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This study was presented as a dissertation at Princeton University in 1931 and was accepted by the Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures. Since then I have worked through it at various available times and have added some parts and rewritten others. To Professor Harold H. Bender I am especially grateful for his advice and interest. To Professor Robert J. Menner and to Professor Arthur G. Kennedy I am indebted for several helpful suggestions.

A discussion of ἀπὸ κοινώ is in the main a quite technical subject, but not necessarily one which is difficult to follow. If at first it should seem to be such, the reason lies perhaps more in the name than in fact. The term is probably not so commonly used as other syntactical terms such as ellipsis, asyndeton, and fusion; but as a feature of language it is deserving of equal recognition. And in some respects it is not technical at all; for probably every educated person manifests at one time or another some curiosity about a particular turn of word or phrase which he uses or hears, and if he sought to describe it he might one occasion find that it could be called ἀπὸ κοινώ. In general the term applies to that feature of language wherein it seems necessary to understand a word twice although it is expressed but once.

The second edition of Webster's New International Dictionary gives "apo koinou" and defines it as "a syntactical construction in which a subject or object in one clause stands also, without repetition, in a case relationship in a following clause, as in 'then sprang from his seat Hagen thus spoke' (Gudrun, 538)." With this definition mine (p. 16) has no conflict, although mine is in some respects broader and in others imposes further conditions. The use of the form "apo koinou" with Latin spelling, rather than with Greek spelling, seems increasingly desirable and it may well eventually fall in with the English pattern as a single word with the accent on the first syllable as it is now sometimes pronounced, although the dictionary gives "apò koinour." Since, however, statements containing the Greek form of the term are quoted here and there throughout this book, it has seemed best in this instance, by keeping the same form throughout, to guard against a certain amount of confusion to which the appearance of the two forms might give rise.

This present treatment of the construction consists of a collection and analysis of examples from Old and Middle Germanic languages. Some have been pointed out by others; many have not. It is likely that everyone who has studied an early Germanic poem, such as the Old English Beowulf
or the Old High German poetry of Otfrid or the Old Saxon Helland, has
come upon some reference to ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ concerning a particular passage and
has there thought about the likelihood of the construction. But in consider-
ing this likelihood one naturally wishes to study other examples. Isolated
references cannot offer the helpful criteria which a collection and a sifting
of examples from numerous poems provide.

The abhorrence of anything “ungrammatical” in most modern writing
tends to exclude the construction there. It would strike the eye as some-
how an error of omission, since it makes twofold use of a single locution.
Such a syntactical short cut we are usually careful to avoid in writing,
although it may not infrequently be heard in daily speech and is found in
writing of earlier periods.

The recognition of ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in the older languages is of value in a
number of ways. It enables one to understand text as it stands without feel-
ing that something has been omitted which must be editorially supplied.
And applying to a somewhat similar tendency it eliminates some unneces-
sary punctuation which occasionally gives to an early Germanic poem a
halting quality with which it was not actually afflicted. It makes unneces-
sary certain grammatical exceptions, such as holding a usually transitive
verb to be intransitive because its apparent object is also object of another
verb. Quite the opposite from being a burdensome bit of linguistic parapher-
nalia for the student, it helps to bring home to him the realization that the
dull printed page before him was once the spoken word as ready on the
tongue of man as is his own.

The occurrence of the construction ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ, though limited, is suf-
Ficiently frequent to merit a general understanding of the term. As one of
the many vagaries which language exhibits, it is of interest to all. And to
those readers of older texts who feel that in certain passages something is
syntactically amiss, it is deserving of careful consideration as a fitting in-
terpretation.

H. D. M.

Stanford University, California
August 1, 1938

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION ................................................. 7
ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ a Widespread Syntactical Construction .......................... 7
A Résumé of Discussions of ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in Germanic ...................... 10
An Interpretation of the Term ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ ................................. 16
The Plan of Discussion .............................................. 18

CHAPTER II. ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in OLD GERMANIC POETRY ..................... 20
A. The Common Element Constitutes a Half-Line .......................... 20
B. A Possible Koinon Stading in a Half-Line with
the First Part of the Construction and Relation of
Such to Asyndeton .................................................................. 36
C. The Common Element Stading in the Half-Line
with the Second Part of the Construction .................. 38
D. A Dependent Clause between Two Independent
Clauses and an Independent Clause between Two
Dependent Clauses .................................................. 49
Table of Citations ...................................................... 52

CHAPTER III. ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in MIDDLE ENGLISH AND MIDDLE DUTCH .... 55
I. Middle English ....................................................... 55
A. The Position of Koinon in Middle English
Verse .............................................................................. 58
B. Grammatical Nature of the Koinon ................................. 65
C. Context of the Construction .................................. 67
II. ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in Middle Dutch ............................................. 69
III. Comparison with Middle High German and Old
Germanic ......................................................................... 75
Table of Citations ...................................................... 79

CHAPTER IV. ἀν ἢ οὐνοῦ in OLD GERMANIC PROSE ................... 81
Infrequency of the Construction in Prose ................................. 81
A. Gothic ........................................................................... 81
B. Old English ............................................................. 84
C. Old Norse .............................................................. 85
Comparison with Asyndetic Parataxis in Old High
German (Tatian) ...................................................... 86
Table of Citations ...................................................... 88

[ 158 ]
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The term ἄνω καθὼς has been applied broadly to constructions which are not entirely of a uniform type. The interpretation has varied, depending partly upon the particular language which happened to be under discussion. Thus in regard to Latin the construction is defined by Stöle-Schnalla Lateinische Grammatik: "Die Figura ἄνω καθὼς besteht in der Setzung eines zu beiden Gliedern einer Verbindung gehörigen Wortes erst beim zweiten Gliede." 1 Tobler in his Vermischte Beiträge thus refers to the construction as it appears in Old French: "Die Redeweise, deren Eigentümlichkeit besteht in der gleichzeitigen Zugehörigkeit eines Rede-stückes zu einem Satze, dessen Schluss und zu einem zweiten Satze, dessen Anfang es bildet. . . ." 2 Behaghel in his Deutsche Syntax defines the construction with reference to Middle High German: "Unter constructio ἄνω καθὼς ist die Erscheinung zu verstehen, dass formal und sachlich gleichgeordnete Sätze oder Satzglieder, die nicht durch Konjunktion gebunden sind, ein Glied gemeinsam haben, das in der Mitte zwischen beiden Sätzen oder Satzgliedern steht und grammatisch sich sowohl mit dem vorausgehenden wie dem nachfolgenden Redeglied zur Einheit zusammen-schliesst." 3 Although the interpretation of ἄνω καθὼς varies somewhat in regard to any one branch of the Indo-European languages, in the main the construction to which the term is applied has one distinctive feature. It is a kind of verbal economy: a word or closely related group of words, expressed but a single time, serves at once a twofold grammatical function. And this form of expression is widely spread through Indo-European.

The Sanskrit term for this construction is kākākṣayata, "in the manner of a crow’s eye"—a rather pat term derived from the belief that a crow, while having but one eye, could nevertheless see him on either side of his head. 4 A passage from the Mānasavādharmaśāstra illustrates this construction in Sanskrit.

4, 83: vīrahastāca sūlaṇa nāgam kimcidapi śṛṇṣṭa

Having bathed his head with oil let him not touch his head'

---

1 Fifth edition, p. 848.  
2 Adolph Tobler, Vermischte Beiträge, I, 115.  
3 Otto Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, III, 534.  
4 In connection with ἄνω καθὼς this term has been pointed out by H. H. Bender, Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XI, 565.
THE CONSTRUCTION ἐπὶ κοινῷ IN THE GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Kullucka’s commentary upon this passage, as cited in the Boehtlingk-Roth Sanskrit Dictionary under kākākā, is as follows:

 autre le tainte an kākākāvadehayastra cāmhādayate.

"Thus the word tailed is connected kākākāvadehayastra with both sides." 6

The term ἐπὶ κοινῷ as applied to syntax was first used by Apollonius Dyscolus in his De constructione. 8 He there gives as an example the following passage:

Βουλεύειν μὲν Πνεύματος καὶ Αἴτησις ἢχεον ἢ ἅρμονίας τε Προθέμενον τε Κίνοις τε, 7

where ἢχεον, he states, is to be taken as koinon. A construction in which the koinon is probably more keenly felt is Thucydides i. 26. 3:

δαίμονοι τε τάν βουλήμαν τινοι κελέοντες. 8

Here ἐπὶ may stand ἐπὶ κοινῷ with the two participle between which it occurs.

In the field of Latin syntax, the term ἐπὶ κοινῷ has been used broadly. The following citations have been pointed out as examples of the construction:

Liv. xxx. 30. 7:

pervia paucis esse exercitibus

Esse is taken ἐπὶ κοινῷ.

Liv. xlvi. 5. 10:

sed cum veneno se malle quam morti ferro dixisset

Mori is taken ἐπὶ κοινῷ.

Horace C. i. 13. 4:

fervens difficili bile tumet icur

Difficult bile is taken as ablative of cause with both fervens and tumet.

Horace C. i. 3. 28:

igneum fraude mala gentibus intulit

---

6 Other references to this term in Sanskrit are given by Boehtlingk-Roth under kākākā. Also Lanman, in the notes to his translation of Rāja-Chandara’s Kākākā-Mahāpari, Harvard Oriental Series, IV, 264.

8 Grammatici Graeci, II, 2, pp. 170-71.

9 Thid. i. 494-55.

10 Cited by A. Biegler, De diversis quibus Graeci et Romani in dicendo ust sunt brevissati generibus (Lipsia, 1851), p. 18.

11 These last two citations are from W. Bahrrens, “Beiträge zur Lateinischen Syntax,” Philologia, Supplementband, XII, 281 and 268.

---

Gentibus is taken as dative of indirect object with intulit, dative of reference with mala.

Horace C. i. 30. 2:

 sperno dilectam Cyprum et vocantis | ture te nullo Glyceræ decoram | transfer in aedem 19

Te is taken as direct object of vocantis and transfer.

Cic. Leg. agr. 2. 95:

ex hac copia atque omnium rerum affluentia 11

Omnia rerum is taken in common with copia and affluentia.

Tobler 12 has cited a considerable number of examples of the construction in Old French. From his collection the following citations are taken:

Marie de France G 313:

Mes si vos ples que jeo vos die
M’aventure vos cunetrai 13

M’aventure may be taken in common with die and cunetrai.

Rich. 2900:

Et Richars aiguele ces paiens
Ochist a milliers et a cen 14

Ces paientes may be taken in common with aiguele and ochist.

Bast. 1840:

Chius est tant vertuies c’on doit recommander
Le poiasse de lui a tous bons recorde 15

Le poiasse may be taken in common with recommander and recorde.

Tobler also mentions an ἐπὶ σωφρον of sound of and syllabic but he states that this may be merely synaloepha. For instance: non ne nule ne tent amender (== a amender) son facefe. 16

---

10 These citations from Horace are from J. C. M. Grimm, The Construction ἐπὶ σωφρον in the Works of Horace (Philadelphia, 1928).


12 Adolph Todler, Vermischte Beiträge, I, 115 ff.

13 Die Lais der Marie de France, ed. Warnicke.

14 Richars li Biana, ed. Foerster.

15 Li Bastiers de Buillon, ed. Scheler.

16 Vermischte Beiträge, I, 187 note. Similar occurrences in Sophocles have been discussed by J. H. Wright, “Studies in Sophocles,” Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XII, 137 ff. He finds that often, where a word seems to be omitted, a similar sound is found in a syllable of a word which is there expressed. For an analogous occurrence in Old English, cf. Anglia, XI. III, 311, sec. 154.
There seems to have been no mention of the construction ąžo ąsvo in the Balto-Slavonic languages, but as it is noted so widely one would expect to find it there. The following passage from a Lithuanian daina contains two constructions in which there is possibly a feeling of a common element.

Nemūdykšt 
\[\text{Let the rain fade}\]

margū skrūlnu rasztēlį
The fair chest's inscription

nemendrūkšišt
You will not imprint

bē Tilšės drukorēlio
Without the engraver of Tilšė

Nemūdykšt
\[\text{Do not you break}\]

margū skrūlnu køjēlēs
The feet of the fair chest

nepadarysišt
You will not replace

bē Išrūši džūrēšūlį
Without the Išrūši artificer

In the first verse, the accusative rasztēlį stands between two verbs, is necessarily the object of the first, and in thought is the object of the second verb. Similarly with køjēlēs in the second verse.

Constructions referred to as ąžo ąsvo have long been noted in some of the Germanic languages. It is with this branch of the Indo-European family that we are here specifically concerned.

A RÉSUMÉ OF DISCUSSIONS OF ąžo ąsvo IN GERMANIC

The most recent work concerning ąžo ąsvo in Germanic is a thorough treatment by Fritz Karg of the construction as it appears in Middle High German. The central theme of Karg's work is a comparison of the ąžo ąsvo construction, such as do sprone von dem gesdile her Hagen e also sprach, with the construction which he calls the hiez-Konstruktion; for example, die worhte ein smit hiez Völkan. In this comparison he investigates the rhythmic and syntactical nature of both constructions. He finds that, while in ąžo ąsvo in poetry the koinon often begins a line or fills a line and so is separated by a pause from the preceding part, in the hiez-Konstruktion the assumed koinon often ends a line and hence seems to belong more closely with what precedes than with what follows. In the latter construction, too, he points out, there is often a divergence of case in the assumed koinon; that is, it stands in an oblique case and as subject of the following clause would have to serve also as nominative. He further finds that in the speaking of a sentence containing ąžo ąsvo there is a sudden change in the tone of the voice when the koinon is reached, but that this change does not occur in the enunciation of the hiez-Konstruktion.

He distinguishes between complete ąžo ąsvo, in which each of the two parts forms a complete sentence, and incomplete ąžo ąsvo, where such is not the case; he holds, however, that these two types have essentially the same structure. In regard to the context of the construction it is his observation that both parts usually express an action; these, for example, may stand in a temporal relationship to each other or from a situation conceived of as consisting of a group of actions any two may be chosen. In contrast he points out that the hiez-Konstruktion prevailing does not always state or specify a person or thing and does not express an action. Where a sentence stands as a possible common element, he decides that this is not a true ąžo ąsvo form.

In discussing the historical background of the construction he considers a number of passages from the Heliand but concludes that there is no real ąžo ąsvo in that poem. The first real ąžo ąsvo he finds in the Exodus, about 1120; the first hiez-Konstruktion in the Physiologus, about 1050. The construction ąžo ąsvo, he finds, is most noticeable in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and thereafter is increasingly rare; while the hiez-Konstruktion, on the other hand, begins to flourish as ąžo ąsvo tends to disappear. The former, he notes, is rare in religious poetry and prose but more common in folk poetry and poetry of the court, while the hiez-Konstruktion is frequent in religious poetry and prose.

Asynhdon and ąžo ąsvo are, he believes, distinct from each other. In an asynthetic construction the word which might serve as koinon is in his estimation more closely attached to the first part of the construction and is followed by a pause. The reverse he finds to be characteristic of ąžo ąsvo.

