives, also, are usually unstressed, and are put immediately after the verb, *e.g.*:

\[ \text{gasaljands sik, I. a; afwandida sik, II. a.} \]

Only in case of inversion or of transposition, when the position after the verb is one of too great emphasis, does the reflexive precede the verb, *e.g.*:

\[ \text{mib sis misso sik andrununn sumai, III. a.} \]
\[ \text{faur mel sik gahaban, VIII. a.} \]

First place in the sentence does not seem to have been a position of as great emphasis in Gothic as in Greek. In fact, the author of the Skeireins frequently places an unstressed particle in this position. With the Gothic the final position seems to have been the position of emphasis. In fact, the most noticeable feature of word-order in the Skeireins is the tendency to place the governing word after the word or words governed, 'Ascending Construction' or synthetic order. This construction is illustrated by the following striking examples:

\[ \text{pizos du gupa garaihteins, I. d;} \]
\[ \text{pana iupa briggandin in piudangardjai gups wig, II. a.} \]
\[ \text{po leikeinon us wambai munands gabaurf, II. b;} \]
\[ \text{leikis hraineino inmaidips was sidus jah so bi gup hrainei, III. b.} \]
\[ \text{posei ustauhana hahaida wairpan fram fraujin garehsn, I. b;} \]
\[ \text{po faura ju us anastodeinai garaidon garehsn, I. c.} \]

Instances of the opposite or 'Descending Construction' also occur, *e.g.*:

\[ \text{afleta frauaurhte jah fragift weihis ahmins, III. c.} \]

Another striking feature is the rhetorical separation of words, *e.g.*:

\[ \text{ak himinakunda anafilhands fulhsnja, IV. d;} \]
\[ \text{missaleikaim bandwihs namnam, V. b;} \]
\[ \text{anduh pana laist skeiris brukjands waurdis, V. a.} \]

On the whole we must conclude that the Gothic order of words was by no means rigidly fixed. This fact is proved
for the Skeireins by the number of exceptions to any law that we may formulate, and by the rhetorical arrangements for emphasis; for the Bible translation by the license which permitted Wulfila to follow the Greek order so exactly, and yet to produce a work which is not only intelligible, but seemingly not unnatural. On the other hand, in both works there is manifest a fondness for the synthetic order. The governing word, noun or verb, usually comes after the governed word, thus binding the parts of the expression into a closely united whole.

III.

OLD HIGH GERMAN WORD-ORDER.

The subject of word-order has been examined more carefully in OHG. than in any of the other Teutonic dialects. I shall content myself, therefore, with the results of the investigations of others, and shall only attempt to bring these results into a form convenient for reference and for comparison with the results of my own investigation in Gothic and in Old English. I shall take up the prose monuments in their chronological order, considering: first, the translations of the eighth and ninth centuries, including the Monsee-Wiener fragments of a translation of Matthew, the translation of Isidor’s ‘Contra Judæos’ and that of Tatian’s Gospel Harmony; second, Notker’s translation of Boethius; third, Middle High German prose. Otfrid, since his work cannot illustrate the development of prose order, will be considered separately.

A. OHG. TRANSLATORS OF THE EIGHTH AND NINTH CENTURIES.

I. Principal Clauses.

Rannow, in his work on Isidor, says: “Was also erstens die Hauptsätze angeht, so sucht er [Isidor] den in der Ent-
wicklung des Deutschen immer mehr zur Geltung gelangen- 
den Grundsatz zu befolgen, das finite Verb möglichst voran 
zu stellen." In the use of this order Isidor follows the Latin 
order in 71 instances, departs from the Latin order in 43 
instances. Opposed to these are only 28 instances in which 
the translator, 23 times in agreement with the Latin, 5 times 
in disagreement, puts the verb at the end.

Tomanetz, who has examined the order in all three of the 
principal translations of the eighth and ninth centuries, 
reaches substantially the same conclusion. He asserts: "Für 
die ahd. selbständigen Hauptsätze, lässt sich wol als allge-
meine Regel hinstellen, dass das Prädicat von dem betonten 
Wort angezogen wird, also zweite Stelle einnimmt, ausser es 
ist selbst betont, in welchen Fall es den Satz eröffnet." The 
following table 1 will show the relative frequency of the differ-
ent arrangements, s.v. . . . and s. . . . v.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.v. noun</th>
<th>In disagreement with Latin</th>
<th>Independent of Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v. pron.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v. adv.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (s.v. . .)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s. noun v.</th>
<th>In disagreement with Latin</th>
<th>Independent of Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. pron. v</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. part. adv. v</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (s. . . v.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further evidence to the same effect is supplied by clauses 
consisting of predicate word and copula. The order is:

copula, pred. word. In disagreement with Latin 68 times.
pred. word, copula. Independent of Latin 6 times.
pred. word, copula. In disagreement with Latin 0 times.

The order of words, then, in principal clauses, when inde-
pendent of the Latin, and even when in disagreement with 
the Latin, is most frequently the same as in modern High 
German principal clauses.

1 This table is borrowed from Hermann. K.Z., 33.
II. Subordinate Clauses.

In Isidor Rannow notes the tendency of the finite verb in subordinate clauses, more and more to seek the end position. This it does,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In agreement with the Latin original} & \quad 41 \text{ times} \\
\text{In disagreement with the Latin original} & \quad 34 \text{ times}
\end{align*}
\]

This phenomenon is made more striking by the small number of instances in which the finite verb was moved to the initial position.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In agreement with the Latin original} & \quad 6 \text{ times} \\
\text{In disagreement with the Latin original} & \quad 8 \text{ times}
\end{align*}
\]

Counter to this tendency to place the verb last, Rannow notices a tendency to put last the word or phrase to be emphasized. For example, the translator reserves the last place for prepositional phrases:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In agreement with the Latin original} & \quad 70 \text{ times} \\
\text{In disagreement with the Latin original} & \quad 32 \text{ times}
\end{align*}
\]

This counter-tendency in part explains the number of clauses not completely transposed.

In the relative clauses of the three works under consideration, Tomanetz has made the following observations:

The order of words is,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like the Latin</th>
<th>Without Latin Original</th>
<th>In Disagreement with the Latin</th>
<th>In spite of Other Change from Latin Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.v. . . .</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. . . v.</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total s.v. . .</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Total s. . . v.</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tomanetz further shows by statistics that among the words preceding the verb, the number of pronouns is relatively greater than of any other kind of word. He infers that from the order s.v. . . . which, he believes, was original, the distinctive order of the subordinate clause has been developed through the influence of subordinate clauses with pronominal
objects. Further, from the fact that the order, \( s \ldots v \), is much less frequent in the second of two co-ordinate relative clauses, than in the first, in which this order is needed as a mark of distinction from principal clauses, he infers that the transposed order had its ultimate origin in the desire to differentiate subordinate from principal clauses.

We have no general statistics for inversion in these monuments of OHG. We have, however, the assertion of Gering regarding causal adverbs in the apodosis: “Von diesen Wörtern müssen diejenigen, welche am Satzanfange stehen, nach den Gesetzen der Germanischen Wortstellung, Inversion bewirken, d. h. das Prädicatsverbum unmittelbar an sich heranziehen.” Starker makes the same assumption and upon it bases his explanation of the origin of inversion in the apodosis.

The other features of word-order in these works, it is hard to describe. Rannow has noted in Isidor the position of the genitive before its governing substantive. The genitive precedes in all instances except in that of two nouns both of which have the article. The arrangement occurs so often as to be characteristic of this work. It is further to be noted that in the translation of Tatian, which usually follows the original very closely, the adjectives and possessive genitives precede their substantives, even when in disagreement with the order in the original.

B. Notker’s Boethius [end of 10th, begin. of 11th cent.].

Lohner believes that in Notker we have the pure expression of German speech feeling, and that from this work we may derive the laws of German Syntax. He bases this belief on the fact that the German of the translation in the main is like the Latin original only where the syntax in the two languages is the same, and especially on the fact that parenthetical expressions, independent of the Latin, agree in syntax with the translated parts, thus proving the independence of the latter. This freedom, as compared with the slavishness of the earlier translations, seems to show that the form of the High German language had at length become fixed,
and that the translator in consequence was not at liberty
to follow his original slavishly.

The results of Lohner's investigations in Notker are as follows:

1. Relative and *conjunctio nal* clauses have the same con-
struction as regards the order of words.

2. This work has a developed order of words in the
dependent clauses, which expresses itself especially by the
separation of the finite verb from the introductory word and
by the final position of the verb wherever possible. The
verb occupies the final position in about two-thirds of all
*conjunctio nal*, and in about three-fourths of all relative
clauses.

3. Where the verb has a medial position, and therefore
other elements stand at the end, there may be perceived
some special motive, rhetorical or euphonic, which occasions
the older order.

4. From this freedom to stand at the end are excluded all
simple pronouns and most pronominal phrases, also other
words and phrases with weak stress, such as adverbs. In
relative clauses, the frequency with which the various ele-
ments follow the verb is shown by the following statistics.
There follow the verb:

| 1) Of prepositional phrases | 30 % |
| 2) Of the different noun objects | 23 % |
| 3) Of infinitives | 20 % |
| 4) Of *predicative* nouns | 12 % |
| 5) Of *nominale predicate* (incl. past part.) | 9 % |
| 6) Of noun subjects | 2 % |

5. Pronouns and particles usually take second or third
place.

6. Even in the other classes of words there is recognizable
a regular grammatical arrangement, which, however, may be
specially modified for the emphasis of an element or in the
interest of a smoother, more rhythmical flow.

In the period, then, between Notker and the earlier trans-
lators, a great development has taken place in the direction
of uniformity in language. Traces, however, of the older
order of words appear here and there. In the apodosis, the modern German rule that the verb shall stand first is not regarded; and the earlier freedom to place the verb last, even in principal clauses, appears here and there.

C. MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN.

In the Middle High German period the norms of word-order which we note in their incipiency in the translators of the eighth and ninth centuries, and in their middle stage in Notker, have become fixed, so that the order of words in the prose of the period is essentially that of modern German prose. Only in poetry do we see traces of the original freer arrangement. This freedom manifests itself in various ways.

1. Transposition may occur in principal clauses.¹
2. The direct order may occur after an introductory adverbial phrase.
3. Transposition may occur after an introductory adverbial phrase.
4. Several adverbial modifiers may stand first.
5. The attributive adjective may follow the noun.
6. The genitive may stand between the article and the substantive.
7. The substantive may be followed by the article with the dependent genitive.
8. The dependencies of an infinitive do not precede as often as in modern German. This holds true even of the Middle High German prose.

D. OTFRID.

In poetry grammatical rules are not so rigidly observed as in prose, and in consequence poetry is not as valuable as prose in the historic study of word-order. For this reason, in the sequence followed thus far, all poetry has been unregarded. On the other hand, in poetry the expression,

¹ Paul, Mhd. Grammatik.
less hampered by grammatical restraints, is more natural, and, therefore, perhaps reflects the speech feeling better than prose does.

Otfrid’s Evangelienbuch, written about 800 A.D., is one of the most considerable monuments of OHG. literature. The word-order in this poem has been investigated by Ohly; from the mass of statistics that he presents I have selected the following:

**I. Independent Affirmative Clauses.**

1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

Side by side seem to stand two normal arrangements of words, the direct and the indirect. Leaving the apodosis out of consideration, the order is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Introductory Word</th>
<th>With Introductory Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1342 (neg. 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>714 (neg. 222)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the apodosis the direct order is the more frequent, though the indirect order occurs very frequently, both with and without introductory word or phrase.

2. *Position of Verb in Relation to its Dependencies.*

In clauses with *direct* order the statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Without introductory word</td>
<td>1051 (neg. 39)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) With introductory word</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In apodosis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Introd. by particles, <em>ioh, etc.</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, 1088 | 71 | 335 |

In *inverted* clauses the order is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>V. and S. Together</th>
<th>V. and S. Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The predicate noun follows the copula | 320 : 8 |
- The infinitive follows the auxiliary | 86 : 7 |
- The infinitive follows the dependencies | 39 : 49 |
II. Subordinate Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

All instances of inversion are to be regarded as exceptions to the rule, and due to metre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct.</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2539</td>
<td>100 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

The total number of subordinate clauses containing elements besides subject and verb is 2539.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject is preceded by some other member of the clause in 127 of the above instances.

III. Clauses of Command.

When the subjunctive is used, the rules of word-order are the same as for affirmative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct.</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) With introductory word 9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Without introductory word 4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the imperative is used, the subject is usually left unexpressed (579 instances). When the subject is expressed the order is,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct.</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) With introductory word 0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Without introductory word 5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Independent Questions.

In interrogative clauses a) without interrogative word and b) with interrogative word serving as object, the order is, nearly without exception, inverted. When c) the interrogative pronoun is subject of the clause, the order is direct. The instances occurring are a) 27, b) 45, c) 29.
V. General Remarks.

1. The attributive adjective may be placed after its substantive. When two adjectives qualify the same noun, three different arrangements are possible: 1) both before, 2) both after, 3) one after, the other before.

2. The genitive, if it has no article, may be placed between the article or adjective and the substantive.

3. The dependencies of the infinitive are not placed before as regularly as in modern German.

From the above statistics we see that the difference between principal and subordinate clauses was much more marked in Otfrid than in the prose translations of the eighth and ninth centuries. In Otfrid the modern German rule of order is observed in four-fifths of all instances in both kinds of clause, principal and subordinate. Another noticeable feature is the frequent use of inversion. This, as Ohly shows, cannot be attributed wholly to the demands of metre, but must, in many instances, be explained as 'pathetic order.'

E. General Conclusions.

From the evidence of the statistics quoted from the different OHG. monuments, we must infer that at the time when the earliest works that have descended to us, were composed, there already existed a feeling for the difference between principal and subordinate clauses, which expressed itself by a difference in word-order. In this belief we are confirmed after a hasty consideration of the Hildebrandslied. In this, the oldest monument of OHG. literature, the regular order in subordinate clauses is the transposed. The statistics, hastily gathered, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal clauses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clauses</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Six consisting of subject and verb alone.
2 In one instance the verb has the medial position (Part. Transp.).
The infinitive, used in connection with a finite verb, follows its dependencies in ten instances, preceding only once, and that due to the chiastic arrangement. As in Otfrid, examples of inversion are numerous, probably owing to the livelier emotions of poetry, which demand for their expression the 'pathetic order.'

OHG., then, does not afford us much direct evidence as to the order of words in primitive Teutonic. We notice only that just as the phonology and inflections of OHG. have differentiated themselves from those of the cognate dialects, so the word-order has already adopted that peculiar differentiation, which, rigidly carried out, is characteristic of modern German.

IV.

OLD NORSE WORD-ORDER.

The subject of Old Norse word-order has, unfortunately, received but little attention. The only available treatment of the subject is that contained in Lund's *Oldnordisk Ordfojningslære*, Kjøbenhavn, 1862, and this is very indefinite and unsatisfactory. Consequently, since the scope of the present work will not permit of a separate, detailed investigation in this dialect, the treatment in this chapter will necessarily be inadequate.

The materials for study are not entirely satisfactory. There are, first, the monuments of Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian literature, which, at the earliest, date back only to the end of the eleventh century, and which, therefore, cannot fairly be compared with the monuments in OHG., in Goth., and in OE.; second, the oldest Runic inscriptions, which are of too fragmentary a character to be of great value for the study of word-order.

I. Old Icelandic.

The earliest Icelandic literary monuments, as we said above, date back only to the end of the eleventh century; and the *Younger Edda*, which is the most available work for
our purpose, appears in a manuscript of about 1300 A.D. The results, then, of an investigation of word-order in these monuments cannot be taken as representative of primitive word-order in Old Norse. On the contrary, the aptness of the idiom and the directness of the style in the Younger Edda are such as characterize only languages in an advanced stage of development. We are interested, then, in the word-order of Old Icelandic only because it shows one of the different developments from the primitive Teutonic.

Lund affirms that the simplest order is: 1) subject (with its qualifiers); 2) predicate (with its qualifiers); 3) indirect object (hensynet); 4) direct object. There seems to be no fixed position for the other elements except that qualifications usually follow the main conception.

There are, however, nearly as many exceptions as there are instances falling under the rule.

1. The sentence often begins with a verb, not only when the verb is conceived as prominent, but in general in past narrative, and even in present, if the sentence is closely connected with the preceding and the subject is the same, so that the grammatical predicate has the greater weight.

2. The verb stands first in the apodosis, often with ha at the beginning.

3. If the sentence begins with an adverb or conjunction, or with a phrase, the verb precedes the subject.

4. In clauses of command, entreaty, and exclamation, the verb is placed first, also in interrogative clauses not beginning with a pronoun.

5. Phrases like "said he," etc., as in English, are inverted.

6. An interrogative clause begins with the interrogative particle, if it has one; a relative clause with the nearest word, even if this is governed by a preposition, which then preferably follows. Conjunctional subordinate clauses also usually begin with the conjunction. But each of these kinds of sentence may have a conjunction or connecting adverb first.

7. There are also certain exceptions for the sake of euphony. If a noun has two adjectives, one is put before
the verb, the other after. The auxiliary is often separated from the participle, the verb from the dependent infinitive.

There are also many instances of departure from the regular order for the sake of emphasis. A word which would otherwise follow, for the sake of emphasis is placed before. If by reason of contrast, or for any other reason, a word is the most important one for the meaning of the whole sentence, it is put at the beginning without regard to the kind of word or its regular position. This great freedom promotes a shorter, more vigorous mode of expression. Circumlocutions are avoided.

The attributive adjective usually precedes its noun. The genitive case dependent on a substantive usually follows, but may precede if one wishes to make prominent the idea contained in the dependent word. But in case of two adjectives, one may precede the noun, the other follow with ok (and). In case of two nouns, each with an adjective, the order is, adjective, noun, noun, adjective. When used with the definite article, the adjective may be placed either before or after the noun.

Prepositional adverbs modifying verbs, instead of being fused with the verb as in modern German, remain separate and follow the verb.

Another feature, so striking as to deserve special attention, is the separation of words for the sake of emphasis; e.g.:

Harald's saga hins hárfagra
Harold's sagas the fair-haired
Hann hafði hjálm á höfði gullroðum . . .
He had a helmet on his head, gold red and . . .
Svá var hann kapsar . . . at . . .
So was he impetuous . . . that . . .

Poetic order differs from prose order in greater freedom. Words are arranged not only with reference to meaning and to emphasis, but also with reference to rhythm. Furthermore, words belonging together may be separated. Even a word may be divided, and the parts separated; e.g.:

Ha-reið á bak baru bord herti-kon vestan (Hakon).
Lund's remarks, quoted above, in the main hold true. If, however, one look at the Younger Edda, he will notice some striking features not mentioned by Lund. Perhaps the most noticeable is the frequency of inversion; this is so frequent, both in principal and subordinate clauses, that it may be called the regular order. It is further a noticeable fact that there are no instances of long transposition. The order in principal and in subordinate clauses is the same, either inverted or 'normal.' Nearly the only instances of synthetic order in any form are due to the past participle or the dependent infinitive, which occasionally stand at the end of the clause, preceded by their dependencies. A striking illustration of the favored analytic order is afforded by the definite article, which regularly follows its noun.

In general, it may be said that the order of words in the Younger Edda is much like that in modern English, except for the frequent inversion, the occasional transposition of the infinitive or past participle to the end of the clause, and the irregular position of some particular word which for emphasis is put at the beginning or at the end of the clause. The order is remarkably free, and consequently the language is very flexible, more so than modern English. The important word is free to stand in the natural position of emphasis, and that, too, without unnatural inversion or awkward circumlocution.

II. Old Runic Inscriptions.

More significant in its bearing on primitive Teutonic word-order is the evidence afforded by the old Runic inscriptions. Among these are included the oldest monuments in any Teutonic dialect. Unfortunately they are very fragmentary.

Hermann makes the assertion that in the Runic inscriptions of Old Norse the order of words in principal clauses is s. . . . v. 7(?) or 6 times, s. v. . . . 4 times; that two instances of subordinate clause are found, and that in both of these the verb is at the end. This assertion is somewhat sweeping. A more accurate notion may be formed by examining some

1 Unless we consider the Finnic loan words.
of the principal inscriptions. These I shall arrange in the order of age, at the same time using Noreen's numbering.

Third century:


Fourth century:

48. *talino ʒisaion wilir ... tipis hleuno = ...* see will ... (?)
20. *ek erilar ansuʒisalas muha haiteʒa ʒaʒaʒinu zaheþpu, sali jah haʒala wizju bi ʒ = I, earl Asgil, Moe am called, help, fortune, and prosperity consecrate ...*

8. *ðaʒar þar runo faihιdo = Thagr these runes scratched.*

Fifth century:

33. *iʒinon halar = Iginga's stone.*

Sixth century:

19. *uβar hite harabanar wit iah ek erilar runor waritu = Over Hitr, Hrafu, we two, and I, earl, runes writ.*
38. *braþwinan haihnaɾ was = Thraenge's called was.*
24. *ana hahaisla iniɾ frawaraðar = over Haisl, Inr, Frarathr.*
22. *ek erilar sa wilaʒar hakeka ... = I, earl, who Wilagr am called.*


25. ... ? ... *sweštar minu liþu mer waζe = sister mine dear (to) me, Wagr.*
42. *ek wiwaɾ after woðuriðe witaðahalaiðan worahto runor ... ? ... = I, Yr, after Othrithr, wrought (the) runes ... ? ...*

44. *ek ʒaʒustalðar þewar ʒoðaʒas = I, Høgstaldr, servant of Gothag.*

Seventh century:

26. *iupinʒar ik wakrar unnam wraitα = Ythengr (rests here).*
    I, Wacker, undertook the writing.

5. *eirilar hroɾar hроɾer orte ðat arða ... = Earl Hror (of) Hror, made this ...*
Seventh–eighth century:


34. *niuha ñorumR niuhq ñestumR habuwolafR lazaf hariwolafR mažiu suheka heðera ñinonor . . ? . = New (monument) (to the) sons, new (to the) guests, Holfr gave, Herolfr (to the) son. Turn (I) here with runes*

3. *sar pat barutR uti ar weladauđe haeramalaur ñinarunar arapeu falahak haderaz haiðrruno ronu = He (who) this breaks, before (him) is baleful death. Harmless (I) big runes of witchcraft conceal here (of) honor runes sōw."

I have quoted above, all the intelligible primitive Norse inscriptions that are long enough to be significant for word-order. It will at once be noted that there is a difference between inscriptions of different periods. In the six inscriptions of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries (39, 48, 13, 20, 8, 33) the order is, without exception, synthetic. The same is true of the first four (19, 38, 22, 6) of the sixth century. The last four (25, 35, 42, 44) of the sixth century have the analytic order. The two (26, 5) of the seventh and the first two (16, 34) of the eighth also have analytic order; and the last one of the eighth century has an arrangement of words quite like that characteristic of the classic Old Icelandic prose.