Finally, Karg believes that the ąžo ąsvo construction in Middle High German literature was taken over from the habits of daily speech. He states:

"Man denke etwa an einen Redner, der, wie man herkömmlich sagt, 'aus der Konstruktion fällt.' Diese lapsus linguae werden in vielen Fällen Konstruktionen ąžo ąsvo sein . . . ."

R. Hildebrand notes that the construction occurs in Middle High German, Latin, and Greek. He cites a few examples from each of these languages. In the construction he sees a shorthand method of thinking—"eine art stenographie des gedankens." The cultural development of a people, he feels, makes necessary a more abbreviated method of expression.

---

17 Cited from Wiedemann, Handbuch der Litauischen Sprache, p. 254.
which presses to the heart of the matter without employing words which may be dispensed with.

In his edition of Ercc, M. Haupt assembles a large number of examples of das xo voxv in Middle High German.\(^{10}\) Upon the nature of the construction he remarks only that it is found in early and popular Middle High German poetry rather than in the cultivated style of the thirteenth century. The Heiland, he says, is full of it. His examples are grouped according to the grammatical form of the koinon: nominative; accusative; two cases in one form; verb; phrase; and adverb.

H. H. Bender in a discussion of sixteen examples of das xo voxv from Gudrun considers that the construction may sometimes result from the omission of a relative pronoun, that in long and involved sentences it may be occasioned by anacolouth, and that originally perhaps in most cases it arose from subordination without relative pronouns, a period immediately following parataxis. The possible course of development as he outlines it would be as follows:

1. Parataxis: do sprang von dem gesidele her Hagen. her Hagen also sprach.

2. Subordination, originally not syntactical but only subordination in thought and expression: do sprang von dem gesidele her Hagen; (her Hagen also sprach) or (der also sprach).

3. Coalescence of two words which stood side by side with the same meaning, resulting in das xo voxv: do sprang von dem gesidele her Hagen also sprach.

He notes the lack of unanimity of opinion concerning the Gudrun examples and the tendency on the part of editors to avoid the construction through varied punctuation and textual readings.\(^{11}\)

Hermann Paul states that in das xo voxv one sentence may be logically subordinate to the other, so that one might represent it by a relative clause.\(^{12}\) Such a sentence as Gegen Frankfurt liegt ein Ding über heißt Sachsenhausen he considers das xo voxv. The koinon too, he thinks, may represent divergent cases as in von einem stangen was gebunden.

At a meeting of German philologists in Jena in 1921, B. Delbrück spoke on “Die Konstruktion das xo voxv im Hochdeutschen.”\(^{13}\) He dis-

---


\(^{12}\) Deutsche Grammatik (Halle, 1920), IV, 189 f.

\(^{13}\) Verhandlungen der 53. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Jena (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 63-64.

agreed with Paul concerning such constructions as von einem stangen was gebunden and sentences containing the verb heissen. Such constructions he considered really two sentences, the second of which could be joined with an anaphorical pronoun. das xo voxv originates, in his estimation, from habits of daily speech; as, for instance, the expression, es geht mir etwas besser geht es mir. So arose the construction of a common element with two predicates, and on this model other similar sentences were formed.

In an instructive section on das xo voxv, O. Behaghel doubts that it originates in anacolouth.\(^{14}\) Rather it arises, he states, from asyndeton. From a Middle High German point of view such an Old High German construction as the following from Matthew, argynund duo us pharisara wopathans garati would, he believes, be considered das xo voxv; and from such instances with the koinon as subject the construction spread. In Volume IV of his Syntax\(^{15}\) he cites examples wherein a main clause stands das xo voxv between two dependent clauses. Such an occurrence, he feels, is to be connected with a widespread tendency to express a thought more than once, and may also be influenced at times by some uncertainty on the part of the speaker in regard to what he had already said. These constructions he would distinguish from those in which only a word serves as common element. Numerous similar examples from the Heiland had been previously cited by him;\(^{16}\) for example, Heiland 1665: et thu sis godes zuem, be hui ni heis thun, et thu sis huter habes.

L. Kelner considers das xo voxv to be of the same nature with what he calls “the oldest stage of the adjective clause (omission of the relative pronoun)”\(^{17}\); as, for example: Her on his goare gene Foster at Baum gerefa.\(^{18}\) Such locutions as was at Baum gerefa in his opinion fell from the beginning as subordinate to the principal sentence, and he would look upon the whole construction as a sentence with one subject and two predicates. The starting point for the construction das xo voxv he believes lies in sentences of the type, “There be some sports are painful,” where the common subject occurs in the middle.

E. Einemken considers the simplest form of das xo voxv to be the pat for pat pat construction; for example: he wile nu gelestan pat he lange gehet, where the relative and demonstrative fall together and only one is

14 Deutsche Syntax (Heidelberg, 1928), III, 535 f. On p. 534 he gives the definition of das xo voxv already quoted, which he illustrates with numerous examples from Middle High German, arranged according to the grammatical form of the common element.

15 Deutsche Syntax (Heidelberg, 1932), IV, 289 f.

16 Die Modi im Heiland (Paderborn, 1876), p. 15.

17 Historical Outlines of English Syntax (London, 1892), pp. 61-64.
expressed. As the pronoun could assume two functions, one for the main clause and one for the subordinate clause, so could a noun. Such a sentence as se fader hire scálde one pemwe nele Bala hatte contains in his interpretation a common element functioning as object of a main clause and as subject of a subordinate clause.

In discussing what he terms contact clauses, such as "This is the boy we spoke of," Otto Jespersen notes that they are frequently explained on the ándó sonóø principle. He remarks:

This may account for some cases, and at any rate may describe the psychological feeling even in Present English sentences like those given above. But the explanation is not sufficient, and if it is admitted, we must at any rate say that the construction was soon extended to cases in which there is no element that can strictly be said to belong to both parts of the sentence.

He feels it safer to say that in early speech the pronoun was felt to be inherent in the verb, that two sentences, originally independent units, if pronounced rapidly after each other, came to be felt as a grammatical unit, and that this usage continued after it had become customary to have a pronoun as subject. In his so-called contact clauses he cites examples where the ándó sonóø feeling is excluded but gives others, for example, "My father had a daughter loved a man," where he feels that the ándó sonóø analysis may be applied.

Concerning Old English, Klaeber in Textual Interpretation of "Beowulf" expresses the belief that some passages suffer from over punctuation. He states: "Certainly a simple ('unvaried') word or phrase occupying a medial position between two terms of variation should be assigned the ándó sonóø function, whenever it occurs at the beginning of the line." Exemplifying this he cites Beowulf 753: he on moode wæð | forhát on ferhæ. With a proleptic use of nouns or pronouns the verb is stated, as it states, he said to be employed ándó sonóø. For example, Beowulf 1180: ic minne can | glæden Hroðulf | put he þa geogode wile | arun healdon. Furthermore he mentions an instance of the ándó sonóø construction with an object at the beginning of the second half-line, Beowulf 131: polda ágyðæow ðegnsorge dreah. In discussing variation he mentions the form "noun: infinitive phrase, the former being general in its meaning, the latter specific; they are 'governed' by the same verb, which may be said to be used ándó sonóø." Exemplifying this, he cites Beowulf 1431: beærhts ongeætan | gudhorne galan.

---

30 Modern Philology, III (1905), 237 ff.
32 Bijdrage tot de Syntaxis der "Dat"-Zinnen in het Germanisch (Utrecht, 1918), pp. 92-94.
literature: (1) Gothic: The Gothic Bible and Skeireins; (2) Old High German: Tatian, Otfrid; (3) Old Saxon: the Helian and the Old Saxon Genesis; (4) Old Norse: the Poetic Edda, Gyfjamning of the Prose Edda, the first six sagas of the Sturlunga group; (5) Old English: the poetry collected in the three volumes of Grein-Wülcker, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie, Alfred's translation of Orosius, Alfred's translation of Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; (6) Middle English: some fifty thousand lines of Middle English poetry; (7) Middle Dutch: some sixty thousand lines of Middle Dutch poetry; (8) Middle High German: some Middle High German poetry. For such reference as is made to this last field I have used examples mainly from the collection made by Karg.

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM ðæð seoww

Since the term ðæð seoww will be used henceforth in this discussion only as the writer interprets it, a definition is necessary as a working basis. The definition is not made arbitrarily but is deduced from the observation of numerous similar syntactical constructions. Such constructions do not, of course, always fall into stereotyped forms; but there are certain main characteristics which can be held to. From the observation of these the following definition is formulated.

ðæð seoww is a syntactical construction in which a word or closely related group of words, occurring between two portions of discourse, contains an idea which completes the thought of the first part, to which it is grammatically related, at once supplies the thought essential to the following part, to which it may also be grammatically related, and is not felt to belong more closely with the first part than with the second.

It is not always possible to draw hard and fast rules about a phase of syntax, and in some cases the including of a construction in the category of ðæð seoww or its exclusion therefrom is a matter of degree and not of clear-cut distinction. In the main, however, the definition here given is tenable. For the sake of specific example, the following citations are given:

Old English, Beowulf 740:
ac he gefeng bræce  forman sǣn
slependne rinc  slat unswearnum

Here slependne rinc stands between gefeng and slat, completes the thought expressed in gefeng and is object thereof, supplies the thought essential to slat and is object thereof, and stands in a half-line, hence is not felt to be more closely connected with what precedes than with what follows. Similarly in the following examples:

Beowulf 131:
þulode þryðswþ þegnsorge dreah

Here þegnsorge is object both of þulode and dreah.

Old English, Beowulf 1238:
Seged up dadun

Old Norse, Sigurðarkviða 4:
ne hunskr konungr  heljask at armne
mey frumur  fal mege giuka

Brot af Sigurðarkviða 19:
ja reynde þat  es rifet hafhe
møþogr a vî  min at bêja

Old High German, Otfrid I, 25, 9:
zi imo sprah tho lindo  ther gote su sebo
kunsta imo . . . .

Tatian 269, 5:
Tho antlingi ther ander increbota inan.

Constructions are not considered ðæð seoww if the word which would have to serve in common must serve two cases, one of which is different in form from the word as it appears; nor if it is distinctly more closely related to the preceding part of the sentence; nor if the second part is so
subordinate in idea that a carrying over of thought is not essential. These three points are illustrated, respectively, by the three following examples:

Roman van Lancelot 13872:
Dat mi mijn vader te wive gat
Een kind was des coninck sone.

Helian 5100:
Theo bałe ina the biskop habda bitran hugi.

Alexander 7, 851:
Duer es een boom heet lignum vite.

Since the discussion of ḍan xōvō in the field of Germanic is a broad subject, these examples have been taken for the sake of orientation before specific details are taken up.

THE PLAN OF DISCUSSION

Regarding the ḍan xōvō construction, there are four main factors to be taken into consideration: (1) the grammatical nature of the koinon, (2) the context of the sentence in which the construction occurs, (3) the position of the koinon as it occurs in verse, and (4) the possible connection of ḍan xōvō with constructions of a somewhat similar type. The question of the position in verse divides the subject into two parts—poetry and prose; and these will be considered separately, with a discussion of the grammatical nature of the koinon and the general context of the sentence in each. The question of the relation to other constructions involves a consideration of two constructions: (a) asyndetic parataxis; (b) attributive constructions in which the second part expresses an attribute or state of the word which would be taken in common. This construction has been referred to variously as the adjective clause, omission of the relative, contact clause, and hier-Konstruktion. In the matter of asyndeton, the question is whether a word is to be taken in common or whether it is more closely related to a preceding part. As the means for determining this are not the same in poetry and prose, the question will be taken up first along with the ḍan xōvō construction in poetry and secondly with this construction in prose.

The attributive construction, however, is not confined to a question of sentence-pause, and its appearance in prose and poetry may be discussed together. To start with the earliest appearance of ḍan xōvō, the next

---

28 This method of analysis is similar to that of Karg in his “Die Konstruktion ḍan xōvō im Mittelhochdeutschen,” in Syntaxische Studien; other writers mentioned in the résumé of discussions provided above have individually considered one or several of these points.
CHAPTER II

āðr xwōð in old germanic poetry

In Old English poetry, the Poetic Edda, the work of Ofrid, and the Helian and Old Saxon Genesis, all included in this discussion, a line consists of two half-lines between which there is a caesura. In an āðr xwōð construction the common element may take any of the following positions:

1. It may fill a half-line, as, for instance:

   Helian 2469:
   an is briest hledet that gibod gores
   linnod endi lestid

2. It may rarely occupy a half-line along with the first part of the construction. Here it is separated by the caesura from the second part and this intervening pause vitiates somewhat the feeling that there is a common element, as it is metrically more closely attached to the first part of the construction; for instance:

   Beowulf 513:
   ēaer git eorostream carnum þehton
   maruon merestrata mundum bragan

Here one must decide between āðr xwōð and asyndeton. (3) It may occupy a half-line along with the second part of the construction; for instance:

   Ofrid II, 9, 29:
   nu will ið hiær gizeellen ein bildi ginenmen
   Rhyme Poem 9:
   þæ was wæstumnus awæht world anspréht

In no case in the material covered does the whole construction fall within a single half-line.

A. THE COMMON ELEMENT CONSTITUTES A HALF-LINE (RARELY TWO HALF-LINES)

In this construction the koinon may be either the first or the second half-line. If it falls in the first half-line, it is set off somewhat from the portion in the preceding line by the natural feeling of a slight pause following the completion of a full line. It is set off from the succeeding portion by the caesura. For example:

   Beowulf 56:
   hæah Haelædæ neðh þonðen līde
   [174]

   Buggon þa to bence bláagandæ
   fylle gefegont

   Beowulf 1119:
   wand to wolcanum wælþryra most
   hlynode for hliwe

   Phoenix 186:
   nuban bliceð
   wedercondel aworm weordum ðyteð

   Ofrid I, 25, 9:
   zi into sprah tho lindo ther gater sun selbo
   kunhta im er ix wolza iz oth so wesan scolta

   Ofrid IV, 36, 1:
   ni möhun noh blinnen thes armillichen willen
   theo selven eawrion than othm tho nit worton³

   Helian 2238:
   segel up adun
   wæðorwæth man letnu wind aftar
   manon othTER thana mestrom

---

¹ The subject of the following half-line, fægær gefegont, is not bláagandæ, but magæ para. Cf. Hoops, Kommentar zum Beowulf (Heidelberg, 1932), p. 127.
² In two examples from Ofrid the first verb is singular, the second plural:
   Ofrid IV, 24, 13:
   Ingægin riæf tho luto heriscaf theru lüto
   ıscrirrum filu gahun

Here the singular heriscaf governs the singular riæf, but the plural idea of the subject as a whole induces a plural form for the following verb. Similarly V, 20, 19.
Here, after the second part of the construction, fandoda is frahon, there is a definite change in idea and a new subject is expressed. In such constructions, the first two verbs with intervening subject constitute a distinct unit of thought. This one may call the closed construction. In such examples as the following, however, the two sentence portions surrounding the common element are felt to form less of a unit. One may call this the open construction.

**Andreas 962:**

\[\text{[Text in Old German]}\]

**Heliand 832:**

\[\text{[Text in Old German]}\]

**Rygsla 43:**

\[\text{[Text in Old German]}\]

In these examples there is an element which is to be construed with what precedes and with what follows, and it is no more closely related to one than it is to the other. But the asyndetic addition of one or more other verbs gives a certain looseness to the construction. This asyndetic joining of several verbs is common in old Germanic poetry, and it would not be surprising if it occurred after an ðan ðō xoynō construction as well as elsewhere. It is, however, relatively rare. From 87 examples in which the koinon is the subject, there are only 24 examples where another verb follows with unexpressed subject. But of these 24 examples, 12 are of a type wherein the first two verbs, with their common subject, form a unit in thought to which the third verb is alien:

a) The third verb is joined by a conjunction. In such cases the feeling of unity in the first two verbs is preserved, and the third verb often has the aspect of an addendum. For example:

**Andreas 537:**

\[\text{[Text in Old German]}\]
Here the two verbs, **bliðe weron** and **herodon**, with their common subject, **rof oretta**, form a unit of thought from which the third verb, **cwæð**, is excluded.4

b) The first verbs stand closely together, but a following verb is separated from them by numerous intervening words. For example:

*Genesis 1376*:

> strong was 7 reðe
> sce ðæ wærum wold  wærah 7 peahite
> manifestu bearn  midangeardes
> woman wæge  wera ðefælland
> hof hergode6

Here the two parts, joined by the common subject, **Simon Petrus**, may be looked upon as a method of expressing the general idea, 'he wasn't slow in speaking.' There is a distinct break in thought between this idea and the following expression, 'had good courage.'

*Beowulf 234*:

> gewat him ḥa to waroðe  wæge riðan
> þeow Hroðgares  þrynumm cwehte
> magenwæðu mundum  meþwæþwæðum frægn

Here the portions joined by the common element **þeow Hroðgares** express the general idea of the thane's approaching the shore in a rather hostile fashion. The third verb introduces the speech which follows.

*Beowulf 2538*:

> æras ðæ bi ronde  rof oretta
> orde under helme  hioroserecan her
> under standeslufu  strengo getræwode
> anes namæs

The first two sentence elements joined by the common subject, **rof oretta**, express the general idea of the warrior's getting ready to fight. The third verb brings in a new idea, namely, that he trusted in his own strength.

*Daniel 256*:

> bliðe weron
> eorlas Ebra  ofestum herodon
> drithen on dreame  dydon swa he cfison7

The expressions **bliðe weron** and **herodon**, with their common subject, **eorlas Ebra**, contain the idea that joyfully the leaders of the Hebrews worship the Lord. The clause, **dydon swa he cfison**, is a distinctly supplementary expression.

Out of 87 cases where the common element forms the subject, there are 75 examples in which the two verbs with their one subject form a syntactical construction which is not only neatly connected grammatically but which also, within the continuous expression of ideas in the poem, forms a distinct unit of thought. There are 12 examples in which the two verbs with their common subject do not form such a unit of thought. For example:

*Beowulf 1980*:

> meoduscenecum hwearl
> geond þæt heoreced  Hæreðes doktor
> luode þæ leode  hwæðe heer

Here the general idea is that of ministering to the men in the hall, and the third verb is as essential to this thought as are the other two.

*Metra 28*, 15:

> on ðære iccan  eaxe hwirfæð
> eaill runa roder  recene scriþæð
> suðheald swîðæð

The movement of the firmament is the idea contained in this whole passage. The first two verbs with their common subject do not express an idea essentially different from that expressed by the third verb.

The 12 examples of this type, however, are distinctly in the minority compared with the 75 cases in which the first two verbs with their common subject constitute a unit of thought. The only essential difference between the open construction and the closed construction is that the former, in some instances, does not possess the compactness of expression which is characteristic of the latter.

2. **Accusative case**.—Koinon is accusative (15 in all), for example:

*Christ 484*:

> 7 fulwæð  fæc under roderum
> hwæðeræð to heoforum

6 Similarly, *Elene 61*, and *Beowulf 2430*.  
7 Similarly, *Chronicle Poem 381*, *Whale 27*.  
8 Similarly, *Jalana 614*, *Helian 832*. In the example above the synonyms **wærah** and **peahite** go together, forming the second verbal expression in the group and followed at some length by the third, **hergode**.
Here Christ is giving commands to his disciples as to what they are to perform. That *fclc under roderum* must be the object of *heavorfað* is clear from the context. The passage runs on, 'break up idols, abolish hostility, sow friendship.' The idea is plainly to turn mankind toward heaven. Under *heavorfan* Bosworth-Toller Dictionary cites this passage as: *fálwað fclc heavorfað to heofonum: baptize people and turn them to heaven.*

**Metra 27, 2:**

swa swa merefloðes
yða hverað tacale sæw
wægæð for windes

The waves stir and move the ice-cold sea because of the wind. Both *hverað* and *wægað* need a direct object.1

**Salomon and Saturn 395:**

eristnað 7 clælan 8 wulde gewlitigað

**Christ and Satan 154:**

sær we ymb hine utan ealle hofan
leomu ymb leofne lofsonga word
dríhtne sædon

*Loftsonga word* is object both of *hofan* and *sædon.* *Leomu* is used figuratively here, 'limbs of the lord,' parallel with *æw* in the preceding line.4

**Hellland 2630:**

endil fahid bedin
wile endi gode tiuhid up te stade
lidad siæ te lande

It is significant that the pronoun is expressed after *lidad* but not after *tiuhid.* The expression *wile endi gode* is object of *fahid* and stands in a position to serve as object of *tiuhid,* so that no further expression is necessary.

**Sigorparkeifiga 4:**

ne laan leomo kyssa gerpe
ne humsker konungr heftjas eart at arne
meye frumunna feal mæg Gúta

The Hun king is Sigurth, and the passage refers to his lying with Brunhild chastely, since he was winning her for Gunnar, the son of Gjuki. In English it might be possible to translate this construction, 'he never had to his arms the maiden he kept for Gunnar,' and explain it as a relative ellipsis, the relative 'whom' having merely been left out. But it is doubtful if this applies here. There is really no relative subordination in the second part of the construction. There are rather two independent ideas, 'he never had the maiden in his arms' and 'the maiden he kept for Gunnar.' *Mey frumunna* is definitely the object of *hefja* and was probably felt to be directly the object of *fæl.*9

**Guþrunarkeifiga II, 8:**

þa hefre þa hrafn gjialla
græo gjialla æale fægna
varga þiota

Here the adjective phrase, *æale fægna,* modifies both *hrafn, græo* in the preceding section and *varga* in the following section.10

**Bewulf 1807:**

Heht þa se hearda Hunting beran
sénum Ecglafes heht his sword nimnan

Interpreting this 'then the brave one bade the son of Ecglaef bear Hunting, bade him take his sword,' *sénum Ecglafes* stands *ðæo wæcwæf* subject accusative of *beran* and *nimnan.*11

**Bewulf 1020:**

Forgæf þa Bewulfes bearn Healdfenes
segen gyldenæ sigores to leane
broden hiltcumbor helm ond byrnan
mære mæhburmae word manige genowan
beforan beorn beran.

It is usual to punctuate here with a semicolon after *byrnan* or a colon after *-sæwæde.*12 It *-sæwæde* surely belongs in the group *segen, helm, byrnan,* all objects of *forgæf.* The process of enumeration is rather lengthy, and

---

1 Cf. Daniel 388: *þa be lagostreamas* | *weteriscpe wægæð,* and the prose *Boethius* 39, 1: *swa swa yða for windes þa se hverað.*

2 Cf. Bosworth-Toller Supplement under *him.* E. Koch, *"Jubilae Jaunts and Jottings,* Lund Universityer Arsskrifte, N.F. avd. 1, Bd. 14, nr. 26, p. 70, takes *leomu* as object of *hofan:* "lifted up our wings." In the context the raising of wings seems less likely than the raising of songs of praise, and *leomu,* 'wings,' is less likely than *leomu,* 'limbs of the lord.' *Loftsonga word* is taken as object of both verbs by G. Krapp, *The Jutish Manuscripts* (New York, 1931), p. 235.

3 Cf. B. Sjömons and H. Gering, *Die Lieder der Edda, Kommentar* (Halle, 1931), II, 246: "mæy frumunna is sowohl obj. zu hifæk [hefja] wie zu fæl (konstr. ðæo wæcwæf)."


the mention of the last gift leads directly into the new idea, manige gesæwon 
beforean beorn beran, with -sæwol as direct object; it is possible too that 
segen, hiltcwombe, helm, and byrnan are to be considered objects of beran.14

3. Genitive case.—There are only three examples in which the koinon 
stands in the genitive case.

Helland 734:

ni warth sid nob er
jamariht re forgang jungaro manno
armiliaro dor

Here the expression jungaro manno qualifies both forgang and dor.

Beowulf 1043:

ond ða Beowulf be bega gswæðer
esor Ingwine onweald getæah
wæga and wepna het hine wel brucan

The Chambers edition of Beowulf states that here brucan is used with-
out expressed object; but this seems unlikely. The prince of the Ingwins 
gave Beowulf horses and weapons and told him to enjoy them. Wæga and 
wepna are genitives qualifying onweald and are also in thought the object 
of brucan and are expressed right before it. Brucan takes the genitive case. 
The same type of construction occurs in Beowulf 2810:

[response]

gegnge gesæwale
georgum garwigan goldsahne helm
beah on byrnan het many brucan well

Here, however, helm, beah, and byrnan are accusatives. Byrnan, in form, 
is genitive as well as accusative and can be object both of gesæwale and 
brucan. Metrically, the three nouns are about as closely related to one verb 
as another. They are obviously the object of gesæwale and, in thought, are 
the object of brucan; since byrnan may be grammatically construed with 
both verbs, it seems possible that there is a feeling of a common element 
here.

Beowulf 1486:

læt ic gemcystum golde funde 
bega byrstan breac bonne moste

Here too brytan is accusative, object of funde; but formally it may be 
genitive object of breac. Hoops supplies his and translates “ich erfreute 
mit seiner, solange ich konnte.”16 These groups with brucan are analo-
gous to Beowulf 2162, Bruc ellæs wæl, except that here the genitive object 
is obviously expressed. In these three examples just cited brucan, which

---

14 For an enumeration of gifts brought and given, cf. Judith 335–42.
15 Commentary, p. 174.
16 Commentary, p. 177.
17 Beowulf, p. 197.
18 Peter Nester 3, 23; Andreas 596.
19 According to reading in Livit Psalmorum (ed. B. Thorpe, Oxford, 1835). Wäl-
ccker supplies inæl before melodies and Krapp, The Paris Psalter and the Meters 
of Boethius (New York, 1932), supplies inæl; in either case facnum wordum stands 
ðan xwoló.
20 Given in Thorpe’s text.
Latin verb, and likewise to its Old English equivalents, *frunon* and *mel-ddenan*, *fornum wordum* being common to both.

_Heliant 5298:_

技术支持的 as well as *ledian.*

_Heliant 3211:_

emid is folum twem

The uncertainty concerning which verb *misd* is *folum twem* qualifies—

_Heliant 345:_

biet man that alla the eilendium man iro odill sohtin

In this *angegin* . . . *bodon*, ‘for a meeting with the king’s messengers,’

_Beowulf 809:_

ja þet onundfe se þe fela aer

Here *manna cymne* qualifies both *modes myrðe* and *fyrene,*

_Beowulf 1502:_

halan lice hring utan ymbbearh

In such examples as these, where a dative case or prepositional phrase stands in a half-line between two verbs, there is an unbroken flow of thought through the whole construction and the common element forms a neat connecting link.

5. _Verbal expression._—In three instances the common half-line is a verbal expression. When a verb stands between two nouns each of which it may govern, the second noun is often a variation of the first, so that one feels it to be an appositional expression not closely linked to the verb, and here it is doubtful if the *dán xwvô* principle applies. At times, however, one may feel that the second noun is to be closely linked to the verb. For example:

_Psalms 137, 2:_

eac ic ðin tempel tidum weorðige

Latin: *adorabo ad templum sanctum tuae.* Here the Old English elaborates the Latin *tempulum sanctum* into *tempel* and *halige hus.* They both, of course, express the same idea, but that the significance of the verb extends also to the second noun might appear from the fact that the expression of “worship” is caught up and modified at the end of the passage by the adverbial expression *holde mode.*

In the following example the final noun is rather to be taken closely linked with the verb than held as an appositional addendum.
Latin: *et dabitur ei de auro Arabiae.* Here the group of *Arabia gold* is subject of *byð seald* and object of *leod.*

8. Anomalous instance.—An anomalous instance from Old Norse is *Alvísmál* 1:

```
Bekke breiða nu skal bruðr með mer
heilm i sime smaet.
```

Here the group *nu skal bruðr* is essential to both infinitives, *breiða* and *smaet.*

Unusual too is the construction in *Metra* 11, 34:

```
7 þæs winnende wrocioð faste
agðwice òðer utan ymbeloppet.
```

Here the group *agðwice òðer* supplies subject and object for *wrocioð* and also for *ymbeloppet.*

Some of the Latin sources for Otfrid’s work are available, and in examples of the common half-line construction his method of translation is significant.

```
Otfrid I, 25, 9:
zì ismo sprah the lindo ther gates sun sehlo
kunda ino.
```

Latin: *responsends autem Jesus dixit.* Otfrid translates the participle *responsends* as a finite verb and translates the noun *Jesus* in such a way that it fills a half-line between the two verbs *sprah* and *kunda.*

```
Otfrid III, 2, 26:
gagantun ino hilde the holden scælka sine
zaltun ino ouh innan thes.
```

Latin: *servi occurrunt ei et nuntiavortunt.* Otfrid translates *servi* in such a way that it fills a half-line between both verbs. The conjunction is felt to be unnecessary as a direct joiner and is rendered by *ouh.*

```
Otfrid IV, 22, 15:
riaf imo al ingenni thes laminites meginig
quad war in lobs joh suzi man Barabian in lazi.
```

Latin: *exclamavit autem simul universa turba dicens.* Otfrid translates **28**

---

27 Cited also *Gufrunmarkþjá*, II, 8, cited on p. 37, above.
28 Siemew, *Die Lieder der Edda*, p. 150, takes the construction as *ánö lóf.*
   Cf. also *Kommentar*, I, 327.
29 Under *agðwice* and *wrocioð*, Bosworth-Toller Dictionary cites *agðwic òðer* with *wrocioð* in this passage; under *ymbeloppet* with *ymbelopped.* Cf. *wrocioð òðer* in prose *Boethius* (ed. W. Sedgefield, Oxford, 1899), p. 49, l. 7.
30 Cited at the foot of each page in *Otfrids Evangelienbuch* (ed. Oskar Erdmann, Halle, 1882).
universalis turbis in such a way that it fills a half-line, after which dicens is translated finitely by quod.

In such examples as these the translating of the Latin construction verb-noun-participle by the Germanic construction verb-noun-verb, and the placing of words in a medial position give additional evidence that we are here dealing with a common element.