There is discernible, then, a gradual development from the synthetic to the analytic order. This is illustrated by the position of the demonstrative adjective. It occurs in but three of the above inscriptions. In the fourth century (8) and in the seventh (5) it precedes its noun; in the eighth century (16) it follows.

The verb stands at the end in each of the three subordinate clauses (22, 20, 3), though at least two of these are paratactic.

Inversion does not occur in the inscriptions until the eighth century, when it occurs (34, 3) as in Old Icelandic literature.

The evidence, then, of the old Runic inscriptions, though slender, is very valuable, because so early and because it
shows that the synthetic order was the earliest and that the order of words characteristic of literary Icelandic does not belong to primitive Teutonic, but is the result of a gradual special development.

V.

OLD SAXON WORD-ORDER.

For the facts of OS. word-order, we are indebted to Ries, who has made an exhaustive study of the word-order in the *Heliand*. From this work of Ries, a model in its kind, I have taken the most general statistics.

A. Principal Clauses.

I. Affirmative Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

The fundamental type of word-order is the direct. The indirect (inverted) order is to be regarded, not as an exception to the rule, but as a means of expressing certain shades of meaning.

   a. Indirect Order in Free Use.

   1. From Logical Relation to the Context.

   Ries assumes that the first place in the sentence is the position of emphasis, and says that at times the verb bears the principal accent, and accordingly stands first.

   2. Stylistic-Rhetorical-Syntactical Motives.

   For animation of style the chiastic order may be used.


   The indirect order regularly occurs when some later member of the clause is placed first. Exceptions to this rule are to be explained mainly on rhythmical grounds.

\[
\text{Indirect order} \begin{cases} 
\text{with initial position of object} & 88 \\
\text{" } & \text{adverbial expression} & 749 \\
\text{" } & \text{predicate noun} & 6 
\end{cases}
\]
This use of indirect order may be known as 'regular-indirect' order, as distinguished from 'indirect order in free use,' when inversion occurs without introductory word. The use of direct order after an introductory word or phrase is known as 'irregular-direct,' as distinguished from 'regular-direct,' without such introduction. It is to be noticed that the 'regular-indirect' order is relatively more frequent with predicate nouns; the 'irregular-direct,' with object at the beginning.

The general statistics for inversion in principal-affirmative clauses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>'Regular-direct'</th>
<th>'Irregular-direct'</th>
<th>'Indirect in free use'</th>
<th>'Regular-indirect'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the first three thousand lines of the <em>Heliand</em></td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

For *Heliand* (1–3000) the statistics are as follows:

a. 'Regular-direct' Total 330
   Neutral (only subj. and verb) 34
   Transposed (s. . . v.) 69

b. 'Irregular-direct' Total 59
   Neutral 5
   Transposed 42

In about 32% of all clauses consisting of more than mere subject and verb, the order is transposed.

II. *Clauses of Command.*

1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

   a. IMPERATIVE, WITH PRONOUN SUBJECT.
b. **Subjunctive.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With introductory particle</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
<th>Direct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without introductory particle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.**

Of the 7 imperative clauses with 'irregular-direct' order, all are transposed (s...v.).

### III. Interrogative Clauses.

1. **Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With introductory word</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
<th>Direct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without introductory word</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.**

Of the 8 interrogative clauses with 'irregular-direct' order, 7 are transposed (or partially transposed).

### B. **Subordinate Clauses.**

1. **Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.**

In principal clauses the indirect order, as we have seen, is nearly as frequent as the direct. In subordinate clauses the indirect order occurs but rarely, 158:1957 (7–8%).

Clauses with pronoun subjects, for metrical and logical reasons, employ the direct order exclusively.

In clauses with noun subjects, 158 out of 528 have indirect order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With auxiliary verbs</th>
<th>Direct.</th>
<th>Indirect.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105 (28%)</td>
<td>104 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative clauses</td>
<td>49 (13%)</td>
<td>30 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With negative-auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>20 (5%)</td>
<td>27 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a later member of the clause is put first, as in principal clauses, the verb is attracted forward on account of a
feeling for the unity of the verb and the later members of the clause. It may be noted also, that, as in principal clauses, the attracting power is different with different words, the predicate word having the greatest, the object having the least; that is to say, the feeling for the unity of verb and predicate is stronger than for that of verb and object. In the instances of 'regular-indirect' order the word at the beginning was: object (14%), adverbial expression (40%), predicate noun (45%). In the instances of 'irregular-direct' order, the word at the beginning was: object (40%), adverbial expression (53%), predicate word (6%).

2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

For Heliand (1–3000) the statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (subordinate clauses)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb at end</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb in middle position</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In subordinate clauses consisting of more than mere subject and verb, the verb is separated from the subject in 70% of all instances, as against 32% in principal clauses.

VI.

OLD ENGLISH WORD-ORDER.

The subject of Old English word-order has already received some attention. The word-order of Beowulf has been examined by Ries and Todt, that of the A.S. Chronicle by Kube, that of Alfred's Orosius and Ælfric's Homilies by Smith. I shall first summarize the results of these investigations, and then in succeeding chapters give more in detail the results of my study of the word-order in the A.S. laws.
A. **BEOWULF.**

From Ries's work I have derived the following table:

**I. Independent Affirmative Clauses.** *(Beowulf, 1–1000.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>S. and V. separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Regular-direct,'</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76 (Transp. 36, Part. Transp. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Irregular-direct,'</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ind. Affirm. Clauses (direct order)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>S. and V. separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>142 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. Subordinate Clauses.** *(Beowulf, 1–500.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Verb at end (transposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** — In 67% of the instances in which the verb is not at the end, it occupies a medial position, so that in subordinate clauses the verb is separated from the subject in about 83% of all instances, as opposed to 70% in principal clauses.

The arbitrary system that Todt has adopted makes it difficult for us to utilize the results of his investigation in *Beowulf*. The verb, according to his scheme, may stand, a) at the beginning, b) after the first word, c) after several members, d) at the end. Todt renders this scheme still more complicated by making the following qualifications: When there is no object, the position d) is not conceivable, for whether or not an unimportant expression follows a verb already preceded by several independent members is unessential, the clause is to be classed as c). If, on the other hand, both subject and object precede the verb, the clause is classed d'), no matter if a modifier follows. For purposes of comparison, the only way of utilizing Todt's results is by grouping classes c) and d) into one class in which are included all clauses with direct order which have words interposed between subject and predicate.
I. Independent Affirmative Clauses.

1. Simple Verbs.
   a) 98      b) 204      c) 213      d) 355

2. Auxiliary Verbs.
   a) 17      b) 45       c) 15       d) 4

3. The Copula.
   a) 81      b) 166      c) 29       d) 7

   a) 31      b) 36       c) 54       d) 19

5. Verbs with the Infinitive.
   a) 29      b) 30       c) 43       d) 8

Total.
   a) 256     b) 481      c) 354      d) 393

From these statistics it is impossible to determine anything concerning the relative position of subject and finite verb. But the frequency with which the verb is separated from the subject is very noticeable. This separation (transposition or partial transposition) occurs in 50% of all clauses. The discrepancy between this percentage and that obtained by Ries is to be explained by the fact that while Ries excepts all 'neutral' clauses (only subject and predicate), Todt counts all such clauses as untransposed.

It is further to be noted that the simple verb is separated from the subject much more frequently than are the other verbs, auxiliary, etc.

II. Subordinate Clauses.

1. Simple Verb.
   b) 9       c) 297      d) 332

In the clauses with fully stressed subject the verb stands at the end 47 times, not at the end 27 times. The corresponding ratio in principal clauses is 86:73.
2. Auxiliary Verbs.

b) 2  c) 14  d) 8

The inclination to stand at the end is very strong, as is shown by the position of the participle, which precedes 18 times, follows 6 times. The corresponding ratio for principal clauses is 8:73.

3. Copula.

b) 8  c) 43  d) 47

4. Modal Verb.

b) 5  c) 74  d) 59

The infinitive precedes 92 times, follows 46 times. The corresponding ratio for principal clauses is 37:103.

Total.

b) 26  c) 428  d) 346

The verb is separated from the subject in 96% of all instances.

We notice, then, both in principal and in subordinate clauses a marked tendency to place the verb at the end, or at least after several of its dependencies. This tendency is stronger in subordinate than in principal clauses, and in the case of simple verbs than in that of auxiliaries, etc.

B. AS. Chronicle.

The results of Kube's examination of word-order in the Chronicle are somewhat indefinite. In but few instances has he given any exact statistics.

His principal conclusions are as follows:

I. Principal Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

a. Direct Order.

1) Interrogative clauses  Not at all.
2) Imperative clauses  Rarely.
3) Affirmative clauses  Under most diverse circumstances.
b. **Indirect Order (Inversion).**

After introductory adverbs and adverbial phrases the order is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After *her* the order is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After *pa* the order in the apodosis is always indirect; in affirmative clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After adverbial expressions of time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case of two clauses connected by *ond*, the first of which has indirect order, the order in the second is direct.

2. **Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.**

A substantive in the accusative case usually follows the verb, but may precede. The personal pronoun in the accusative invariably precedes the verb. In case of indirect order, the arrangement may be either *v. s. o.* or *v. o. s.* In case of compound verbs, the object is usually one of the separating elements. Except in the case of pronouns, which sometimes precede the verb, the dative object comes third, whatever may be the relative position of subject and verb. The predicate noun follows the verb. Phrases of time and place not very frequently stand between subject and verb.

II. **Subordinate Clauses.**

1. **Relative Clauses.**

The verb usually stands at the end except in the case of an object in the form of a clause. The second of two place-expressions sometimes follows the verb. Inversion is infrequent.
2. **Temporal Clauses.**
Verb usually last. Inversion only three times.

3. **Causal Clauses.**
Proportion of verbs at end, 1:1. Inversion only twice.

4. **Conditional Clauses.**
Only two instances. Both direct, transposed. The infinitive precedes the finite form.

5. **Concessive Clauses.**
Direct; transposed.

6. **Indirect Questions.**
Direct; verb stands at the end more often than within the clause.

7. **Object Clauses.**
Direct; usually transposed.

8. **Final Clauses.**
Direct; verb equally often at end and in medial position.

9. **Consecutive Clauses.**
Usually direct; verb more frequently in the medial position.

10. **Comparative Clauses.**
The few clauses that occur have direct order and the verb at the end.

**III. Position of Elements in Word-Groups.**
The genitive, subjective and objective, nearly always precedes.
The attributive adjective, with rare exceptions, precedes its substantive.
Numerals usually precede.
Possessives and indefinite pronouns (*eall, ilca, etc.*) precede.
C. Alfred's Orosius and Ælfric's Homilies.

I. Independent Clauses.

The usual order is the 'normal.' In case of a compound verb, the auxiliary follows the subject immediately, medially, or finally. When modifiers are few, the final position is more usual. The pronoun in the dative regularly precedes the verb. There are only 9 exceptions in the Orosius. In a portion of the Homilies equal to the Orosius, 64 precede, 22 follow (3:1). The pronominal direct object also precedes. There are in Orosius 4 exceptions to this rule. In Ælfric, 88 precede, 20 follow. This preference of the pronoun for the initial position is due to the tendency to follow the antecedent as closely as possible.

Transposition also occurs occasionally in independent clauses. Smith gives us no statistics concerning the frequency.