Definite categories for the context of such constructions are difficult to establish, but in the main they fall into two divisions: (1) one in which each of the two parts contributes toward the expression of one general idea or to the description of one particular event or situation; (2) one in which the construction expresses two different ideas, often two actions, the second of which temporally follows the first. Examples of the first type are about twice as numerous as those of the second. For example, Type 1 is shown in

**Beowulf 2117:**

\begin{align*}
\text{ba was eft hrae}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{gearo gynwrecce grendeles modor}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{sibode sorhfull}
\end{align*}

The general idea is that Grendel’s mother was in a perturbed state of mind. This is expressed by saying that she was eager for revenge and that she went about full of sorrow.

**Otfried III, 20, 29:**

\begin{align*}
\text{tho hintarquamun gahun thie nan er ginshun}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{ni woltnan an irkemoen}
\end{align*}

The subject of discourse is the general perplexity of those who had known the blind man, when they see him with sight restored.

**Heliant 3031:**

\begin{align*}
\text{habda iu tho giholpan helendo Krist}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{habda sia forfangana fundo kraftu}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{wamisadun biwerit}
\end{align*}

The comprehensive idea that Christ had benefited the woman is set forth in the first part, and this is made more specific in the second part. Type 2 is shown in these two examples.

**Beowulf 2575:**

\begin{align*}
\text{Geesa dyrhten gryrefahe sinh}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{bond up abroad}
\end{align*}

The two parts of the construction stand in a temporal relationship to each other; first he raised his hand and then he struck.

**Otfried IV, 36, 1:**

\begin{align*}
\text{ni molhun noh blihmen thes armilichen willen}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{thie selbun wortorti thaz oogtan tho mit worton}
\end{align*}

Here the temporal sequence is not so clear as in the example from Beowulf, but the adverb tho shows that the occurrence expressed in the second part follows that expressed in the first.

In the few examples where the common element is a verb, there is of course no distinction to be made with regard to the two parts of the construction, as the idea expressed by the verb applies to both parts. Also in a few instances of a koinon the second part of the construction does not form an independent idea in itself. For example:

**Psalms 118, 52:**

\begin{align*}
\text{stic wass gemynidig marra doma}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{hinran gelcanol}
\end{align*}

**Heliant 734:**

\begin{align*}
\text{ni varth sid noh er}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{jamartlika forgang jungaro manno}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{armilikaro dof}
\end{align*}

Under Type I are some examples where the general idea is that of preparing to say something but where the two parts of the construction nevertheless show considerable variation; for example,

**Heliant 2831:**

\begin{align*}
\text{Tho habda is word garu}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{Philippus fred gumo quath that thar sif wari}
\end{align*}

There are, however, eight examples where this type of construction amounts practically to two different expressions for said; for example,

**Otfried IV, 22, 15:**

\begin{align*}
\text{rast ino al ingeini thes lanilites menig}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{quad war in liob joh suazi man Barabban in iazi}
\end{align*}

In such cases as these, while there is no syntactical subordination, there is perhaps a feeling that the second verb of the construction is more formal than necessary and somewhat less important in thought than the first verb of saying.

Instances are very rare wherein the part following a possible common half-line represents a definitely subordinate idea or is merely an attributive expression, such as the following:

**Christ and Satan 75:**

\begin{align*}
\text{eft reordade ofre sde}\vspace{10pt} \\
\text{fesoda aldor wass ba forwurth agen}
\end{align*}

\textit{21} Also Psalms 102, 14, 2.

\textit{22} This construction is exceptional in carrying a part, \textit{hina}, of the common element over to the beginning of the next line.

[188]
It is an essential characteristic of the áðr sōwō construction in Old Germanic verse that both parts of the construction contain a comparatively equal independence of thought. This sometimes approaches repetition of ideas; but in very few cases is there any feeling that the second part of the construction is distinctly subordinate in idea. There is no reason to believe that the áðr sōwō construction in early Germanic is in any way related to the relative-clause construction. There is a question, however, if this means of joining ideas by áðr sōwō may be related to axyndetic parataxis—the joining of two independent ideas without visible connective.

B. A POSSIBLE KOINON STANDING IN A HALF-LINE WITH THE FIRST PART OF THE CONSTRUCTION AND RELATION OF SUCH TO ASYNDTON

There are very many axyndetic constructions in Old Germanic poetry in which there can be no possible relation with áðr sōwō; for instance,

*Helianc* 2266:

helidos quamun
lūdī te lande  sagedun lōf goda
maridun is meginkraft

In such constructions the order of words prevents any possibility of a common element. If, however, one clause takes the inverted order, verb-subject, it is not impossible that the nominal idea may carry over to the following verb; for instance,

*Atlantē* 3:

horsk vas husfrejja  hugbe at manve

There is more feeling of a common element in such a construction if after the two verbs a new subject is expressed or a distinctly new idea taken up. It is characteristic of the áðr sōwō construction that the two parts of the construction constitute a unit of thought within the flow of discourse in the poetry. In some axyndetic examples, there is a joining of three or more verbs, even when the first clause has the inverted order with a subject in position to serve in common; for instance,

*Helianc* 72:

that was fred gumo  habda ferhtan hugi
was fön them liudun

*Hymeskviþa* 28:

geldi llorirje  greip a staifne
vait meþ austre  upp logafaka

*Christ* 609:

dreoscēd deaw 7 ren  dugüþe weccaþ . . .
locás scerścielan

When, however, the construction consists of only two verbs, there is a certain feeling of unity in the expression; for instance,

*Helianc* 5173:

than bed that barn godas  bendi tholda

*Atlantē* 62:

Hörpo tol Gunnar  hruþle ilkvistom

The only point that distinguishes such constructions from áðr sōwō is the fact that the possible koinon is more closely related metrically to the first part of the construction. But when the expressions are short and concise, as in these examples, it seems possible that there is a carrying over of idea. And if the possible common element happens to be an object which both verbs require, then this carrying over of the idea is essential in spite of the metrical pause. For instance,

*Otfrīd* IV, 4, 15:

namum sic tho iro wat  legiun thoruf in gīdat

Here wat is, in thought, the object of both namum and legiun. One might say that the object of legiun is understood and does not have to be expressed; but since the obvious object of legiun immediately precedes this verb, such an assumption is unnecessary.

*Vplundarkviþa* 26:

slo lann brjostkringlor  sende Bövilde

*Vplundarkviþa* 38:

slok brjosttiringlor  sendak Bövilde

As in the example from Otfrīd, to say that the object here is understood with sende amounts to saying that, since the object is expressed immediately preceding, it is unnecessary to repeat it. To call it a relative ellipsis is resorting to a construction which is rare in Old Norse and which introduces into the context a feeling of subordination very likely not intended to be there. To call it áðr sōwō involves the difficulty that the possible koinon is more closely connected with the first part. But the second verb requires an object in spite of the preceding pause. One may call it an axyndetic construction which nearly merges into áðr sōwō.

*Beowulf* 513:

þær git eagorstream  eartum þehton
mation merestreata  mundum brugdon

This is a description of a swimming contest, Breca against Beowulf. The two expressions, eartum þehton and mundum brugdon are clearly parallel and are both somewhat metaphorical terms for the motions made in
swimming; \textit{fehtan} means 'you covered' or 'enfolded' and takes \textit{eagorstream} as its object. The expression \textit{mundum brugdon} is cited from this passage in Bosworth-Toller and there translated 'Ye vibrated with your hands.' Chambers, in his edition of \textit{Beowulf}, translates it, "brandished your hands." \textit{Brugdon} may mean 'to draw,' 'to pull,' 'to braid,' 'to weave.' Following as it does the expression 'the sea stream you enfolded with your arms,' it seems pretty clear that \textit{mundum brugdon} refers to the way in which they swam. They 'pulled' or 'rove' the water. \textit{Meresträta} supplies the object, and the line is exactly parallel with the preceding line \textit{eagorstream earnum fehton}. Any idea of brandishing hands seems quite extraneous here; they pulled at the water and thus advanced, as the following line states: \textit{glidon ofer garsecg}.

It is certainly possible that asyndetic constructions may at times allow of an \textit{ðað xowuð} interpretation. It is not implied that the \textit{ðað xowuð} construction is in all instances a direct development from asyndeton, but rather that the pause that often appears in poetry between two parts of an asyndetic construction is not always sufficient to prevent the possibility of a common element.

\section*{C. The Common Element Standing in the Half-Line with the Second Part of the Construction}

In Old English and Old Saxon poetry there are many examples of a not wholly pleasing construction which nevertheless has some similarity with \textit{ðað xowuð}. In this construction a verb may be taken in common with a preceding and a following portion; but instead of an uninterrupted flow of thought from one idea—through the common element—into another idea, one is brought to a sudden and at times seemingly unnecessary addition after the common element; for example.\footnote{Compare with this passage \textit{Wanderer} 4: \textit{braen mid baddum} \textit{wicellicde sacæ, Judith 229: mundum brugdon} \textit{scalecas of scæðum sciremæd scyrd}; \textit{Genesis 991: handum brugdon} \textit{hæla} \textit{of scæðum hringmælæd scyrd}.}

\subsection*{1. A Verb between Two Nominatives—}

\textit{Beowulf} 1666:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ja þæt hildæbl}
\textit{forbarn brodenægel swa þæt blod gespræg}.
\end{quote}

\textit{Heliand} 192:

\begin{quote}
\textit{tho warth san after thi maht gode}
\textit{gikudid is kraft mikil}
\end{quote}

\subsection*{2. A Verb between Two Accusatives—}

\textit{Beowulf} 1357:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Hie dygel lond}
\textit{wariegæ wulflæðað}
\end{quote}

\textit{Beowulf} 3066:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ja he biorges ward}
\textit{sohte searonstandað}
\end{quote}

\textit{Heliand 691}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{giwirkeon is wilcone}
\textit{that sie mostin is huldi ford}
\end{quote}

\textit{Heliand 5231}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Tho ni mahta lastares wifht}
\textit{an theu herne gode}
\textit{bodo keres}
\textit{findan felmi word.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Elene 106}:

\begin{quote}
\textit{hebban heorcumbæ}
\textit{7 wegennbræce}
\end{quote}

\footnote{W. Braune, \textit{Altthdeutsches Lesebuch} (9th ed., Halle, 1928), p. 154.}

\footnote{Similarly \textit{Juliana 315}: \textit{þæh þæt him toweorda god} \textit{omwriga wulfæres cyning wisdomes gæst}. Also \textit{Heliand} 1284, 5551.}

\footnote{Klaeber would take this \textit{ðað xowuð}; \textit{cf. Modern Philology}, III, 242.}

\[192\]
With these are comparable two Old High German passages.

*Otfrid III, 15, 17:*

Lertun sie nan einan ruam thaz er gidati ino einan duam

*Otfrid III, 25, 35:*

Thaz drubtun selbo wolto bi unsiher sterben scolta

3. **A verb between two modifying expressions—**

*Guthlac 183:*

bones by of waðum wege cweoman
restan rynelpragun

*Elene 498:*

swa he purh ffeodesciepe
to cwale monige cristes folces
demde to deale

*Heiland 301:*

ni welda sio ino te brudi tho
halon ino ti hiwum

*Heiland 1695:*

erth thana selbon man thar it im te sorgon skal
werdan them te witea the hi mid is wordum gesprîktd

The noteworthy feature about such constructions is that an idea, incomplete at the end of a line, is completed in the first word of a following line; and immediately thereafter an appositional idea is added which suggests a carrying on of the thought expressed in the word at the beginning of the line. But the second appositional expression is often so obviously an addition that there is little feeling of the carrying through of thought. This condition arises, of course, from the very fact that the possible koinon is a verb, and when a verbal element is construed twice in a construction it will hardly yield two independent ideas such as those expressed in a construction wherein two verbs are connected by a common noun object or subject. This is the essential difference which I find between ðano xoðwoð and constructions in which a verb is a possible koinon. It seems likely that the second parts of such constructions were at times felt by the speaker to be mere appositional afterthoughts and at times were felt to be directly governed by the verb. In general, however, concerning the interpretation of Old Germanic poetry, it is likely that Klaeber was very near the truth when he stated that a simple word or phrase occupying a medial position

---

"As to this Erdmann, *Otfrids Evangeliuenbuch,* p. 437, remarks: "Der Inf. sterben gehört sowol zu medo als auch zu scolta ... ."


---

between two terms of variation should be assigned the ðano xoðwoð function whenever it occurs at the beginning of a line. And when the possible koinon is other than a verb, there need be no skepticism about the ðano xoðwoð interpretation.

a) **The koinon is subject (7 instances).**

*Otfrid II, 1, 21:*

tho er deta thaz sio zarpita ther himil sus io wæropa
thaz fundament si houle

The direct object of *deta* is *fundament*, but in line 21 *deta* takes a purpose clause, *thaz sio zarpita ther himil sus io wæropa*, where *himil* is subject of *zarpita* and *wæropa* and stands in the second half-line with the second verb.

*Otfrid I, 1, 39:*

Thaz tharanan singe iz scoo man ginemne

Here *man* is common subject to *singe* and *ginemne*. Erdmann, in his edition of *Otfrid*,

not ever any of these constructions and refers to them as two asyndetic sentences whose common subject stands in the second part. But they are essentially ðano xoðwoð: a word is so placed in a sentence that it completes the thought of a preceding part to which it is grammatically related, supplies the thought necessary to a following part, in which it is also grammatically related, and is not felt to belong more closely to the first part than to the second.

*Otfrid II, 7, 12:*

thaz er to meinta ther wæroð ouh bizeinta

On the interpretation of this line, Paul Piper, in his edition of *Otfrid*, remarks: "Das Subjekt ist erst zum zweiten Prädikat gesetzt . . . (ðano xoðwoð)."

*Elene 1245:*

we ne lae onlag burh lochme had
gamelum to geace gife unscynde
megencyning amet

Here the subject of *onlag* is not expressed until the second line following, where it immediately functions as subject of the following verb *amet.*

*Rhyme Poem 9:*

la was wartman aweahd world anspreht
Juliana 584:

la toscaden wear
lig tolysed

These two examples are closely paralleled by the following.

Heland 1800:

than werdad in anton after thi
himilfortun anthilidan

In these last three examples the construction does not offer two complete parts, since the second part closes somewhat abruptly with a participle. It is only this varying degree of completeness in the second part that distinguishes such examples from the dano wolvu joining of two complete ideas.

Heland 4115:

so mag hebânkungenes
thin mikila mæt godes 
manno gihwillikes
ferâhe geformnon

In this example, however, the first part is not complete when the possible common element, thin mikila mæt, is included. 44

b) The koinon is accusative (19 instances).

Otfrid II, 9, 29:

mu wyll ih hlar gisellen ein bliði gynnen

Otfrid IV, 2, 6:

thar er fon tothe irwagta 
Lazarum iriqueta

Otfrid IV, 14, 1:

thanne ih quad er santa 
in min arunti isîh wanta

Otfrid IV, 35, 7:

thaz nusai er thara wisen 
than ichamon losen

Otfrid V, 21, 4:

suntar ziu se irgazin 
sin thionost so frilazin

In these examples, as in all such constructions from Otfrid, the variation in context in the two parts is very slight, but the second part of the construction joins so closely in thought that it is hardly possible to consider the second expression an appositional afterthought.

---

44 For a similar lack of completeness of the first part, cf. Beowulf 809, discussed on p. 30 above.
fetters the hands of the doomed man,' and under gehefigian is cited he handa gehefigæg, ‘he makes the hands heavy.’

c) The koinon is genitive (5 instances).

Otfred III, 7, 63:

Thaz gras sint alusiti thes lichamen lusti

The passage means that the grass (on which the multitude sat) represents the weaknesses and lusts of the flesh. The words thes lichamen are as essential to alusiti as to lusti. Erdmann notes: ‘thes lichamen Gen zu beiden Substantiven.’ In the Weißenburger Katechismus55 occurs the group acusti thes lichamen glossing vitia carnis.

Otfred V, 14, 7:

Ther stad bizeinot lusti thes sines libes festi

Kelle takes lusti as adverbial dative.56 Comparison of this line with the line next but one, Ther se bizeinot dati joh worolt unustati, leads one to believe that lusti is a noun and that the phrase thes sines libes qualifies both lusti and festi. The construction is so taken by Erdmann.

Heliand 267:

Endi ni kumid

thes widon rikeas givand

Since endi without a qualifying expression is somewhat vague, it is likely that it is to be construed directly with the following genitive rikeas. For a similar order of words compare Heliand 4349: soh givand kumid | himiles endi erdu.

Brot of Sigorparkwifo 19:

pa reynde pat es ribet halhe
mopoger a vit min at bibja

The genitive min must be taken with a vit, and it is also genitive object of bibja.57

Otfred V, 23, 293:

seben outh thar then drost theru englo thionost

Piper translates this: ‘wir sehen da—ein tröstlicher Anblick!—die Engel in ihrem Dienste.” But it seems likely that what is seen is the comforting sight of the angels as well as their ministrations. Under this interpretation, theru englo qualifies both nouns between which it stands.

57 Sijmons and Gering, Die Lieder der Edda, Kommentar, II, 231: “min ist dæm xouði konstruert (sowohl von d vit wie von bibja abhängig).”
The word geteo in the meaning of 'allure,' 'bring a person to action or condition,' which is the meaning here, is cited twelve times in the Bosworth-Toller Supplement—in eleven instances with a phrase, to followed by dative, the one exception being the present example, where a comma is placed after geteo. In view of such phrases as gete⁹⁸ geto, getogeto to fremondo, fremondo, it is clear that to gefiste is to be construed as well with geteo as with fremondo.

Christ and Satan 67:
Crists heo afeorde
dreamum bedeldes⁶⁵

Here afeorde needs the qualifying expression dreamum, and the group dreamum bedeldes is a not infrequent combination. Kock translates: "Christ had removed and severed them from joys."⁶⁶

The following example is unusual in that the koinon runs over the half-line to the beginning of the following line.⁶⁷ The unity of the koinon is also somewhat broken by the additional word eæc, which has to do with the previous mention of ystir in the preceding line.

Eleven 741:

ha ymbolede synt mid ystir eæc
forom gefretæd

e) Rarely an adjective stands and xowró; for example,

Beowulf 753:
he on mode weard
forht on ferðæs⁶⁸

The first part of this construction is incomplete without forht, and that this is to be taken directly with on ferðæ seems likely by comparison with Juliana 328: we beoð hygewmere | forhtæ on ferðæ.

Also rare is the use of an adverb as koinon.

Metra 4, 17:
he gongan seal

befordan ferana⁶⁹

---

⁶⁴ IV, 2a and 3, under geteo.
⁶⁶ On this M. D. Clubb, in his edition of the poem in Yale Studies in English (LXX, 64), remarks: "Kock's interpretation . . . of dreamum bedeldes as coordinate with hio afeorde gives a stylistic effect which is a great improvement over the usually assumed participial construction."
⁶⁷ Cf. Psalms 118, 52, cited on p. 35.
He refers to a star which directs the course of the sun, the essential idea here being that it goes before it; *berora* qualifies both *gongan* and *feran*.

There are in the poetry of Otfrid twelve examples of a construction similar to these just discussed but differing in that the conjunction *joh* is expressed:

*Otfrid II, 7, 63:*

\[ \text{ih sah thil er thil holot} \quad \text{joh Philippus gilodoti} \]

*Philippus* is subject of *holoti* and *gilodoti*. Piper, in his edition of Otfrid, points out this passage and calls it *dano xowoo*.

*Otfrid III, 7, 17:*

\[ \text{wio sib zerbit} \quad \text{joh thiur worolt werbit} \]

*Otfrid III, 14, 81:*

\[ \text{want er ist sello wunno} \quad \text{joh alles guates brunno} \]

*Otfrid IV, 33, 13:*

\[ \text{wanta sah gilangan} \quad \text{joh drukin ira irlangan} \]

*Hartmaat 23:*

\[ \text{zi hellu sint giarit} \quad \text{joh thi ondore gikerit} \]

This appears to be a device peculiar to Otfrid, as far as Germanic is concerned. It is relevant here, however, to make mention of constructions in Latin which have been termed *dano xowoo* by specialists in that field. Such constructions as

*Otfrid III, 14, 81:*

\[ \text{Want er ist sello wunno} \quad \text{joh alles guates brunno} \]

and

*Otfrid V, 14, 9:*

\[ \text{Ther se bireinit dati} \quad \text{joh worolt unstatit} \]

are exactly analogous in form to such Latin constructions as

*Cic. Leg. agr. 2, 95:*

\[ \text{ex hac copia atque omnium rerum auctius.} \]

Such a construction is fairly common in Latin; but in Germanic it is isolated with Otfrid and, such being the case, it is far more probable that Otfrid borrowed the construction than that he knew it as a form of syntax. The construction *dano xowoo* in Old Germanic verse, some discussion is due a construction which occurs with some frequency in Old English and Old Saxon and which has been termed *dano xowoo*. In this construction a dependent clause stands between two independent clauses, or an independent clause between two dependent clauses. Otto Behagel in *Die Modi im Heland* gives a section to the construction *dano xowoo*. He divides it into two types: "(a) der Hauptsatz steht *dano xowoo* ... ; 1065, ef thu sis godes sumu, be hoo ni heita thu, ef thu griwald habes? ... (b) ein Nebensatz steht *dano xowoo* zu zwei Hauptsätzen: 535, so it gio maro ni ward an these wo wolot, thoit thu hoolik helag man Krist anhenit, thoh
ni ward it gie te thee kuninges hobo gimarid." 16 In his Syntax des Helianhd 14 he refers to the subject thus:

Wenn der zweite Satz des ersten variiert, so kann der Fall eintreten, dass blos das Subjekt und ein Theil des Prädicats (das Verbum finitum ist dabei stets eingeschlossen) Variation erfährt, während ein anderer Theil des Prädicats unvariiert bleibt; dieser dient dann sachlich auch zur Bestimmung des zweiten Satzes, steht der Sache nach dox voxvof: et in verandem sali to lamb undar waftos: so sculun gi undor huna fund fearen, 1874: wurdum niu is unyang lichte, bliecand so thi thu erhte anne: so aken that barn godes, 3124."

E. Nader, in his work on the syntax of Beowulf, under the section on concessive clauses notes that sometimes a concessive clause occurs between two sentences with each of which it may be construed. 15 He mentions as a possible example of dox voxvof:

Beowulf 1713–18:

breax holgenmod beodgernetas
ealcgisefalan ob þæt he ana hwærf
mære beoden mondrumman frem
scæh he hine miltig god muerges wyrunum
eatþum stepte ofer ealle men
forð gefremde hweððere him on færfhe greow
broethord blodrew. 76

L. Schücking, in his analysis of methods of joining sentences in Beowulf, in a section entitled "Die sogenannten Nebensätze dox voxvof" cites three more similar examples from Beowulf, but does not agree with Nader in calling them dox voxvof. He remarks that while a dependent clause may be logically construed as well with one independent clause as with another, this is no proof that the speaker intended it to belong with both. He contrasts with such constructions the Middle High German type, die warthe ein smat hiecz Vulcan, where he believes there can be no doubt that ein smat is a koinon. 17

Karg, in his dox voxvof im Mittelhochdeutschen, 18 considers Behagel's citations of dox voxvof in the Heliannd and discards them all. While he feels that in some cases the medial clause may be construed as well with what precedes as with what follows, yet he feels that this possible connection is not strong enough to justify an dox voxvof interpretation.

---

14 Similar construction, from the Heliannd and elsewhere are discussed by Kock, "Zeitschrift für deutsches Allertum, XLI, 197 ff.
15 Otto Behagel, "Die Syntax des Heliannd" (Wien, 1897), par. 460.
17 L. Schücking, Die Grundzüge der Satzverbindung im Beowulf (Halle, 1904), par. 40.
18 Fritz Karg, Syntaktische Studien, pp. 47–49.
When an independent clause stands between two dependent clauses, one may interpret it as δόον ὁμόω if the independent clause is a compact group of words; for example,

\[ \text{Heliant 5195:} \]

\[ \text{ef he so harldico quathe under thesear menegi menwerk frumul anfisbaid othn etr under iu falkshepi ef he si is ferahes skelo} \]

Such constructions call to mind expressions not infrequently heard in Modern English, as an example of which one might cite the colloquialistic “if we had some ham we'd have some ham and eggs if we had some eggs,” or the less facetious “if he wanted to do it he could if he'd try.”

**TABLE OF CITATIONS**

I. Old English (Grein-Wilker, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, Bd. 1-3)

A. Koinoon filling a half-line (rarely two half-lines)

1. Koinoon nominative
   a) Closed construction: *Bowelulf* 56, 533, 1013, 1119, 1618, 1626, 1814, 2117, 2204, 2575; *Finnnsburg* 16; *Maldon* 29, 85; *Wanderer* 45; *Soul's Address* 11; *Elen* 17, 1143; *Gloria* 34; *Doomsday* 111, 129, 231; *Calendar* 153; *Judith* 223; *Genesis* 1192, 1890; 2003, 2665, 2866; *Daniel* 641, 763; *Asser* 119; *Christ and Satan* 470, 615; *Phoenix* 186, 370; *Fates of Men* 7; *Metra* 19, 53; *Salm* 35, 57; 77, 45, 2; 113, 23, 3
   b) Open construction: *Bowelulf* 234, 2680, 2430, 2538, 2809; *Chronicle Poem* 39, 1; *Andreas* 237, 962; *Elen* 61; *Genesis* 1370; *Daniel* 256, 713; *Christ* 502; *Guothlac* 666; *Whale* 27; *Riddles* 35, 2; *Metra* 28, 15; *Iulian* 614; *Maldon* 168; *Last Judgment* 1

2. Koinoon accusative: *Bowelulf* 740, 825, 1020, 1807, 2495, 3090; *Christ and Satan* 154; *Metra* 27, 2; *Christ* 484; *Salomon and Saturn* 395; *Psalms* 148, 1

3. Koinoon genitive: *Bowelulf* 1043; *Psalms* 118, 52

4. Koinoon dative or prepositional phrase: *Bowelulf* 809, 2002, 1548, 1717, 2107; *Maldon* 111; *Guothlac* 560; *Metra* 13, 66; *Psalms* 136, 3

5. Koinoon adjectival: *Psalms* 102, 14, 2

6. Koinoon a verb: *Christ* 375; *Bowelulf* 1730

7. Koinoon representing two cases which formally fall together: *Bowelulf* 1487, 2810; *Wanderer* 52; *Psalms* 71, 15, 1

8. Koinoon in half-line with second part of construction

   1. Possible koinoon as a verb
      a) With nominatives: *Christ* 362, 629; *Andreas* 661, 712; *Bowelulf* 1666, 1836; *Metra* 2, 4; 26, 48, 29, 75; *Mind of Men* 1; *Creed* 33; *Chronicle Poem* 35, 1; *Elen* 844
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b) With accusatives: *Juliana* 254, 643; *Christ* 457, 677, 793, 1959; *Andreas* 219, 1288; *Bowelulf* 1377, 3066; *Metra* 26, 53; *Calendar* 51; *Phoenix* 167; *Guothlac* 1054, 1218, 1311; *Genesis* 2851; *Elen* 106, 209, 1306, 1316

c) With modifying expressions: *Guothlac* 183; *Elen* 498

d) With datives: *Juliana* 360

2. Koinoon nominative: *Juliana* 384; *Elen* 1245; *Rhyme Poem* 9, 28

3. Koinoon accusative: *Bowelulf* 131; *Elen* 277, 244, 317, 768; *Phoenix* 188; *Salomon and Saturn* 158; *Genesis* 934; *Maldon* 62; *Doomsday* 29; *Metra* 10, 29; *Psalms* 59, 7, 3

4. Koinoon dative or prepositional phrase: *Juliana* 142, 483; *Elen* 741; *Christ and Satan* 67

5. Koinoon an adverb: *Metra* 4, 17; 28, 72

6. Koinoon an adjective: *Bowelulf* 753; *Christ* 121

II. Old Saxon (Heiland, ed. H. Rückert in *Deutsche Dichtungen des Mittelalters*, Bd. 4, Leipzig, 1876; *Bruchstücke aus der altfränkischen Genesis*, ed. F. Wilhelm in *Münchener Texte*, Heft 2)

A. Koinoon filling a half-line

1. Koinoon nominative
   a) Closed construction: *Heliant* 1875, 1827, 2238, 2770, 2831, 3031, 3195, 3265, 3395, 3400, 4409, 4582, 5023, 5530, 5778
   b) Open construction: *Heliant* 832, 3033

2. Koinoon accusative: *Heliant* 2469, 2630

3. Koinoon dative or prepositional phrase: *Heliant* 345, 1469, 2899, 3211, 4009, 5298

4. Koinoon genitive: *Heliant* 734

5. Koinoon as a verb: *Heliant* 3120

B. Koinoon in half-line with second part of construction

1. Possible koinoon as a verb
   a) With nominatives: *Heliant* 192, 6474, 6777, 5841, 5869
   b) With accusatives: *Heliant* 691, 945, 1305, 1411, 2024, 4496, 4574, 5231
   c) With datives: *Heliant* 3083
   d) With genitives: *Heliant* 140, 1093, 5878
   e) With modifying expressions: *Heliant* 1301, 5799, 1438, 1695, 2093, 2906, 3707, 3733, 4380, 4570, 4582, 5302

2. Koinoon nominative: *Heliant* 1800

3. Koinoon accusative: *Heliant* 594; *Genesis* 41

4. Koinoon genitive: *Heliant* 267


A. Koinoon filling a half-line

1. Koinoon nominative
   a) Closed construction: *Otfrid I* 25, 9; *III* 2, 26; *III* 7, 51; *IV* 22, 15; *IV* 24, 13; *IV* 36, 1; *V* 20, 19
   b) Open construction: *Otfrid III* 20, 29
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CHAPTER III

Ďnō xowōn in Middle English and Middle Dutch

I. Middle English

In his *Studien zur Mittelenglischen Syntax*, Georg Dubislav devotes a page to citations of examples of ďnō xowōn. Although he does not discuss the nature of the construction, his interpretation of it in regard to Middle English may be seen from an examination of some of his seventeen citations.