When a word, phrase, or clause, other than the subject, or a co-ordinating conjunction begins the clause, the verb may be drawn forward and the subject made to follow.

There are two different aspects of inversion: 1) as a means of more closely uniting the inverted clause with the preceding (by pa, bonne, etc.); 2) as a means of indicating relative stress (e.g., when direct object begins). Orosius uses inversion for the first purpose more often, Ælfric more often for the second.

Inversion caused by an initial dependent clause is not frequent in OE., unless the apodosis is begun by a word like bonne.

II. Dependent Clauses.

There are no instances in Orosius of inversion used to express condition, concession, or interrogation; only two of inversion to express command or persuasion. The Homilies, however, use inversion for all these purposes.

The order in dependent clauses is much varied.

1 Smith, Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc., 1893.
1. *Orosius.*

a. **Simple Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Compound Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—Usually some form of the verb stands at the end. Either principal or auxiliary stands at the end in 162 instances.

2. *Homilies.*

a. **Simple Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Compound Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—Either principal or auxiliary verb stands at the end in 126 instances.

The order of words in Oratio Obliqua is more like that in independent clauses, than is the order in subordinate clauses.

1. *Orosius.*

a. **Simple Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Compound Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—Either principal or auxiliary verb stands at the end in 40 instances.

2. *Ælfric.*

a. **Simple Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Compound Tenses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparative study by Smith of the word-order in these two works seems, then, to show that the difference between principal and subordinate clauses was being levelled, that the normal order in modern English is the product of a gradual development, not, as asserted by Fiedler and Sachs, due to French influence. Further evidence will be brought to bear in the two following chapters.

VII.

WORD-ORDER IN ALFRED'S LAWS.

Old English word-order has been investigated in Beowulf, in the Chronicle, in Alfred's Orosius, and in Ælfric's Homilies. The results of these investigations, given in the preceding chapter, are most important; but there are not yet available a sufficient array of facts, for any absolutely satisfactory generalization. Beowulf does not truly represent OE. word-order, on account of the restraints of metre; the Orosius is open to suspicion, though slight, on the ground that it is a translation; Ælfric's Homilies represent the language at a later stage of its development; and the results of Kube's investigation of the Chronicle are unfortunately not in statistical form, and are hence not to any great extent available for our purpose.

For further investigation the Anglo-Saxon laws seem to be peculiarly fitted. They are evidently independent and are written in prose. They may, therefore, be taken as representative of the OE. speech feeling. They were also formulated at different times, some very early and continuing through the whole OE. period, and, therefore, afford an opportunity for study of the development of the language. As representatives of different periods, I have selected the code of Alfred and the code of Cnut. I have made a study of each, and have arranged the results in statistical form so as to exhibit the word-order current in each period, and by comparison to mark the lines of development.
LAWS OF ALFRED.

A. INDEPENDENT CLAUSES.

I. AFFIRMATIVE CLAUSES.

As explained in the introduction, in the matter of word-order, our subject for study is the relative position of the essential elements of a clause; the grammatical subject, grammatical predicate (finite verb), and grammatical object. The relative position of qualifier and qualified is included here, because such combinations of words are, at bottom, subordinate clauses; the qualifier being the predicate, the thing qualified being the subject. The relative position of the various coördinate dependencies is usually arbitrary, and is determined by the consideration of emphasis or of connection.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

In Alfred's laws there occur 154 independent affirmative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect (Inverted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. — The direct order is that in which the subject precedes the verb; the indirect (inverted), that in which the object precedes the subject.

Under 'direct' are included clauses in which the subject is not expressed. Under 'indirect' are included only the instances in which the subject (expressed) is preceded by the verb. Consequently the relative number of instances of inversion is not as small as might at first sight appear.

Inversion does not seem to follow any invariant rules, except that after the introductory particles; Æonne, Æa, Æær, the order is always inverted. The High German rule according to which a later member of the clause (object or adverb), when standing at the beginning, attracts the verb forward, thus causing inversion, does not hold good in OE.

To be sure, of the thirty-five inverted clauses that occur, twenty-three have an introductory word. But it will be
noticed that this is merely a formal sign, and instead of being
the cause of inversion, is perhaps the result.

The introductory words occurring are: (*bonne 16 times),
$by$ (3), $zeo$ (1), $nu$ (1), $eac$ (1), $sær$ (1); e.g.:

*bonne sceal he be, LX. hida . . .*,* 124, 2 ; $by$ sendon hie ærend-
zewrit to him, 78, 26 ; $zeo$ þesomnodon we us ymb $sæt$, 80, 7 ; $zeo$
was $gold$æofe . . . maran $bonne $ðru, 88, 15 ; $nu$ sint eal$æelic
. . . ., 88, 16 ; $eac$ is ciepe monnum $zereht$, 96, 11.

That inversion requires a particle as formal sign, is seem-
ingly proved by the fact that inversion occurs without such
sign only in negative clauses in which the negative particle
stands first (12 times), e.g.:

*Nelle ic from minum hlaforde . . ., 70, 4 ; ne $by$ he ealles swa
scyldi$5$, 72, 5 ; ne $by$ se $a$ na $ðy$ mara, 124, 5 ; ne mot hine
mon tieman . . ., 124, 8.

That is to say, the verb never stands directly at the
beginning.

When, however, the object or a prepositional phrase, or an
adverbial expression more definite than $bonne$, etc., stands
first, the order is, without exception, direct; twenty-seven in-
stances of such ‘irregular-direct’ order occur. In these
clauses the introductory word or phrase is: the object (12
times), a prepositional phrase (9), $eac$ (3), $swa$ (1), $ærest$ (1),
. X., $wintra$ (1); e.g.:

1 *ead$modnesse he lærde, 78, 20 ; mid him we sendon iudam . . ., 80, 11 ;
Of $dissum$ anum dome mon mag $zæd$encean . . ., 80, 19 ;
$æac$ we setta$5$, 86, 1 ; $by$ he mot, 92, 8 ; $ærest$ we bebeod$ß
$batte . . ., 110, 5 ; . X.,$ wintra $cniht $ma$ $bion $dief$ $æ$ $zewita 112, 13.

It must be noted that in many instances the subject is not
formally expressed, so that there is no distinction between
direct and inverted order. For the clauses in which the sub-
ject is formally expressed, and which are begun by some word
or phrase other than the subject, the statistics are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inverted.</th>
<th>Direct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 (such words as $bonne$, etc.)</td>
<td>27 (objects, prep. phrases, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The references are to page and line in “The Legal Code of Alfred the
Great.” Ed. by M. H. Turk, Halle, 1893.
Manifestly, then, the HG. rule is not valid in OE.

The occurrence of inversion in independent clauses is confined almost exclusively to the apodosis, perhaps owing to the fact that in the laws most of the principal clauses are in the apodosis. Out of 35 instances of inversion 29 are in the apodosis, e.g.:

\[\text{Zif he ne wille his wæpenu sellan, bonne mot he feohtan on hine, 102, 7;}\]
\[\text{Zif he hit bonne dierneð, bonne rymed he ðam deadan . . ., 116, 2;}\]
\[\text{ne þearf he hiora mā ðeldan, wære hiora swa fela swa hiora wære, 122, 17.}\]

But clauses in the apodosis are by no means always inverted. As against the 29 instances of inversion in the apodosis, there are 24 instances of direct order; e.g.:

\[\text{Zif ŝe bonne elles doð, hie cleopian to me ŝi ŝe hie ŝi eow bonne slea mid minum sweorde, ŝi ŝedð þret . . ., 76, 11;}\]
\[\text{Zif he hine triewan wille . . ., þat he mot, 92, 7;}\]
\[\text{Gif þorcund mon odde fremde bútun wē ŝe ŝeond wudu ſon ſe . . ., for þeof he bid to þrofianne . . ., 114, 19.}\]

To sum up, then, inversion occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Apodosis</th>
<th>Not in Apodosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Formal Introd.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Introd.</td>
<td>10 (all neg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direct order occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Apodosis</th>
<th>With Object or Adverb First in Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

In independent affirmative clauses the position of the verb with relation to its modifiers is in the main the same as in modern English. This order we will call the ‘normal,’ defining normal order more exactly as the order in which the finite verb follows immediately the grammatical subject. But this order, though general, is not universal. If we call ‘transposed’ those clauses in which the finite verb stands at the end after all its dependencies, and ‘partially transposed’ (Part.
McKnight,

Transp.) those clauses in which the finite verb has a medial position after part of its dependencies, and ‘neutral’ those clauses consisting of verb alone, or of subject and verb alone, then the statistics for independent affirmative clauses are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of clauses with normal order need hardly be cited, e.g.:

*Ic êom dryhten AMAGE 3od., 68, 2; bis syndan 8a domas pe se ælmih-te³a . . ., 78, 14; ælc mon mot onsacan frym³e 7 . . ., 124, 6.*

Examples of transposed clauses are:

*hus cwœ³, 68, 2; Ic hine ðehiere, 76, 20; Ic 8a ælfred westseaxna cyning eallum minum witum ðas ðeeowde, 82, 20.*

Examples of partially transposed (Part. Transp.) clauses are:

*7 on mone³a seno³ bec hie writan hwær anne dom hwær ðerne, 82, 7; 7 on ðrum wisan bebead to healdanne, 82, 12.*

Examples of neutral clauses are:

*hie pa cwœden þæt . . ., 82, 21; Eac we bebeoda³, 100, 19.*

It will at once be seen that the normal order predominates. Many of the clauses classed as transposed or partially transposed have an order that would be quite possible in modern English. As in modern English, an object or adverbial modifier may, for rhetorical purpose, be placed first. Such clauses (‘irregular-direct’), whether the subject is expressed or not, are here classed as transposed or as partially transposed, according as the verb stands at the end or not.

The pronoun-object does not occur frequently enough to materially affect the result, but the pronoun-object precedes the verb relatively more often than other dependencies do.