Partenay 743:

For thys hertis slyn in circute gan hold
To miles aboute gan it comprehende

The hart's skin enclosed a circuit two miles about. As Dubislav remarks, *to miles* is to be construed with *hold* and *comprehende.*

Partenay 906:

And that she had charged thaim verily
You sel for to lye yaf in charge and best.

Here the group *you sel for to lye* is necessary to complete the idea expressed in the two verbs *charged* and *yaf.*

Partenay 2360:

Lenger nolth ought to declare sa tell
his obsequ e doyn without doubte any

Dubislav takes *his obsequ* as koïnon. But if *doun* is a participle, as seems likely, the construction cannot be ďnō xowōn.

Partenay 6194:

And honourably all thing fouregd pure
As it belonged *lord* and *gounour*
Both on life and deede shold heue hauent honour

If the group *lord* and *gounour* is a koïnon, it must serve as subject of the verb in the second part. Occurring as it does at the end of the line, *lord* and *gounour* is doubtfully to be taken directly as subject of *shold have.*

---

1 Anglia XL, 315 f. In Anglia XLV, 289, he mentions and exemplifies an “Ďnō xowōn des Lauten”; for example *ne sole by drage to be grounded,* where he states “das y gehört sowohl zu dem b wie zu drage.”

2 Cf. the citation from about 1400 in *New English Dictionary* under *hold,* 5: *that yle holt in compass aboute with fresche mylere.*
Ayenbite of Invyt (E.E.T.S. 23, 269):

Yet nowe sel securich his heuynesse staken away uram drede to be love of he heuemely sche contraye himselfe wende.

That the prepositional phrase is to be construed with the preceding part as well as with what follows seems here somewhat doubtful though not impossible.

*York Plays* 75, 121:

Go make be message haue I mende.

To this Dubislav remarks: "Für uns scheint auslassung des relativums vorzulegen. Dass aber der Englander àsō xoûvō konstruierte, scheint durch die inversion bewiesen zu werden, die das objekt the message voraussetzt. Vielleicht haben wir hier einen der quellströme, aus welchen die konstruktion der relativlosen attributivesätze entstanden." The inverted order does give some evidence that the message is construed àsō xoûvō. Constructions of this type, in which the second part is an attributive expression, very rarely take the inverted order in the second part, while similar constructions with normal order in the second part are common in Middle English.

*York Plays* 226, 169:

āsō arte cambered in curtynesse
And caris to pis coste
To marre men of myght
Haste pōu marked in thyn mynde

This is an optional case. *To marre men of myght* is necessary with *marked*, and it may be an explanatory phrase to *caris to pis coste*.

*York Plays* 289, 486:

Sir douctes we deme als deu of be deth
pis jōte bat ye fauour grete fautes can we fynye
This daxe tor to deme hym to dye

Dubislav makes no remarks about this. The passage appears to contain two independent sentences, the first ending with *fawour*.

*York Plays* 481, 28:

†ai purposed þame prestē
To misliche hym with malis in þere mynte hace þei menyde

This is àsō xoûvō, as the infinitive phrase is necessarily object of *purposed þame prestē*, 'they were ready,' and also of *menyd*, 'they intended.'

---

2 Cited by page and line from the edition of Lucy Smith, *York Plays* (Oxford, 1885).

---

**P.P.V.B. 190:**

There the catte is a kitoun

Evidently Dubislav interprets this as "where the cat is is (also) a kitten." But the context shows that this is not so. The whole passage reads:

there the catte is a kitoun the courte is fyn elyn
to which is added the Latin: *ve terre ubi puér res est etc.*

**William of Palerne 1793:**

*And heðde hem vnder an holu hok* was an huge denne

Here, although there is a metrical pause after *hok*, it seems more probable to construe it as àsō xoûvō than to take the alternative of interpreting 'where there was a huge den,' or 'it was a huge den.'

**Destruction of Troy 3703:**

Cut of þere cables were caged togedur

Dubislav remarks, "Der letzte teil erscheint uns als subjektsloser relativsatz." This is the type of construction sometimes referred to as omission of the relative. The difference between such a construction and àsō xoûvō is discussed in chapter v. Suffice it here to say that from the evidence of Old Germanic, the second element of the àsō xoûvō construction is very rarely of a relative nature.

**Destruction of Troy 4334:**

ful solemnly set in the sight of the pepell
*With worship on all wise* that worthy comauddit

The prepositional phrase may go as well with *set* as with *conauddit.* The subject concerns the setting up of an image, and it may be interpreted that it was set up 'with every reverence' and that he commanded it to his people 'with every reverence.'

From Dubislav's citations it is difficult to determine precisely what he considers àsō xoûvō. His remarks on the two passages, *make be message have I mende and cut of þere cables were caged togedur*, imply that he discriminates between àsō xoûvō and omission of the relative.

To this brief treatment of the subject by Dubislav, the editor, Eugen Einemelk, appends a note: "Diese sonderart der konstruktion ist von mir ausgiebig belegt in *Anglia* 14, pp. 129 ff." This article by Einemelk is entitled "Quelle der Engliischen Relativellipsē" and the term àsō xoûvō is not applied. His note to Dubislav's article implies that he considers the

---

4 In *Anglia* XIII, 351, in discussing constructions with a relative ellipsis he expresses the view that, while the original meaning of àsō xoûvō for such constructions may have been kept by Middle English, already in Middle English there was a tendency to feel them to be omissions of the relative.
relative ellipsis and ἄνο κωνοῦ to be closely related. Einenkel’s citations are taken mainly from Robert of Brunne’s Chronicle and from Genesis and Exodus. With some exceptions they are of the type: *He had a sone men cald Ector* (Brunne, 1, 350); *intil a water highte Akalon* (1, 995); *The prete richesse he hadde byforn al was aweye and ylorn* (1, 2450). These are cited, however, as illustrating a “gemeine satzeil” which, for example, in the first is “Objekt des haupt- und des nehensatzes” and in the second is “Teil eines adverbiale ausdruckes des haupt- und ... subjekt des nehensatzes.”

There has been little attempt to discriminate in the field of Middle English with regard to various constructions somewhat similar to ἄνο κωνοῦ, and the term has been used broadly to cover constructions which are in some respects not at all the same. In the discussion of ἄνο κωνοῦ in Old Germanic poetry it appeared that, in instances where the order of words would favor a possible common element, rarely did the second part offer a merely attributive expression. In his work on ἄνο κωνοῦ in Middle High German, Karg has convincingly maintained that such examples as *da bi lit ein lant heizet Endian* (Salm, u. Mor, 256, 3) and *er zoch us ein meazer | was schone unde woonesom* (183, 2)⁴ are different contextually and rhythmically from such an ἄνο κωνοῦ construction as the familiar *do sprinc von dem gestide her Hagene also sprach* (Kuβer 358). One is led to doubt whether the term ἄνο κωνοῦ rightly covers all cases to which it has been referred in Middle English. One wonders, for example, if the construction *intil a water highte Akalon* is to be classed along with such a construction as:

Brunne’s Chronicle 1544:

*And sente until his flote on flode*  
*That ractayl to the schip al yok*

In the first example the second portion merely adds a qualifying statement about water. In the second example there are two distinct and equally important expressions: “He sent that rabbale of men to the ship”; “that rabble of men all went to the ship.”

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine such constructions as the second example here given. In chapter v such constructions as the first example will be considered from the common Germanic point of view and compared with the construction ἄνο κωνοῦ.

A. THE POSITION OF THE KONION IN MIDDLE ENGLISH VERSE

In Old Germanic verse the common element in most cases either filled a half-line or stood at the beginning of a half-line with the second part of the construction. It was also pointed out that it might occasionally stand

at the end of the half-line with the first part of the construction. From 46 examples in Middle English, 23 cases show the common element at the beginning of a line; in 5 cases the whole construction is completed within one line; and in 14 examples the common element fills a line, or, in alliterative meter, a half-line. In these examples, there can be no feeling that the common element is more closely related to the first part than to the second. There are 4 other examples where the konion stands at the end of a line, there being a high degree of probability that it is to be construed also with a sentence element in the next line.

1. Konion at the beginning of line.—

Brunne’s Chronicle 937:

When they hadde ther godes halde  
*Byside the casteles bushed and spred*

The prepositional phrase *byside the casteles* is equally important with *lad* and with *bushed and spred*.

Brunne’s Chronicle 1508:

Corineus was go forto chace  
*Venison to take of grace.*

Venison here has the meaning of ‘wild game.’ Compare, for instance,

Alexander 4121:

Quat was baire viaunce in la vales ser, venyson pai said  
*Shike as we hunt in lyh holis* with *hunting in tymes*

Venison is object both of *chace* and *take*. The phrase of *grace* means ‘out of grace.’ In line 1519, Corineus is warned that he should not hunt without the king’s grace.

Brunne’s Chronicle 2812:

Bremel schold Belyn holde  
*His lond fro Humber northward he tolde*

That Belyn must be construed as of Belyn, is shown by the next two lines:

Ilk del intyl Katenesse  
Held Bremel of Belyn more ne lese

Furthermore, MS T reads:

Belyn lete Bremel of him holde  
Fro Humber north his lond he tolde

Lond is object both of *holde* and *tolde*.

Brunne’s Chronicle 4576:

At his conseil for to lende  
*Agayn the Bretonys 121* he wold wende

---

⁴ These two passages are cited by Karg, *Syntaktische Studien*, pp. 15 and 16.
**Linde** means ‘to march’ or ‘to go.’ The adverbial phrase *ageyn the Bretons* qualifies both *lende* and *weende.*

**William of Palerne 2501:**
and blie bat he bar  before william hit leide

The phrase *before william* fits patly both with *bar* and *leide.* To interpret this thus, ‘And quickly that he bore, before William he laid it,’ would be to destroy the sense that the reader certainly must feel—that he bore it before William.

**Alexander 1704:**
And jai in parchement him paytid  his person him shewid

Darius has asked the Syrians what Alexander looked like, and they draw a caricature of Alexander for Darius and show it to him. *Person* is object both of *paytid* and *shewid.* The second *him* is certainly indirect object, and there is a confusion in idea unless the first *him* is taken similarly.

**Cursor Mundi 15:**
How charles kyng and rauland faght  
*Wit sarazins wald jai na saighe*

The phrase *wit sarazins* is essential both to *faght* and *wald jai na saighe.* Without it the first part would be misleading and the second part incomplete.

**Partenay 5102:**
Ouer long wold be to declare and tell  
*Ther worthy deedes unto say or spell*

In this repetition of idea one may feel that here, as elsewhere in *Partenay,* a desire to fill out the line and complete the rhyme had something to do with the construction.

**Bruce 17, 454:**
And saw it wes nocht cyth till ta  
The toun we sic defens wes maid

If the first line be construed separately: ‘and saw it wasn’t easy to take’ where *take* requires no object, then *it* requires an antecedent, and none has been expressed. It *was* must be construed impersonally, ‘and saw it wasn’t easy to take (something).’ In the second line the causal element is stronger than the relative idea: they couldn’t take the town for the town was made with such defense.

**P.P. A3, 151:**
*Heo buggeth with heore juweles*  *yr lustices heo schendeth*

While *buggeth* may at times be construed intransitively, here the idea of bribing justices with gold is clearly in mind. Text B, 154 reads:

By Ihesus with here juweles  soare justices she shendeth.

2. **The whole construction filling a line.—**

**Brunne’s Chronicle 1672:**
They wyththrowen to loges they yede

**Brunne’s Chronicle 2906:**
He passed in *Norwey* he gan aryve

**Partenay 2938:**
Now is this breymyn whereof Am Adred  
Torned and changed into coldnesse lad

3. **Koinon filling a line, in alliterative poetry a half-line.—**

**Brunne’s Chronicle 153:**
Alle ther lymnes how thai besemned  
*In his buke has Dares demed*

*Both of Troie and of Grece*  
*What lynes schuppe was ilk a pece*

In this example, the line *in his buke has Dares demed* is essential to the preceding and following portions. It is easy to see how an idea which in prose would probably be terminated is, in this rather singsong poetry, carried on so that it leaves two portions grammatically dependent on a common medial element.

**Genesis and Exodus 2532:**
God leue hem in his blisse spilen  
*Among engyles and seli men*  
*Wiben ende in reste ben*

Eienkel, in his discussion of the relative ellipsis, has cited this as an example of “adverbial bestimmung des Haupt- und des Nebensatzes”; but more probably *ben* is infinitive parallel with *spilen,* the interpretation being: ‘God allow them joyously to live among angels and blessed men without end to be in rest.’ There is no reason for connecting the middle line any more with one part than with the other, and it fits easily with both.

**William of Palerne 3317:**
*bat ech welth was awndered  bat seis wiht eisen*  
*so corains a contenance  bat lud kniht hadde*

---

6 That is, the two parts with each of which the koinon is grammatically construed, and the koinon.

7 *Anglia,* XIV, 132.
The second part of the construction, *nat hud knight hadde*, cannot be construed as a relative clause because of the expression *so* in the koinon. One could hardly say *so courageous a countenance which that knight had.*

*Alexander 302:*

\[\text{jan was awindow of his word is the worthy lady}\]
\[\text{Besweht seylish his sire}\]

*Alexander 466:*

\[\text{hus heyst by tis brest it were}\]
\[\text{pat all hire bele chandig}\]
\[\text{To skyre skarlet heue skythes hire face}\]

*P.P. B12, 48:*

\[\text{And Rosamonde rist so reufuly bysette}\]
\[\text{The beste of his body in badnesse she dispended}\]

Skeat, in his edition of *Piers Plowman*, in a note to this passage translates the first line, “And Rosamund, in like manner, pitifully bestowed herself” and adds, “The word *bysette* is properly active, meaning ‘to employ,’ as in C, vii, 254; we must supply *her*, i.e. herself.” The need for supplying is eliminated by taking the passage *dano xovnu*.  

*P.P. A3, 99:*

\[\text{Cortoisliche the kyng cunseth to telle}\]
\[\text{To Meede the mayden meleth those words}\]

This is the same sort of variation in expressions for speaking which was met with in Old Germanic alliterative verse.

*P.P. C3, 165:*

\[\text{cease shal we weuere}\]
\[\text{Til Meede be thy weathed wyf we wolde nought stynke}\]

In the text used a semicolon is placed after *weuere*. This seems to interrupt what is likely the meaning: ‘we will not cease or pause until Meed be thy wedded wife.’ The B-text and, similarly, the A-text read:

\[\text{cease shall we weuere}\]
\[\text{Til Meede be thy wedded wyf thou wilt wittis of us alle}\]

These last six examples are from Middle English alliterative verse and are quite comparable to instances in Old Germanic verse—a common element is situated in a half-line and the flow of thought passes uninterruptedly through it.