**Pronoun-Object.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alone before Verb</th>
<th>Before Verb, not Alone</th>
<th>After Verb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 (Inv. 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The past participle as part of a compound verb occurs only 17 times in principal clauses (including clauses of command). It stands at the end of the clause 13 times, the other 4 times following the finite verb directly, or separated only by the subject, e.g.:

\[ \text{The present participle occurs only twice. In these two instances it follows the finite verb immediately.} \]

\[ \text{Dryhten was specende ḍas word to Møyse, 68, 1; eac micelre ḍesomununge ḍodes ġeowu was smeažende be ġare hale urra sawla, 108, 30.} \]

\[ \text{INFinitive.} \]

The infinitive occurs 50 times in principal clauses. It stands at the end of the clause 28 times; followed only by finite verb once. It follows the finite verb directly 27 times, e.g.:

\[ \text{Naže he hie ūt on elēoðiʒ folc to bebycʒanne, 70, 10; se sceal dēaʒe sweltan, 70, 25; X. wintra cniht maʒ biʒe ʒewita, 112, 13; Mon sceal simle to herezafolæ ʒifan at anum wyþtan, VI., waʒa, 128, 11.} \]

\[ \text{II. Clauses of Command.} \]

The regular position of the verb is first in the clause (introducory particles being left out of consideration). When the subject is expressed, the order is regularly inverted. All exceptions may be explained on some special ground, rhetorical or other.

\[ \text{Note. — It is so often impossible to distinguish between optative and imperative that no discrimination has been made in the treatment. But from observations made, I feel justified in saying that the order is the same in the two kinds of clause.} \]
Narrowing our attention to inversion, we obtain the following results:

**In Apodosis (105).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Intro.</th>
<th>Without Intro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>95 (7 neg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not in Apodosis (38).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Intro.</th>
<th>Without Intro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (12 neg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g.:

\[\text{Zif } \text{hwa } \text{zeh} \zeta \text{ze } \text{cristene } \text{beow}, \text{VI.} \text{zeor } \text{feowise } \text{he, } \text{by } \text{siofilan beo } \text{he } \text{frioh } \text{breapunza, } 68, 19, 20; \text{Mid } \text{swelce } \text{hrazle } \text{he } \text{inode, mid } \text{swelce } \text{zanze } \text{he } \text{Ut}, 70, 1; \text{Ne } \text{minne } \text{noman } \text{ne } \text{ciz } \text{du } \text{on } \text{idelinesse, } 68, 5; \text{Utancumene } 7 \text{eldeo}i\text{Ze } \text{ne } \text{zetwenc } \text{du } \text{no, } 76, 8; \text{Dem } \text{du } \text{swi}d\text{e } \text{emne, } 78, 3.\]

Those clauses of command in which the order is not inverted, and in which the verb does not stand first, demand special consideration. Such exceptions to the rule are usually due to the desire to emphasize some word or phrase, which accordingly is given the initial position, e.g.:

\[\text{arcebiscepes borpes bryce o} \overline{\text{O}} \text{he } \text{munu byrd } \text{zehete } \text{mid } \text{frim pundum, } 84, 20; \text{Gif } \text{hund } \text{mon toslite } \overline{\text{O}} \text{he } \text{abite, } \text{at } \text{forman } \text{misdiaede } \text{zeselle } \text{VI. scill, } 92, 23; \text{Zif } \text{syxhundum } \text{pissa } \text{hwa} \text{bar } \text{zelimpe, } \text{driefealdlice } \text{arise } \text{be } \text{fære } \text{cleriscan } \text{bote, } 100, 1.\]

Another consideration, which perhaps more often than the consideration of emphasis determines what shall stand first in the clause, is that of connection. There is a tendency to place first the word or phrase which links with the idea expressed in the preceding sentence, e.g.:

\[\text{wyrecad } \text{eow } \text{VI. dazas } 7 \text{on pam } \text{siofilan } \text{resta} \text{eow, } 68, 8; \text{Zif } \text{hie } \text{sien } \text{bu } \text{zelic, ord } 7 \text{hinderweard } \text{scaeft, } \text{bat sie } \text{butan } \text{pleo, } 98, 7.\]

The instances of transposition and partial transposition, and also of normal order, occur most frequently in a last clause of a series. In some instances this is due to one of the motives mentioned above; in others it seems to be for rhetorical effect — chiasmus, e.g.:

\[\text{Zif } \text{beowmon } \text{wyrec on } \text{sunnandaz } \text{be } \text{his } \text{hlaforde } \text{hase, } \text{sie he } \text{frioh } 7 \text{se } \text{hlaforde } \text{zeselle XXX. scill. to wite, } 110, 11; \text{Zif } \text{he } \text{medren } \text{ma}3\text{as } \text{nae, } \text{zielden } \text{ba } \text{zesildan } \text{healfe}, \text{for } \text{healfe } \text{he}\]

\[\text{eow}\]

For clauses of command, the general statistics are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Expressed (183)</th>
<th>Subject not Expressed (203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Subordinate Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

In subordinate clauses the finite verb regularly follows the subject. Inversion occurs only in isolated instances. In 429 conditional clauses there are only 9 instances of inversion: 8 times in clauses with *gif, once where the inversion serves to indicate the conditional nature of the clause, *e.g.:

*Gif in feaxe bid wund, 104, 4; were hiora swa fela swa hiora were, 122, 18.

There is one inverted relative clause, . . . *bæt maζe XXX. swina understandan, 122, 20; one substantive clause (really an instance of parataxis), *Σara zehwelc we willaζ, sy twy bote ., 86, 18; one temporal clause, *돈ne hafζo he *bæt wite afylled mid by aζe ., 126, 9; one purpose clause, *bæt hine moton his maζas unsynζian, 116, 3.

2. Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

a. Relative Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g.:

*se ðe stalaζ on sunnan niht oζde on zehhol, 86, 16; se ðæs wœpnes onlah, 92, 6; he ærest fulluhte onfenζ on anζelcynne, 82, 18.

With relative clauses are included clauses of manner introduced by *swa, *e.g.:

*swa he ær sceolde, 84, 4.
b. Substantive Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: 
žemyne þæt ðu þehalþiþe þone ræste deþ, 68, 7; þæt he æþhwelcne 
onryht þedemeð, 80, 20; þæt he him nan oðer ne sealde buton þæt 
ike, 132, 24.

c. Clauses of Comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: 
... þonne hie mon be þam were þeeahțiþe, 96, 6; þonne him mon 
accorfe þa tunþon ðf, 96, 4.

d. Temporal Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: 
sidðan se áncesseda dryhtnes sunu ... on middenþeard cwom, 78, 
15; oð ðæt anþylde arise to .XXX. scill., 88, 13; þonne him 
ðearf sie ma manna ðp mid him to habbanne on hiora fore, 96, 15.

Under this head are included quite different kinds of 
clauses, introduced by the conjunctions þonne, sidðan, and oð.

e. Purpose Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: 
þæt ðu siþ þy lenþ libbende on eorpan, 68, 13; þæt he mon mid 
ofslea, 92, 3; þæte naniþ ealdormenna ... aþer þam were 
awendende ðas ure domas, 110, 2.

f. Indirect Question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: 
hweþ þæs ðam lician wolde ... 82, 15.

g. Conditional Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the 9 instances of inversion, 4 are included under other heads (130, 1; 106, 24; 104, 4; 78, 2), e.g.:

Gif hit ðonne bið wilisc onstal, 124, 5; 3if hio dead sie, 72, 9; Gif mon forstolene man befo æt oðrum, 126, 4.

h. Result Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.:

pæt hie beod forode, 104, 18; pæt hie dead sien, 72, 16.

i. Causal Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.:

forþon þe hit was his aþen fioh, 72, 6; forþam ðe ðod ælmihtì
pam nane ne þedemde, 82, 3; forþam on VI. daþum císt
zeworhte hiofonas 7 eordan . . ., 68, 9.

j. Concessive Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.:

þeah hwa þeqyc33e his dohtor on þewenne, 70, 8; þeah he scyldì
sie, 112, 25; þeah hine mon beþo ymb niht, 132, 5.

Position of the Pronoun-Object in Subordinate Clauses.

The pronoun-object occurs with such great frequency in subordinate clauses that it must be taken into special account in the consideration of word-order. In principal clauses the pronoun-object occurs only in 20 instances, and is not of much importance in the consideration of word-order. In subordinate clauses it occurs in 183 instances, and, since it nearly always precedes the verb, accounts in part for the frequency of transposition in subordinate clauses. Perhaps the feeling that the transposed order is the natural one for the subordinate clause is in part due to the frequent occurrence of the pronoun before the verb. In the following statistics, the 91 instances in which the pronoun-object stands
alone before the verb are to be classed as transposed or partially transposed, and this transposition is due in these instances entirely to the position of the pronoun.

Pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alone before Verb</th>
<th>Before Verb, not Alone</th>
<th>After Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subordinate Clauses. Summary.

The past participle as part of a compound verb occurs 64 times in subordinate clauses. Here, as in principal clauses, there is manifest a tendency to place the participle at the end of the clause. It stands at the end of the clause 39 times. It must be noted, however, that in 18 of these instances the clause consists only of subject, finite verb, and participle. The tendency to place the participle last is even stronger than that to put the finite verb last, for the order, \( \ldots \text{v.} \text{participle,} \ldots \text{v.} \), occurs 21 times, as against \( \ldots \text{participle} \text{v.}, \ldots \text{participle} \text{v.} \), 15 times. The exact statistics for the position of the participle are as follows:

\[
a. \ldots \text{part.} \quad 18 \quad \text{(v. s. part. once)} \\
b. \ldots \text{v. part.} \quad 21 \quad \text{(s. v. part. 19 times)} \\
c. \ldots \text{part. v.} \quad 15 \quad \text{(s. part. v. 6 times)} \\
d. \text{part.} \ldots \text{v.} \quad 0 \\
e. \text{v. part.} \ldots \text{v.} \quad 5 \\
f. \text{part. v.} \ldots \text{v.} \quad 1 \\
g. \ldots \text{part.} \ldots \text{v.} \quad 2 \\
h. \ldots \text{part. v.} \ldots \text{v.} \quad 1
\]

The verb, it will be seen, directly precedes the participle 27 times. The participle directly precedes the verb 16 times. Examples of the different arrangements are:

\[
a. \quad \text{7 he weorde har of slegen, 74, 12.} \\
b. \quad \text{Gif mid him cwicum sie funden hat, \ldots 74, 16.} \\
c. \quad \text{7 hit onbestated sie.} \\
d. \quad \text{Gif yfr sie ontended ryt to bærnanne, 74, 19.}
\]
f. er ham be his apostolas tofarene waron, ... 78, 21.
g. ðe ware to æwum wife forgifen his fæder, 102, 20.
h. se ðe oft betyzen ware ðief ðe, 120, 12.

The present participle with finite verb occurs in subordinate clauses only twice:

patte næniʒ ealdormonna ne us underʒeode dra æ after ham ware
awendende ðas ure domas, 110, 4; þe ... 3od self sprecende was
to moyse, 78, 14.

The past participle, then, seems to have a claim on last place even stronger than that of the finite verb.

**INFINITIVE.**

The infinitive occurs 82 times in subordinate clauses. Its position is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>infin.</th>
<th></th>
<th>v. infin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen from the above table that the infinitive usually stands either last, or next to the last, followed by the finite verb. It may also be noted that the finite verb follows the infinitive (40:11) more often than the past participle does (16:27). The infinitive is evidently more dependent on the finite verb than the participle is.

Examples of the different arrangements are:

a. Gif he þonne alefe his suna mid to hamanne, 70, 13.
b. 7 him bebead to healdanne, 78, 15.
c. þat he hine bereceean ne mæze, 70, 26.
d. Family newon þe þewuniað onfon þealdor cæstian ðe ... 76, 5.
e. 7 he þeal þealþan mæze bi stafe, 72, 1.
f. 7 þonne him þearf þie ma manna up mid him habanne on hiora
fore, 96, 16.

g. Similar to the tendency to place the participle and infinitive at the end of the clause is the tendency to place the predicate adjective after its dependencies, last in the clause. As in the
case of the infinitive and participle, this is only a tendency, by no means an invariable rule. Examples are:

*Ne sie he na manslezes scyldiz, 74, 12; oxan eaζe bιζ .V. ϖαζινσα weorζ, 128, 10.*

The favorite position above referred to, of the participle, infinitive, and predicate adjective, may be taken as an illustration of a more general tendency,—that to place the governing word after the word governed, or otherwise expressed, to place the most important word last, thus producing what has been variously called ‘ascending construction’ and ‘synthetic order.’ As further illustration of this general tendency may be cited the following passages:

*βαζ he sie οζζε siδυζan ζεωζ, 70, 8; 7 he ne sie ιδαιζες dead, 72, 4; habbe hi siδυζan him to wife, 76, 2; his ζοζε nehstan, 70, 28; us underζεδεοζεζa, 110, 3; eac we ζζεδαζ βαζ mon mote mid his hlaforde feohtan orwιζe, 102, 12; siδυζan hit to ζαμ αζιζε βαζ anζυζe, 88, 14.*

As further illustration of this same general tendency may be cited the usual position of the dependent genitive before its governing word. This position, though by no means the invariable one, occurs in a great majority of instances, e.g.:

*eζιγτα londe, 68, 3; hιοζa δεοζοζδζme, 68, 3; ιπιζes nehstan ierfes, 68, 16; butan δας mυζεζsc hlafordes lefnesse, 92, 14; δας ζεζεζιζζαζtζδζζαζ monnes bot, 94, 20; δας υre domas, 110, 4; δας deadan ιταιζζαζs, 120, 2.*

A remarkable illustration of the freedom in the arrangement and of the peculiar value of the first and last places for emphasis is seen in the following passage:

*dιοζαζs we ζαζαζδ oζδ .VII. men, from .VII. hιοζδ to .XXXV. siδυζan bιζ here, 114, 2, 3.*

It is to be noted that there are no long transpositions, clause within clause, like those in modern German. The only instances of clause included within clause are subject clauses like the following:

*ζιζζδζ eζ δας ωρζεζes onlζa hαζs ωζεζes ζριζζζδaζ dζl, 92, 5; ζοζζεζ scζal ze δε hιζe ah weοζζζp hιζe to hοζζδa hlaforδe, 132, 11, etc.*
The object clause follows the verb upon which it depends, without exception, whether the governing clause be independent or subordinate.

In the later manuscripts of Alfred's laws are to be found many variations in order from that in the oldest manuscript, E, which we have followed. But the variations are so heterogeneous that it is difficult to make any generalization concerning them. If in the later manuscripts there seems to be no greater fondness for the synthetic order, on the other hand, it may be said with certainty that writers of later manuscripts show no greater fondness for the analytic order. There occur variations in both directions. The tendency, if any, seems to be toward greater regularity. In principal clauses of the later manuscripts the order is 'normal' more often than in Ms. E. On the other hand, in subordinate clauses the transposed order occurs in later manuscripts where Ms. E has the normal order. In commands, likewise, the changes in the later manuscripts are usually in the direction of greater regularity, e.g.:

78, 23  

\[\text{monega hædana ðeoda hie to ðode ðecerdon. E.}\]
\[\text{monegæ hædana ðeoda hie ðecerdon to gode. H.}\]

98, 8  

\[\text{Gif mon wille of bold ðetel. E., B.}\]
\[\text{Gif mon of bold ðetale wille. H.}\]

100, 9  

\[\text{hit sie twybote. E.}\]
\[\text{si hit twybote. From margin of B.}\]

104, 18  

\[\text{Gif monnes ceacan mon forsihð. E.}\]
\[\text{Gif man monnes ceacan forsele. B.}\]

112, 1  

\[\text{Gif hwa on ealdormonnes huse ðeþeoahto ðode on ðores ſeþunþenes witlan. E., B.}\]
\[\text{Gif hwa on . . . huse ðode on . . . ſeþunþenan ðeþeoehtæ. H.}\]

124, 27  

\[\text{Gif ſeiðcund mon landazende forsitte fierd. E.}\]
\[\text{Gif se ſeiðcunde man landazende ſyrdre forsitte. B.}\]

In the laws of Alfred, then, the rule seems to be that the verb stands first in imperative clauses, second in principal-affirmative clauses, and last in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, there is manifest a tendency toward the synthetic order; that is, for governing word, whether finite verb, participle, infinitive, noun, or adjective, to follow the gover-
ing word. This tendency is not manifest in every instance because of the operation of counter tendencies. In principal-affirmative clauses, for example, the favorite position of the verb is second. But even in such clauses, traces of the more general tendency are manifest in some instances; and we must assume that its operation originally was more general, and that in course of time, in special instances, for example in affirmative clauses, imperative clauses, etc., its influence was overcome by stronger special tendencies.

**VIII.**

**WORD-ORDER IN THE LAWS OF CNUT.**

**A. Principal Clauses.**

**I. Affirmative Clauses.**

1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

In Cnut's code there occur 115 principal clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. — In two clauses included under 'direct,' the subject is unexpressed.

It will be seen from the above statistics that the direct order predominates. If one studies the instances further, he will find that, as in Alfred's code, inversion follows no invariable rules. The tendencies seem to be the same in the two codes. Inversion occurs after an introductory word or phrase, 20 times, in clauses without such introduction, 7 times, so that evidently an introductory word or phrase is not a necessary condition for inversion. But that such an introduction favors inversion is shown by the greater relative frequency of inversion in clauses thus introduced. In the clauses with direct order the subject is preceded by words other than a conjunction only 18 times, about 20% of all instances. The inverted clauses have such introduction in 20 instances out of 27, more than 80% of all instances.
But, as in Alfred's code, it is to be noted that the introductory words are of different nature in the two kinds of clauses. In the inverted clauses the introductory words are as follows: _ponne_ (1), predicate adjective and adverb (4), prepositional phrase (2), _esc_ (1), _swa_ (1), _nu_ (1), e.g.:

_Donne is swiðe rihtic _p__ __, _2, _7; _Micel is _7 máre _p_ _sacerd _áh _to _dönne, _4, _4; _To _ciric-bote _seal _eall _fole _fylstan _mid _ryhte, _LXVI., _5; _7 _eac _áh _hlaforda _žehwylc, _20, _6; _swa _seal _he _... _., _XXXVIII., _4; _Nu _bidde _ic _žeorne _... _., _LXXXV., _1._

In the clauses with 'irregular-direct' order the introductory words are: object direct or indirect (including dative of interest), 9; pred. noun or adj., 4; adverb, 5; prep. phrases, 2; e.g.:

_Eallum Cristenum mannum žebyrad swiðe rihtic, _4, _1; _b _syndan _biseopas _7 _messe-preostas, _26, _9; _7 _swa _hi _dòð _symle, _4, _11; _And on Myrcean he _ah _... _., _XIV., _1._

It will be seen from the above that the introductory words in inverted clauses are in a majority of instances words serving merely a formal purpose, _ponne, swa, _etc., pred. words and prep. phrases occurring only 6 times. Quite the reverse is true of clauses with 'irregular-direct' order in which, in 9 instances, the object stands first.

As in Alfred's code it is to be noted that, without exception, the inverted clauses without introductory words are negative. It is further to be noted that in Cnut's code there is but one instance of a negative clause with direct order.

It cannot with certainty be asserted that in the apodosis inversion is the rule. There are only 8 instances of inversion in the apodosis as against 19 instances in independent clauses. On the other hand, it is to be noted that in Cnut's code there is but one instance of direct order in the apodosis, and that in a relative apodosis.

* The references are to Cnut's Laws in Thorpe's _Ancient Laws of England_, Vol. I. Arabic numerals refer to the ecclesiastical division, Roman to secular division.
The general statistics, then, for inversion are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apodosis</th>
<th>Independent Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introd.</td>
<td>Not Introd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>Not intro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (neg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 (neg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Position of the Verb with the Relation to its Dependencies.

Here again the order of words in Cnut's code agrees in the main with that in Alfred's. Leaving out of consideration the inverted clauses, the statistics are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instances of 'irregular-direct' order are classed as transposed or partially transposed, according as the verb stands at the end or not. But particles like, beah, bi, etc., are not counted as producing this transposition.

Seven doubtful instances of pet is . . . , are classed as normal.

Examples are:

*Dis is seo zærædys þe Cnut ...* Introd. l. 1 (Normal); *þæi hælfriþ ænþas þærabutan hweardiað 1 þa dæda beweardiað 1 þurh Godes mihta þam sacerdan fylstæð, 4, 9, 10 (Transposed); *Eallum Cristenum mannum zebyræð swide rihte . . .*, 4, 1 (Part. transp.); *And we laræð þi biddað þ . . .*, 7, 1 (Neutral).

An examination of the passages cited above will show that with but few exceptions (8), in the clauses classed as transposed or part. transp., the order is the 'irregular-direct,' in which the subject immediately precedes the verb, but is itself preceded by some later member of the clause. The other instances are either crystallized phrases, e.g.: *And us ne pincð, XXIV., 10*; or are instances such as might occur in modern English, e.g.: *Husbryce 7 barnet 7 . . . æfter woruld-læze is botleas, LXV., 2.* That is to say, the normal order in principal clauses has become nearly as rigidly fixed as in modern English, or in any of the modern analytic languages.
The pronoun-object does not occur in principal clauses frequently enough to appreciably affect the above result. It may be noted, however, that the object pronoun precedes the verb relatively more frequently than the other dependencies do.

---|---|---
3 | 0 | 3

ponne wurðe us eallum Godes miltse þe þearumwre, 19, 8; Ac ic hit forbeode heonon-forð, LXXVII., 11; And us ne þiucð nan ryht þ . . ., XXIV., 10; he dereð him sylsum . . ., XXXV., 6; ponne sceal him cyninze beon, XL., 2.

It is to be noted that the simple pronoun stands as near the beginning as it can without interfering with the general rules of order; also that the more natural position for it seems to be that after the verb.

**Participles and Infinitives.**

The favorite position of the past participle in all principal clauses, including clauses of command, is at the end. In 10 out of 11 instances, the total number occurring, the participle occupies this position, e.g.: 

Ā si Godes nama écélīce ȝebletsoð, 26, 14.

The only instance of other order is, 

ponne sī þe ðaworpen of ȝehāðodra ȝezemanan, 5, 25.

The present participle occurs only once; in that instance it has the position at the end.

Donne mōton þa hyrdað beon swiðe wacore 7 zeornlice cliþiþende, 26, 8.

The favorite position of the infinitive also is at the end. It stands at the end in 21 out of 36 instances, e.g.: 

7 ne bærf ániz mynster-munuc ahwær mid rihte fæhð-bôte biddan, 5, 21; 7 hi man sceal for Godes 3eðe mǣðe on ēah ȝezcnáwan mid ſesceade, 4, 14.
II. Clauses of Command.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

As in Alfred’s code, if we leave adverbs and particles out of consideration, the regular position of the verb is first in the clause; when the subject is expressed, the order is inverted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Expressed.</th>
<th>Subject not Expressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inverted. Not Inverted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>13 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g.: *ponne siʒ h bótlæs, 2, 12; hæbbe he Godes milte, 6, 11.*

Of the 133 instances of inversion it is to be noted that a relatively greater number is without introductory word, and a relatively smaller number is in the apodosis, than in principal affirmative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Apodosis.</th>
<th>Not in Apodosis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g.: *And ʒif ðæf ænʒiʒ mann heonon-forð Godes ciricʒrîð swa ǽbrecep . . ., *ponne siʒ ʃat bótlæs, 2, 12; 7 ehte his ʃæc hæ ro he Godes freond siʒ, 2, 12; And ʒa ʃæc cyric-sceat into hæm ealdan mynstre, 11, 5; And ealle Godes ʃerihta fyrðrîʒe man ʃeorne, 14, 1.*

Instances in which the order is other than ‘First’ (verb first, subj. unexpr.) or inverted may usually be explained on some special ground. The most frequent causes of order other than the regular are:

1) Chiasmus. The second, third, etc., clauses in a series frequently reverse the order of the first clause, apparently for euphony or for some other rhetorical effect, e.g.: *ponne bête man þ ciricʒrîð intó þare cirican he cynincʒe ðullan nund-bruce þa mynster-clænsunʒe beʒte swa þæto ðeþyrîʒe, 2, 18.*
2) Special transposed clauses introduced by þæt, e.g.:

\[ \text{And } þ \text{ man } æc \text{ beboden } fæsten \text{ healde, 16, 1.} \]