4. *Koinon at end of line.*—There are four examples where a common element stands at the end of the line or half-line. In regard to Old Germanic verse, the distinction was pointed out between such a construction as, for example, *Juliana* 189: *ahlog pa se heroine*; *hospowordum spcar*; and *Beowulf* 1119: *wand to wolcnum wolofyra mest blynode for hlanwe*. In either case there is a noun which stands between two verbs with which it might serve as subject. But in the first case the noun is more closely connected with the first verb than with the second, whereas in the second case the noun is as closely connected with one verb as with the other. That all following *of a common element in examples of the first type is excluded by no means certain; but, since it is less so than in examples of the second type, the term *dano xovnu* was applied only to examples of the second type. The same principle may be applied to Middle English verse. Such an example as *Alexander 455, par metis him be gwen* | *Kysis comly hire king*, presents the same type of construction with a noun between two verbs with which it might be construed as subject. But it is more closely connected with the first verb than with the second and hence cannot be placed in the same category with such constructions as, for example,

*Brunne’s Chronicle 1544:*

\[\text{And sent until his flute on floed}\]
\[\text{That raskayl to the ship al rod}\]

Here the thought of the first part is not complete until *that raskayl* is expressed, and this is at once closely related with the second part of the construction. While this latter type is *dano xovnu*, the former need not be considered so, as it is possible that the second verb stands only in an asyndetic relationship to the first part of the construction.

There are some examples however, where, although an element that might be construed in common does complete the thought at the end of a line, it seems very probable that there is but little pause and that the idea expressed in the last word of the line is carried over directly to the following part. For instance:

*Cursor Mundi 2551:*

\[\text{Slepped and herd our hauerd steven}\]
\[\text{Sohil till him spak in sueuen}\]

A MS variant of this (Fairfax MS) reads:

\[\text{selepend herdre our lorde of heyuen}\]
\[\text{solely till him spak in steuen}\]

Although *lorde of heyuen* occurs at the end of a line, it may have been thought of as at once subject of *spac*; the fact that the subject of *spac* must differ from that of the preceding verb *herde* makes an expressed subject for *spac* seem necessary. That there is anything like the omission of a relative in the second part is doubtful.

When in such a construction the possible common element is a modifier, there is even more feeling that it is to be construed with both what precedes
and what follows even though it is metrically followed by a pause. For instance:

William of Palerne 47:
he koured lowe
to bihold in at he hole wile his hound berkyd

This is a very concentrated construction. In the first place, *bihold* must play a double semantic role, first of seeing visually, and second of seeing mentally, that is, perceiving. There can be no doubt that *in at the hole* is to be taken with *bihold*, for *he koured lowe* for that very purpose. Also the dog barked *at the hole*. Line 46 reads: *euere he dogge at he hole held it at a baye*. The general idea is that he wanted to see why his dog was barking at the hole, and if one interprets the passage exactly as it is, 'to behold in at the hole why his dog barked,' the phrase *in at the hole* is felt to be as closely related to *berkyd* as to *bihold*.

Alexander 383:
Worthis agayn to a weve fra a worme turnys
Ance has visited Olympia in the form of a dragon, but on reaching her he changes back again from a dragon to a man; the phrase *to a weve* appears to be needed with both *worthis* and *turnys*.

William of Palerne 1793:
And hedde hew under an holt hok was an huge denne
Clearly, here there are two ideas neatly joined, 'They hid under a hollow oak' and 'under this hollow oak was a huge den.'

In Middle English I have found no examples of *ānō xowō* with a finite verb as koinon, and but one example that could be compared with such an Old Germanic type as

Beowulf 3066:
ja he bierges weard
solute searonilas

As was pointed out previously, even here where the position in verse tempts one to construe the construction as *ānō xowō*, the feeling of pause and completion when the verb is reached makes such an interpretation uncertain. In Middle English examples where a verb that might possibly serve as koinon comes at the end of a line, the feeling of pause and completion is even more obvious, and it is a fair assumption that the original speaker felt the second part as a somewhat detached addendum. For example:

*William of Palerne 3882:* also *nuthe for sorwe* he *swoonede for fere.*

---

**IN MIDDLE ENGLISH AND MIDDLE DUTCH**

William of Palerne 2919:
and he cas him told
sopliche al he sweenen.

Brunne's Chronicle 4236:
That oun cito de Rome wan
Oure see and destroyed ilk a man

Brunne's Chronicle 4006:
My lond to waste he gouth aboute
My frenedes to slo and dryve them oute

**B. GRAMMATICAL NATURE OF THE KOINON**

In Old Germanic poetry it was found that the common element was most often in the nominative case, and next in order of frequency in the accusative case. In the 46 examples from Middle English, however, the instances where the koinon is nominative are much less frequent, and prepositional phrases in an *ānō xowō* position are more common.

1. **Koinon as a prepositional phrase** (23 instances).---

Brunne's Chronicle 1796:
When they had fought and went to fe
Into the hilles agayn to be

Brunne's Chronicle 3888:
Thus sonderlypes he diide them swere
Tyl Argayle schulde they faith bere

That they swore *tyl Argayle* appears from the following lines:

When they had alle sworn an oath
Tyl Argayl wer hem lef or loth

Alexander 5195:
jan thouns furth ser Telomew and tyris him beluye
In emperius aijrell his person he cleseth

Either *tyris* or *cleseth* without the prepositional phrase is inadequate, for the essential fact is that Ptolemy, in impersonating Alexander, attires himself in king's clothes.

Paremy 199:
O varray god for why she encrese
Only a man for doing ile to grow

The gist of the lines is that fortune makes a man prosper by ill-doing, and it is essential that the prepositional phrase *for doing ile* quality *encrese*
and grow. It is likely that the group to grow was fitted in to rhyme with know in the line next but one above.\(^9\)

2. Koinon accusative (9 instances).—

Partenay 214:

In all places shal fructifie and get
love of all shal hauw wher he entermet

Unless get be used absolutely in the sense of 'gain, derive profit,'\(^10\) which seems very improbable, it takes love of all as its object, and this is also the object of have.

3. Koinon nominative (2 instances).—

Alexander 302:

ban was awordrid of his wordis  pe worthe lady
Besaohht sekirly his sire

4. Koinon a sentence (6 instances).—

Partenay 4240:

but yst say thou me
What thou art me say y the here require

P.P. A9, 67:

const thou me dalle
wher that Dowel dwelleth do me to wise

5. Koinon representing two cases (5 instances).—In Old Germanic poetry such a construction was found to be quite rare, and in the instances of its occurrence the inflectional ending of the koinon was such that grammatically the two cases fell together. In Middle English the inflectional endings have largely been leveled, and in these five examples the common element may represent one case as well as the other. For instance:

Brunner's Chronicle 4380:

The partyes smert snyten togiidre
With scharp swordes on helmes gan gildre

Brunner's Chronicle 1544:

And sente until his flote on focht
That ruskayf to the schip al yd

Cursor Mundi 3993:

Lauerd bou send mi now þi rede
Gains cases has ruorn mi dede

\(^9\) Although the koinon is in the line with the second part of the construction, it is unusual in not occurring at the very beginning of the line.

\(^10\) Documented in this sense in New English Dictionary first from the year 1591.
Genesis and Exodus 1343:
He wende biwe and fagen agen
To bereache he garme ten

Parthenay 4240:
but yut say thow me
What thow art me say

There are 11 examples from these 46 of a type not common to Old Germanic verse. The two parts cannot be thought of as two expressions of a general idea, nor are they temporally sequent. One expression is concluded with a locution which seems to call up another idea broadly related to the whole context, in the expression of which idea this final locution forms the first part; for example:

William of Palerne 1793:
And hede hem under an helu holt
was an huge denne

William of Palerne 2208:
ful dereli be hem taugh
Bi contenance wel thei kneu

The reference is to a werewolf who, though he could not speak, yet instructed two youths by his demeanour, and by his demeanour full well they knew.¹²

In two or three instances of this last type there is some feeling of causality in the second part.

Bruce 17, 454:
And saw it was nocht enyth till ta
The iome with sic detens wes maid

At the end of chapter ii, some discussion was given to constructions in which a dependent clause stands between two independent clauses or an independent clause stands between two dependent clauses. This construction occurs also in Middle English,¹⁶ and while there is an amount of syntactical dependence of the middle portion on the preceding and following parts, in general, one feels, as in regard to Old Germanic, a laxness of construction rather than an ðæ ñōwōn linking two parts.

---

¹² Cited by Einemkel, Anglia XIV, 112, as an example of adverbial modification of a main clause and a subordinate clause.
¹⁴ Cf. line 2740: And bi certesyn signes sone he hem taugh; also l. 4378.
¹⁸ For a comparison of several Middle English examples with many from the "Heliand," cf. Kock, "Zum Heliand," Zeitschrift für deutches Altertum, XLVIII, 198 f.

[ 223 ]
1. *The koinon at beginning of line.*—

*Walewein* 5510:

Ende soo scoot in haer ansichte
Met haren naglen trac soo die hust

The preterite *scoot* basically means 'shot,' but it also means 'moved rapidly,' 'darted,' and this must be the interpretation here. 'To dart at one's face' requires some qualifying expression, and quite plainly the idea of this line is a rapid motion with the nails toward the countenance.17

*Ferguut* 363:

Hi nam olorf ende keerde saen
*Te are floech quam hi gegaen

*Ferguut* 2205:

Ferguut heft sinen wech genomen
*In een forest es hi komen

Here the prepositional phrase qualifies both verbs.18

*Walewein* 10330:

Hi ghinc dozen metter scoot
Tote minen her Waleweine ghinc hi thant.

The second part of this construction, of course, adds nothing new to the thought; but, as in the example above, the prepositional phrase qualifies one verb as well as the other.

*Limborch* 1, 252:

Miin noeder es die hertoginne
*Van Limborch ben ec shertoghen kint

Here van *Limborch* necessarily modifies hertoginne, for otherwise the meaning is inadequate; that it also modifies *shertoghen* seems probable in comparison with lines 474–75:

Sonder twivel ghi ductet mi
Van Limborch sertoghen dochter

*Flandrijs* 4, 164:

Al dat in mijns vader hof
*Siet u te dienste sijt here of cnecht

17 Cf. *Walewein* 344: *Ende scoot upien here Waleweine
Bede mit clauwen ende met tanden

18 Cited as *dāz swoō* by Stoett, *Middelnederlandsche Sprookkunst, Syntaxis*, p. 152; also by G. S. Overdiep in his edition of *Ferguut*, p. cxxvi. Here on pp. cxvi and cxxvii are listed under the heading of *dāz swoō* a considerable number of examples. Some of these I have included, but some imply a broader interpretation of the term than my own.

Stoett16 cites this as an example of *dāz swoō*. Franck in his edition of *Flandrijs*20 refers to this passage as "Ausslassung des Verbum substantivum im Relativsatz." Although a verb as *koinon* is rare, possible examples of it in Old Germanic have already been pointed out, and in the present passage such a construction offers a likely solution.21

In the following example a phrase necessarily qualifies a preceding and a following verb.22

*Ferguut* 2429:

Wenndi vinden genade
*Aue Ferguute hie gerne bade

Not necessarily, though probably, to be taken with the preceding and following verb is the prepositional phrase in the following example:22

*Ferguut* 5227:

Mijn her Keie den ridder stac
*Up zieni wilt mijn scacht brac

2. *The koinon in same line with both parts.*—

*Flandrijs* 612:

Gebet wat phi wint ic doo

3. *Koinon filling a line.*—

*Walewein* 964:

*ende dedem dragen
Een paer cloader van water ziden
Men brocht dies was hy bide

The editor, Jonckbloet, supplies a pronoun *se* after *brocht*.

*Walewein* 3705:

Daer hi mede grote striemen
Der joncrouwen stoch in hare ansichte
*Grote slaghe ende ghesichte
Gaf hi hare ende harde vele

The verb *stoch* might be interpreted intransitively, but in these metrical romances there are certain stereotyped phrases and in line 3782, exhibiting precisely the same construction, *stoch* must be taken transitively.

*Walewein* 3782:

*ende stoch
Die joncrouwen in hare ansichte
Grote slaghe ende gesichtie.

21 Cf. also Stoett in *Noord en Zuid* XII, 511 ff., in a note to 1.1117 of the poem there concerned.
22 Cf. by Overdiep in his edition of *Ferguut* as *dāz swoō*.  28 Ibid.
In the next three examples the koinon, although standing in a line separate from the two parts with which it is to be grammatically construed, does not take up the whole line.

**Flandrijs 1, 882:**

Ende scoot van sine verwoet  
*Op Flandrijs die voer hem stoot*  
Sleechi de clauen ander arm

The expressions *scoot op* and *sleech op* occur frequently; here *op Flandrijs* is expressed but once, though it completes the meaning of both verbs.

**Flandrijs 1, 819:**

Flandrijs deide sijn swert sniden  
*Met beden handen des geloet*  
Sleechi den bere op sijn hout

In much the same manner as these phrases, an adverb may stand as koinon:

**Esmoreit 453:**

Dies es leden bi ghetale  
*Achtsen faer dát weet et wale*  
Habd zbeweest mijn minnekijs

In the following example several nouns occur as objects after a verb, and then another verb is added. One could perhaps take some of the nouns with one verb and some with another, but such an arbitrary break seems less likely than that a group of nouns forms a connecting link with both verbs.

**Ferguant 1070:**

Hie dede hem bringen ridders gewade  
Halsberch cousen helm van stale  
Dede Ferguant ane het stont hem wale

Here the nouns *halsberch*, *cousen*, and *helm van stale* are the direct objects of *dede ane* and in apposition with *ridders gewade*, which is the object of *dede bringen*.

---

24 On this the editor, Franck, remarks in the notes: "wenn man eine Construction nicht gelten lassen will, in der *op Fl.* sowohl als Obj. zu dem vorhergehenden wie auch zu dem folgenden Verb gehört, so kann man nach *scoot* leicht ein Adverb, z.B. *voort*, einsetzen."


26 For a similar appositional line, cf. **Fergunt 2323:**

Ende langede heme sine wapijn te male  
Halsberch cousen helm van stale.
Here the subject of *dede is Aberijn*, but the plural *versloegen* requires both *Aberijn* and *Arnout* as its subject.

Similar to this is *Ferguut 5186*:

> Mijn her Keye es comen metten
> Ende alle die vader tellerlooden
> Hadden helm op hoefte gebonden.\(^{29}\)

The construction consisting of an independent clause between two dependent clauses or of a dependent clause between two independent clauses, mentioned in regard to Old Germanic and Middle English, occurs also in Middle Dutch.

*Ferguut 4593*:

> Hi moet ons beten onse quale
> *Oft zijn wille et si maget doen wale*\(^{30}\)

*Walewiin 4281*:

> Ghi act wel vor tswaert ontstaen
> Haddi minen raet ghedaen
> Ghi act joo leven wel behouden

*Essoreit 302*:

> Ay ic en mochte niet droever sijn
> Al haddic verloren in dier gelijke
> Mijn poet ende oec mijn conurie
> Duer comme en wondle droenew twint
> Haddic behouden mijn scoene kint\(^{31}\)

Though the examples of *dan zouwio* from Middle Dutch are few, they show a similarity in context to those in Middle English. There is no feeling that the second part is added in order to qualify the first part. A comparison of the following examples shows in each the passage of thought through the common element from one expression to another which is not subordinate.