3) Special emphasis to be thrown on the subject, which is accordingly placed first, or on the verb, which is accordingly put last, e.g.:

\[ \text{Ac æþhwilc cristen man } ðó \text{ swa him } þealf is, 19, 1; \text{ And æþhwylc cristen } \text{mann } æc \text{ for his } \text{Drihtnes e}³ e \text{unriht } \text{hám} \text{ed } ãeorne } \text{forbu}³ \text{e 6, 14.} \]

4) The object or an adverbial phrase is thrown first for emphasis or for connection, and the subject is not expressed, where, if it were expressed, we should expect inversion, e.g.:

\[ 1 \text{ healnan-forð } lórte \text{ manna æþhwylcne } ... \text{ folc-sihtes } \text{wyrðe, I., 5.} \]

5) Influence of preceding clauses, e.g.:

\[ \text{Ac uton swiðe } ãeorne \text{ frám synnum } Ñeyrran \ldots, 7 æfre } Ñeswican \text{ } 7 \text{ æornlice } \text{bétan } 7 \text{ úre } æc \text{ oðrum } \text{beðe } þ \ldots, 18, 10. \]

6) A relative clause serves as subject, and the order is equivalent to 'First,' e.g.:

\[ 1 \text{ seþe oþer } ðær } ðæþ hit healde, æþþe } ßam } \text{bisceope } ðær } \text{peni}³, 9, 2. \]

2. Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

From the statistics given above, it is evident that the clauses having order other than 'First' or inverted, are the exceptions. Some of the causes of these exceptions have been enumerated above. It remains only to give the statistics for transposition, partial transposition, and normal order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUSES, NOT 'FIRST,' NOT INVERTED.</th>
<th>SUBJECT EXPRESSED.</th>
<th>SUBJECT NOT EXPRESSED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{e.g. } \]

\[ \text{Ac æþhwilc cristen man } ðó \text{ swa him } þealf is, 19, 1; 7 weorc } \text{freonda æþhwylc } \text{fadiþe } \text{mid } \text{rihte, 19, 5; æþþer } \text{ææ}³ \text{bote } \text{ææ}³ \text{bote } \text{fullice } \text{gebete, 2, 20; 7 } \text{þæþe } \text{bonne } æt } \text{ æþære } Þþ Gode } \text{wyllæ, 5, 14.} \]
It must be noted that, with one or two exceptions, all the
commands are in the third person. In consequence the verb
is nearly always subjunctive.

III. Interrogative Clauses.

There is but one instance of direct question in Cnut’s code;
in that one, as is to be expected, the order is inverted.

Ac hu mæ3 bonne æfre æniʒ man hine inweardlice to Gode ʒebiddan,
22, 10.

B. Subordinate Clauses.

1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

Inversion in subordinate clauses is rare. There are eight-
teen instances occurring in conditional clauses, but these con-
sist of the repetition of one fixed formula, sy hit, or sy he, e.g.:

sy hit þurh reaftlác, sy hit þurh feohlác . . . , 3, 3, 4.

There is one instance in a substantive clause,

bonne ʒefadʒe man þa steore . . . , II., 2.

four in causal clauses, e.g.:

forbam þam byð witodlice God hold, 20, 5.

and one in a relative clause,

swa is deofol syf, 26, 6.

With the exception of the instances mentioned, all of which,
it will be noted, occur either in conditional, in substantive, in
relative, or in causal clauses, which partake largely of the
nature of principal clauses, the order in subordinate clauses
is invariably direct.

2. Position of the Finite Verb with Relation to its Depend-
cencies.

a. Relative Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With relative clauses are included *swa* clauses of manner and of comparison, also *heor* clauses of place, e.g.:

> 7 wið bone weallendan brýne he weallad on helle, 6, 9; 7 se he hes *zeswican* will, 6, 11; *swa* oft *swa hi* *zeornlice* inweardre heortan clýpiad to criste, 4, 11.

### **b. Substantive Clauses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.g.*:

> 7 secz e he wære dæd-bana oppe rœd-bana, 5, 16; And *b* is bonne ærest, *b* he his aženne wêr Criste 7 *pam* cyninŽce *zesyle* 7 mid *pam* hine syrfne inlaŽie to bôte, 2, 15, 16.

### **c. Conditional Clauses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.g.*:

> buton he ne mote beon nanes rihtes wyrôe innan his hundrede, XVII., 2; Zŷf hine hwa afyllæ ofer XII. wintre, XX., 3; Gif he æt *pam* briddan cyrre nan ryht næbbæ, XIX., 4; Zŷf hit *swa* ŽeweordŽ on EnŽlalaŽe, XV., 15.

### **d. Concessive Clauses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.g.*:

> peah hit nafre metes ne abite, LXXVII., 10; peah hwa his ažen spere sette to õðres monnes huses dura 7 he piðer-inn ærende hæbbe, LXXVI., 1, 2.

### **e. Result Clauses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.g.*:

> p he huru cunne rihtne Želeåfan áriht understandan, 22, 2; *p h* binnonciric-wâžune mann-slaŽa wœordŽe, 2, 11; *p se cyninŽc* him purh *p* feores Žeunne wið Žulne bôte, 2, 14.

### **f. Indirect Questions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1(?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E.g.*:

> *swa* hwænder *swa* man mæŽe *swa* cuñe *swa* deadne, XXV., 5; hû he on manna săulum mást *zesceadžm* mæŽe, 26, 7; *hu* man fyrmest mæŽe ræd aréðian peode to pearfe, XI., 2.
Under the head of temporal clauses are included several quite different kinds of clause, introduced respectively by the conjunctions; *ponne*, *syppan*, *æfter*, *ær*, and *oð*. In all these clauses the tendency is toward transposition, but in no instance does more than a single one of the adverbial dependencies (usually a pronoun or an adverb) precede the verb, e.g.:

*ponne God demeð manna þæwilcum be ærran þæwyrhtan, LXXXV., 7; ponne he bus cwede, II., 5; ponne us wære leþre, 18, 3.*

### h. Causal Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: *forþam hi sceolan us lædan forð æt ham dome, LXXXV., 6; þe he for neode dyde þ þe he dyde, LXIX., 13; forþam eall þ eall we æfere for riht hláford-helde dEc, eall we hit dEc us sylfum tó micelre þe þe þe, 20, 4.*

### i. Purpose Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.g.: *þ he mote hentan æfter his aþenan, XIX., 7; þ se wóð-fréca ware-wulþ to swoðe ne slite, 26, 12; ne to fela ne ábite of þodcundre heorde, 26, 12.*

### Position of Pronominal Objects.

The pronominal object occurs in subordinate clauses much more frequently than in principal clauses. Consequently the pronoun-object becomes an important object of consideration in subordinate clauses. It occurs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Alone Before Verb</th>
<th>Before Verb, Not Alone</th>
<th>After Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted, then, that 54 of the instances of transposition and partial transposition in subordinate clauses are due entirely to the position of the pronoun, which, because it
refers back to the preceding sentence, always prefers a position at the beginning of the clause. Since the pronoun occurs with greater frequency in subordinate clauses, the greater frequency of transposition in subordinate clauses is in part to be attributed to the pronouns.

The position of the pronoun-object in the various kinds of clause is shown in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Question</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. — a. = alone before verb; b. = before verb, not alone; c. = after verb.

Subordinate Clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Part. Transp.</th>
<th>Inverted</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics for the position of the past participle in subordinate clauses are as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. . . part.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. . . v. part.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. . . part. v.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. part. . . v.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. v. part. . .</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. part. v. . .</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. . . . part. . .</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. . . v. part. . .</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A study of these figures reveals some interesting facts. In the first place, as in Alfred's code, there is a tendency to put the participle at the end of the clause. It stands either last or next to the last, followed only by the finite verb, in 23 instances out of a total of 26.

This tendency to place the participle last is counteracted by the tendency to throw the verb last in subordinate clauses. As a consequence, in 18 instances the participle precedes the finite verb (order c), whereas the finite verb precedes the final participle in only 4 instances, directly precedes (order b) only once. In principal clauses, where this tendency to transpose does not exist, the participle follows the finite verb in every instance.

Further, comparison with the corresponding figures for Alfred's code shows that the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses has increased markedly in the period between Alfred and Cnut. In Alfred's code there is the same tendency to throw the participle to the end. In principal clauses the participle follows the finite verb in 18 instances out of 19. In subordinate clauses even the tendency to transpose is not strong enough to effectually oppose the tendency to put the participle at the end, so that in only 17 instances does the verb follow the participle as against the 48 instances in which the participle follows the verb. This shows that the claim of the finite verb on last place in sub-
ordinate clauses was not nearly so strong in Alfred's code as in Cnut's.

Examples of past participle in Cnut's code are:

a. þæl færo man beo on hundrede þon teóðunʒe zebroht, XX., 2;
b. þæf wican ofpe . . . ahuar on lande wurðan agynte, IV., 4;
c. And þæf elles be cweicum mannnum ciricʒrið abroacen sý, 3, 1;
d. forþam wac bið se byrðe funden to beorde, 26, 3.

INFINITIVE.

The infinitive occurs 83 times in subordinate clauses.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>infin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>v. infin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>infin. v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>infin. . .</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>v. infin. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>infin. v. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>infin. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that the tendency is to place the infinitive at the end of the clause. In subordinate clauses there exists also a counter-tendency to place the finite verb last. Owing to this latter tendency the infinitive is obliged in many instances to stand next to the last (order c, 41 times). In this feature Cnut's code agrees almost exactly with that of Alfred. But the infinitive is not displaced by the finite verb nearly so uniformly as the past participle was. We must infer from this that the claim of the infinitive on the final position was much stronger than that of the past participle, e.g.:

a. Ac hu mæʒ bonne æfre ániʒ mann hine inweardlice to Gode zebiddan, 22, 11.
b. áanne God æfre woldan lúsian 7 wurðian, 1, 2.
c. buton he on husle zeladian wylle, 5, 15.
d. ac bonne we sceolan habban ånweald lean . . ., 18, 5.
e. þæf man fredþian sceal ofer eall Enʒalond on XV. kl. April., 17, 6.
g. 7 Cnut cinʒe lúsian mid rihtan zetrýwðan, 1, 3.

III. General Features.

This tendency to put the participle and infinitive at the end of the clause seems to be but one phase of a more general
tendency to put the governing word after the word governed. Further illustration of this synthetic order is supplied by predicate words, which, like the participle and the infinitive, both in subordinate and in principal clauses, seem to have a claim on last place in the clause, e.g.:

Ne sind ealle cyricean na ʒelicre maðe weoruldlice wurðscipes wyrðe, 3, 6; beo se wið bone cyninʒe hundtwelftiʒ scyldiʒ, XV., 6; And ne beo əniʒ man əniʒes teames wyrðe, XXIII., 1; uton beon à wurum hlafordolde holde ʒetriewe, 20, 2.

Still further illustration of the synthetic order is supplied by the relative position of noun and dependent genitive. With but few exceptions the governing noun follows the governed genitive. A striking instance is the phrase, əðres mannes hises dura, LXXV., 2.

Further instances of synthetic order are phrases like the following:

sawllum to hāle 7 us sylsum to bearfe, 2, 2; Gode to lōfe 7 him sylsum to cynescipe, Introd. 3, 4; þam cyninʒe to handa, LXXVIII., 6.

Further note the position of the governing preposition.

þe leʒer-stop on siʒ, 11, 3; þe he þ fals mid worhte, VIII., 6; nime him ʒf ʒestryne men to, XXX., 31; 7 tēcæn him to þam niʒoðan dāle, 8, 9.

Interesting, because indicating the original order of words, are stereotyped forms of expression like him þincð.

It will be noted that in the two centuries between Alfred and Cnut there has been no breaking down of the old rules of word-order. On the contrary, the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses is more marked in Cnut’s code than in Alfred’s. The tendency also to put the past participle at the end is more marked in Cnut’s code.

It will be noted further that the sentence structure has become more complex. The relative clause frequently serves as subject of another clause, especially of clauses of command, e.g.:

And sepe on ʒemote mid wiðer-tihlan hine sylfne oppe his man weriʒe, hæbbe þ eall forwrecen, XXVII., 2.
Such constructions occur, though rarely, in Alfred's code.

Further, there are numerous instances in which a whole clause is introduced parenthetically within another clause, e.g.: 

\[ \text{And \textit{zelaste alc wuduwe pa here\textit{zeata binnan twelf-mon\textit{dum buton hire ar to onha\textit{ze, witeleas, LXXIV., 12.}}}} \]

Frequently a clause is interposed after the finite verb and before the dependent past participle, e.g.: 

\[ \text{be nele pa heorde pe he healdan sceal mid hredme bewerian, 26, 4.} \]

In one instance a subordinate clause is interposed within a subordinate clause between the finite verb and the past participle. 

\[ \text{And \textit{zif se bonda ar he dead ware beclypod ware, LXXIII., 3.}} \]

In conclusion we must remark that the results of the investigation both in Cnut's code and in Alfred's, are in a measure vitiated by the frequent recurrence of stereotyped phrases which must be counted, but which, as indicative of the speech feeling, cannot compare in value with independent forms of expression.

IX.

CONCLUSION.

From what has been said in the preceding pages, it may be seen that at the time of the earliest written monuments of the Teutonic group of languages, the dialectal differences were already well established. Each dialect differed from the others, not only in phonology and inflections, but also in word-order. In early Old English, in \textit{Beowulf}, the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses was not strongly marked, and in the later (prose) works is barely holding its own. In Old High German, on the other hand, even in the \textit{Hildebrandslied}, principal clauses are distinguished from subordinate. In Old Norse a peculiar tendency to invert is discernible even in the primitive inscriptions of the eighth century, and is firmly established by the time of the Icelandic prose works of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.
A. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

The original order of words in affirmative clauses of primitive Teutonic seems to have been the direct as distinguished from the inverted. That the indirect (inverted) order was not the original, seems probable from the following considerations: 1) Questions and commands employ indirect order, while affirmative clauses employ most frequently the direct, and employ the indirect order only for the sake of the peculiar emphasis to be obtained by a departure from the rule. The difference in the nature of the clauses seems to have demanded a difference in the order of words. 2) With the possible exception of Celtic, all IE. languages in their oldest known form, employ the direct order in affirmative clauses.

The phenomenon of inversion is difficult of explanation. The explanation is complicated in the first place by the circumstance that the accent of the first place in the clause varies with the context, so that it cannot be said with certainty that the first place in the clause is the position of emphasis. Again, clauses differ in nature. What is true of an affirmative clause does not hold true of an interrogative or an imperative clause. Again, the verb varies in importance. At one time it expresses the principal thought-element; at another time it accomplishes a purely formal function as auxiliary or as copula. Consequently, since the verb is at one time an important element, at another, unimportant, and since the initial place is at one time emphatic, at another time, unemphatic, obviously it is impossible to lay down any definite rule determining when inversion shall occur.

All that we can assert about inversion is that it is an order of words occurring side by side with the direct order in all the early Teutonic dialects. Except under certain circumstances, however, in affirmative clauses inversion is the exception rather than the rule. We must conclude that in all these early dialects, especially in the poetic monuments, the order is less rigidly fixed than in the corresponding modern lan-
Languages. The old laws are breaking down, and new speech-feeling is developing. In many instances probably the word-order is determined by the nature of the clause, or by considerations of emphasis or of connection entirely independent of the restraints of a fixed arrangement of the syntactical elements.

When, after a later member of the clause in the initial position, the verb precedes the subject, the inversion is due to the principle of connection. The verb is closely connected in thought with the initial word or phrase, and is accordingly placed next to it. That such connection is the determining principle is proved by the statistics which Ries has gathered, showing that inversion is relatively more frequent after an initial predicate word than after an object. This is true because the verb is more closely connected in thought with the predicate word than with the object, and consequently is attracted to the former more frequently.

The consideration of emphasis causes the inversion in clauses of command. Such clauses are usually isolated, and consequently the first place is the position of emphasis. In commands the verbal element is the most important one. Hence the verb stands at the beginning. In questions answered by yes or no, the verb is usually not the principal element, but occupies the first place, which — owing to the ascending accentuation peculiar to the question — is not the position of emphasis. In the same way are to be explained clauses of wishing. In the enclitic expressions, such as 'said he,' 'quad er,' which in all the old Teutonic dialects are inverted, the verbal element is the least important one, and therefore stands first, i.e. in the least emphatic position, next after the word bearing the principal stress. In like manner is to be explained the greater frequency of inversion in the case of negative verbs and of auxiliaries, and the less frequent occurrence in clauses with pronoun-object.

The origin of the use of inversion in the apodosis is the subject of dispute. Ries, supported by Ohly, believes that the inversion is explained by the nature of the clause, — that inversion is used to indicate hypotaxis. Starker, on the
other hand, asserts that the apodosis was originally paratactic, and that hypotaxis gradually developed from parataxis. In apodosis-clauses independent of the Latin, the proportion of paratactic clauses to hypotactic was: 1) in the OHG. Matthew translation, 8:0 (7:2?); 2) in Isidor, 13:4; 3) in Tatian, 26:25. Starker attributes the inversion to the anaphoric particle, which was more and more frequently inserted to indicate hypotaxis, and which, when not the subject of the clause, caused inversion on account of its initial position. Unfortunately we have not data enough at hand to decide the question.

We have not enough statistics to trace the development of inversion. But we can see that the development was different in the different dialects. In High German the rules for inversion were fixed even in Middle High German, except for apodosis clauses, and in Middle High German inversion has become under certain conditions the regular order. In the AS. laws we may detect a slight decay of the feeling for inversion. In Cnut's code inversion occurs somewhat more frequently than in Alfred's code, but in the apodosis it is less frequent and the total number of instances is smaller. In English, inversion has become almost extinct. In Norse, on the other hand, it has become almost the rule.

B. Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

From the statistics in the preceding chapter it may be seen that in all the Teutonic dialects the verb may be separated from the subject, not only in subordinate but in principal clauses. Further, in principal clauses we find the verb separated from the subject more frequently the farther back we go in time; for example, in Beowulf, in the Gothic Skëireins, and in the primitive Norse inscriptions. Further, in all the dialects there is manifest a fondness for the synthetic order. This is illustrated by the position of the genitive before its substantive and of the infinitive and participle after the words governed. Behaghel infers, from the evi-
Evidence of verbs with inseparable prefixes, that in primitive Teutonic the verb was at the end, and the evidence that we have cited above leads us to adopt his conclusion.

In this belief we are confirmed by the evidence afforded by the cognate IE. languages, in most of which the primitive position of the verb seems to have been at the end. This evidence of the cognate IE. languages also controverts Tomanetz's theory, that in primitive Teutonic the verb followed the subject immediately. For it is hardly probable that Teutonic had an order of words peculiar to itself. Wackernagel's hypothesis, that the differentiation in word-order between principal and subordinate clauses was original, is controverted by the same evidence. Further reason for disbelieving Wackernagel's hypothesis is the extreme probability (established by Hermann) that in primitive IE. there was no subordinate clause. It seems probable that hypotaxis is a development from parataxis.

It remains to establish motives which might have caused the gradual adoption of the analytic order. This is not a difficult matter. The gradual development of any language from its primitive form is attended by the tendency to crowd more and more into a single sentence, more and more to qualify the main assertion by the mention of accompanying details. The sentence, beginning as a very simple element in language, grows to a great complexity. With this increase in complexity, in many instances it becomes impossible for the primitive man, unskilled in handling complex sentences, to grasp at one time all the details. Accordingly, to the apparently finished sentence are added a number of explanatory details, afterthoughts; or some element, by reason of close connection with the following clause, may be put after the verb. To motives like these the analytic order probably owes its origin. Moreover, the verb, which in primitive language usually contained the new idea to be affirmed, and which, therefore, belonged at the end of the clause, in the course of development, lost more and more of its original fulness of meaning. Verbal nouns and adjectives became the bearers of the principal thought, and the verb became
more and more colorless, in many instances becoming a mere formal auxiliary or copula. For example, note the evolution of the verb *have* in all languages, and especially in French. With this loss of fulness of meaning, the verb also lost its natural claim to its position of emphasis at the end of the clause. The sentence gradually took the form of a judgment, and the verb came to be regarded as a merely formal syntactical element used to connect the terms of this judgment.

This theory may be substantiated by facts cited by Ries from *Beowulf* and the *Heliand*. In *Beowulf*, in clauses with 'regular-direct' order, 63 to 64% of the verbs do not immediately follow the subject, as against 23 to 24% in the *Heliand*. In 'irregular-direct' order the proportion is about the same; the instances in which the verb does not immediately follow the subject are about $4\frac{1}{4}$ times as frequent in *Beowulf*. The transposed order occurs in *Beowulf* in 50% of all subordinate clauses; 45 to 46% in the *Heliand*. In the case of the clauses not completely transposed, partial transposition occurs; in *Beowulf*, 67%; in the *Heliand*, 53 to 54%. That is to say, the movement of the verb from the end of the clause is farther advanced in the *Heliand* than in *Beowulf*.

But this progress is less in the case of subordinate clauses. Hence we infer that the differentiation between the two kinds of clause, which is little felt in *Beowulf*, is already established in the *Heliand*. There are many exceptions, but nevertheless a feeling that the difference in the nature of the clauses should be indicated by a difference in the structure. Further, the use of the transposed order in subordinate clauses was favored by the enclitic pronominal objects, which preceded the verb by preference, and which occurred more frequently in subordinate clauses. The year 800, according to Ries, marks approximately the time at which the differentiation was established. From the beginning of the ninth century the development of subordinate clauses is in the opposite direction toward transposition.

In Anglo-Saxon, Smith's statistics go to show that in the period between Alfred and Ælfric there had been some levelling of the difference between principal and subordi-
nate clauses, the order in both instances approaching toward the normal. A comparative study of the laws of Alfred and the laws of Cnut shows that in Cnut's code the difference was even more marked than in Alfred's. The cause of the development of the analytical order in subordinate clauses of modern English can be finally determined only by a study of Middle English prose with regard to French influence.

My general conclusions are as follows: In none of the existing early Teutonic languages does the order of words represent that of the primitive Teutonic. They have differentiated from the parent speech as much in word-order as in phonology. But from the evidence of the cognate IE. languages, from the general direction of the development within Teutonic, and from the tendencies common to all the early Teutonic languages; 1) the position of elements in compounds, especially the position of the inseparable prefix, 2) the frequent end-position of the verb even in principal clauses, more frequent the farther back we go, and 3) the fondness for synthetic order; — from all this evidence I conclude that in primitive Teutonic, in affirmative clauses, which were probably of the very simplest nature, the normal position of the verb was after its dependencies.

George H. McKnight.
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