*Frantriis 1, 882*:

> Ende scoet van sinne verwoet
> *Op Flandris die voer hem stoent*
> Sloechi de clauwen an den arm

*Brunne’s Chronicle 4668*:

> First the Romains ful well stoden
> *Apayn the Bretone in bataille yoden*

\(^{29}\) Cf. Overdiep’s edition of *Ferguut*, p. cviii.

\(^{30}\) This is marked as *dan zouwio* by the editor, Overdiep, who cites numerous similar examples on p. cvxi and remarks: “taalrijk zijn de zinnen die naar twee kanten verbonden kunnen zijn.”


---

**III. COMPARISON WITH MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN AND OLD GERMANIC**

While the material covered for this discussion of the construction in Middle English and Middle Dutch is by no means inclusive, it seems fairly certain that in both these languages *dan zouwio* is not a frequent occurrence. Nor is it a frequent occurrence in Middle High German poetry. From a reading of a considerable portion of Middle High German literature, F. Karg in his *Syntaktische Studien* has adduced some two hundred and seventy examples. He has pointed out three characteristics of the construction there which can be linked up with *dan zouwio* as it occurs in Old Germanic and in these two other Middle German languages:

1. The kooinon does not represent two different cases to one of which it cannot grammatically conform.
2. The kooinon is only rarely more closely attached to the preceding part of the construction; it takes mainly one of two positions in verse, (\(a\) more closely attached to the second part, as

*Kaiserchronik 6038*:

> *duo kom von himele*
> *der gutes engel erecein im do*\(^{32}\)

*Kudrun 538*:

> *do sprac von dem gesidele her Hagene also sprach*\(^{33}\)

\(b\) metrically separated from both parts, as

*Nibelungenlied 1431*:

> *Hagene von Tronege unze dar si sach*
> *do ze Gunthure sprach*\(^{34}\)

\(^{32}\) Cited by Karg, *Syntaktische Studien*, p. 11.

\(^{33}\) Ibid., p. 10.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., p. 11.
THE CONSTRUCTION ḥā ḥōwō in the Germanic Languages

Daniel 1411:
Sich, herre, wir volgen dir
Gar in unsern herzen gir
Suche wir dir antlitzen.  

3. The two parts of the construction are usually of equally independent thought value.

In tracing the historical development of the construction, however, Karg finds the earliest example to be in the *Exodus*, about 1120. But the construction ḥā ḥōwō in Germanic is much earlier than that. In the *Helian*, in Old English poetry, and in the work of Otfrid, are numerous constructions like the following:

*Helian* 1800:
than wærdad in antdon after thiu
*himilportun* anthidan

*Juliana* 584:
*ja toscaden wear*8
*Ig tolysed.*

*Otfrid* II, 12, 60:
thas ih bigine bredigon *fon himilriche redion*

Here a word serves a double grammatical function and stands more closely related to its second correlate; but this second correlate appears as a rather abrupt addition which is there to fill out the line. Exactly this type of construction is found also in the Middle Germanic period.

*Porlernay* 199:
O varry god for whyu she enresse
Only a man for doing ile to grow

*Lancelot* 5561:
Ene bare deer sten verdect
*Met pellen ende met zamele wel herect*

*Mushatblut* 18, 3, 34:
Ich han vertaert *msyn dag urherht*9

*Hiob* 7655:
Got hat di bruder min getan
*Von mir verre gevirret dan*10

For an almost perfect parallel one may compare the following passages:

*Otfred* II, 9, 29:
Nu will iht hir gizellen *ein bili* grinenn

*Tilo von Kulm* 1165:
Nu wil ich uch vort ceelen
*Di zwn gezi üz welen*99

In the Middle Germanic period such constructions as these are not confined to mere repetition of idea; they may be elaborated to two variant expressions.

*Cursor Mundi* 15:
How charles kyng and raueland faght
*Wir sarzrus wald ðai na zaght*

*Limburch* 1, 252:
Min moeder es die hertogine
*Van Limborch ben ic shertoghen kint*

*Eilharts Tristan* 3254:
mit armen hate he bevangin
die koninginne he kuste99

This construction, with the koinois in the second part, in Old German never gets very far away from repetition or slight variation of idea, but it is frequently wielded without abruptness. In smoothness of drift of thought, the following typical Middle High German example can hardly be said noticeably to surpass the Old German examples with which it is here compared.

*Kudrun* 752:
Do sie nu getrunen und soorot abe der fluit
*vil schilde sic beaugen und manigem halm guot*99

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters XXI. Karsten takes the passage ḥā ḥōwō. One might perhaps cite here the Middle High German *Genesis* 12, 7 (ed. H. Hoffmann): *er begunde scaffen | hime unde erde machen.*


98 Ibid., p. 11. Also mentioned as ḥā ḥōwō by the editor of the poem, F. Lichtenstein, in *Quellen und Forschungen* 19; cvii. Somewhat similar to this in context is a passage from *Götsweger Tromperbreg* (ed. A. Köppitz, *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters* XXIX), which the editor takes ḥā ḥōwō:

L. 1654: Der herre eigenheyn
Mitt worten grütten begann
Sinen herren tugendsam
Mitt sinen armen da beschloss

97 *Die mitteldeutsche poetische Paraphrase des Buches Hiob*, ed. T. Karsten in [230]
Doomesday 29:
boone le synful slea   swife mid fyste
breast mine beate   on gebestowe
Offrid 4, 2, 6:
that er for tothe irwahta   Lazarea privata

The construction in which the koinon is no more closely connected with one part than with the other is also used in Old Germanic as aptly and as unforcefully as it is in Middle Germanic. This may be seen, for example, in the following passages.

Genesis and Exodus 2532:
God lese hem in his blisse spilen
Among engeles and seli men
Wiltsten ende in reste ben

Walewein 3705:
Daer hi mede grote striemen
Der jonselfrouwen sloogh in hare ansicht
Grote slaphe ende ghedechte
Gaf hi hare ende harde vele

Hio 995:
Daz von der versen des vuzes
An im nichtszicht bleiv buzles
Uf him in de wirkel sin
Leit er gar bitterliche pin

Rolandslied 6114:
Ther keiser hiez in soconden
pinten sine hende
mit ketenen und mit smuoren
hiez er in mit ime fuorten

Sigorbarkestja 4:
ne hunskr komonger   hetjasz at arme
mey frunysen   fal mege Gyska

Beowulf 1548:
loes gebrace feore
wil ord ond wil ege   ingang forstod

Helian 2679:
an is brested hledit   that gigod goodes
linod endi lestet

41 The editor, Karsten, notes that line 997 stands dan xooxo.
42 Cited by Karg, Syntaktische Studien, p. 19; Bartsch, in his edition of Rolandslied, remarks of line 6116, “these Zeile gehört zu der vorhergehenden und zu der folgenden.”
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IN MIDDLE ENGLISH AND MIDDLE DUTCH

TABLE OF CITATIONS


A. Koinon at beginning of line (half-line in alliterative poetry):
1. Accusative: Brunne 1308, 2812; Alexander 1704; P.P. A3, 151; Partenay 214, 743, 5102
2. Prepositional phrase: Brunne 937, 1796, 3186, 3888, 4576, 4668; Partenay 199; William of Palerne 2208, 2501; Cursor Mundi 15; Genesis and Exodus 1933, 1343
3. Two cases that fall together grammatically: Brunne 1544; Bruce 17, 454
4. Sentence: Partenay 4240
5. Initive: Partenay 906

B. Whole construction in a line:
1. Prepositional phrase: Brunne 1672, 2906; Partenay 2038
2. Two cases fall together: Brunne 4380; Cursor Mundi 3993

C. Koinon filling a line (half-line in alliterative poetry)*
1. Nominative: Alexander 302, 4786
2. Accusative: William of Palerne 3317; P.P. B12, 48
3. Prepositional phrase: Alexander 466, 5195; P.P. A3, 99; B15, 466; Genesis and Exodus 2532
4. Sentence: Brunne 153, 4406; P.P. B1, 69; C3, 165; A9, 67

D. Koinon at end of line
1. Prepositional phrase: William of Palerne 47, 1793; Alexander 383
2. Two cases fall together: Cursor Mundi 2551

II. Middle Dutch (texts: Roman van Walewein, ed. W.J.A. Jonckhloet in Werken uitgegeven door de Vereening ter bevordering der Oude Nederlandse Letterbunde, 3 Jaargang, 3 aflevering; Roman van Lancelot, ed. W.J.A. Jonckhloet, ‘s Gravenhage 1846; Roman van Heinric en Margaretha van Limborch, ed. van den Bergh in Werken van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterbunde, Nieuwe Reeks, 2, 3; Flandrijs, ed. Johannes Franck in Quellen und Forschungen, 18; Roman der Lorreinen, selection in Franck’s Mittelniederländische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1883; Fergusi, van Dr. Belco Verwiel en Dr. J. Verdun, ongebruikt bewerkt en uitgegeven door Dr. G. S. Overbeek, in Bibliotheek van Midihoederlandsche Letterbunde; Middeinlndische Letterbunde; Alexander Geesten, ed. J. Franck in Bibliotheek van Midihoederlandsche Letterbunde)

A. Koinon at beginning of line: Walewein 5510: 10330; Lancelot 5361; Limborch 1, 252; 1, 1906; Flandrijs 4, 164; Fergusi 363, 2205, 2429, 5227

*Rarely with some word or phrase other than the two words with which the koinon is to be directly construed.
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CHAPTER IV

đaðr xouðu in old germancic prose

Infrequency of the construction in prose

From a reading of the Gothic Bible, Old High German Tatian, a considerable amount of Old English, and some Old Norse it appears that the construction đaðr xouðu is very rare in prose. Instances for comparison, however, can be found in each of these languages. Much of Old Germanic prose is a translation from either Greek or Latin, and at times the method of translation is of significance. The question of the relation of đaðr xouðu to asyndetic parataxis, discussed in regard to poetry in chapter ii, also presents itself in prose.

A. Gothic

In the Skeireins there is one passage comparable to đaðr xouðu.
6, 3: in þære nu du leitilai hwellas galarbijan Iohanne hauþjan þuhedun

Iohanne may be dative with both galarbijan and hauþjan. What the commentator is apparently here trying to express is that for a while they gave heed to John and believed him.1

The Gothic Bible offers little opportunity for comparing the relationship of asyndetic parataxis to đaðr xouðu. There are but few examples of the former in Gothic, and these are mainly not of a type in which an element could be construed in common. Typical are the following passages.

Mark 7, 19:
jah in urrunsa usgagiþ gahraineb altans marins

Luke 5, 3:
galaþ þan in ain þize skipe Þætei was Seimonis hauhtai ina

John 12, 14:
bigat þan lesus asilu gasat ama ina2

1 This passage is taken as đaðr xouðu by Jellinek, Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum XX, 100. With the inclusion of Iohanne with the first part, however, there is no completion of idea, the whole being dependent on þuhedun.

2 Cf. also Mark 11, 23; 16, 6; 1 Corinthians 14, 24; 2 Corinthians 9, 9.
In the following instance the construction is comparable to ἀπὸ κοινώ.
1 Corinthians 12, 11:

βαν-καί άλλα ωντεχία ἵνα ἰάξα σαμα αἴνα δατείπ υνδρο ρωτάμα-

με χασε ωιλή

πάντα δὲ τοῦτο ἐνεχεῖ τὸ ὕν καὶ τὸ ἀνίστρ πνεύμα δοκοῦν ὁδῷ ἀνέκου

κοθή πολυτατήν.

Here the Greek participle δοκοῦν, which is certainly construed with πνεύμα,
is rendered by the third singular δατείπ, which may be construed with 

αἴνα, the rendering of πνεύμα.

There are a number of examples in Gothic of a construction in which a noun, pronoun, or phrase falls between a participle and a verb each of which requires an object or modifying phrase, and only the intervening

location is expressed for this purpose. In most of these the construction is 

Greek as well as Gothic.

Mark 11, 2:

καὶ δεινόςδε αὐτὸς σπιπθὲντες αὐτὸν ἀγίστε.

Here in Modern English the pronoun is repeated: 'loose him and bring him.'

Mark 12, 3:

ἐὰν εἰς γνωρίσανα ἢν συνετίθεντον 

οἱ δὲ λαθάντες αὐτὸν διέφερον καὶ ἀντείθεσαν κενον.

This we render by 'and they caught him and beat him and sent him away 

empty.' In Gothic and Greek the third verb here takes an elliptical object; 

perhaps the second verb does also.

Mark 15, 17:

καὶ οὕτως καὶ ἔτοι πλάξειντες ἀπὸς αὐτῶν στέφανον.

Here the word order in the Gothic makes possible a common object impos-

sible in the Greek.

Mark 15, 46:

τὸν ἀνίστρπτορ τίνα λείνα λαγολία 

καὶ καθήλων αὐτῶν ἐναλέταν.

In a similar passage at Matthew 27, 59, both Greek and Gothic express an 

object for nimos and also for biwand, thus, ninos τῶν ἁλε ἱς τῆς 

biwand ἆτ.

Luke 1, 63:

ἐὰν εἰς σκῦμας σπίλα σίμα γαλατειδή 

καὶ ἀνίστρπτος τομίδοις ἐγγορέουν.

Regarding the Gothic variation from the Greek, Streitberg has pointed 

out the Latin reading of several versions, et acceperit pugilarem, and re-

marks that in the Gothic this Latin variant has become blended with the 

wording of the original text.¹

Luke 9, 47:

fairgrieipands bain gasatida 

καὶ ἀνάκαθεν ἀνάκαθεν αὐτῷ κατφ

Streitberg mentions the lack of rendering of αἴτω as reflecting versions 

other than the Greek here compared. ² If he were following the Greek, 

Ulfilas might have made the variation intentionally. Each of the Greek 

verbs requires a different case; the two Gothic verbs govern the same case.

Luke 15, 23:

καὶ ἐνεχεὶ τὸν ἄριστον τὸν στενοχοῦς θοῦντε.

The Modern English feeling that this sentence is incomplete unless one 

adds "it" may arise partly from the usual placing of the object after 

than before the verb; in Gothic where the object frequently precedes the 

verb such a feeling of incompleteness may have been considerably less 

noticeable.

Luke 19, 35:

καὶ ἀνεφέρετος τὸν σεῖτον ἄνα 

καὶ ἠμαθεῖντες ἀναστὰ 

ἐν τῷ πάλαισιν ἐνεπίσημον τῷ Ἱσορροφή

One would probably render this 'and casting their garments upon the 

coll they set Jesus thereon,' but the rendering 'and casting their garments upon 

the coll they set Jesus' satisfies the inflections and perhaps the syntax 

of both the Greek and the Gothic.

John 13, 26:

καὶ καὶ ἑκατοκηκτεῖ καὶ 

γαφ Ἰωάννη τὸν Ἱερομάνον 

καὶ ἐκαπεῖν τὸν ἔρχοντα ἐνεπίσημον Ἐλληνο

In the interpretation of such passages as these above, if a locution be 

taken in common it is usually to be construed with a preceding participle 

and so cannot be said to complete the thought of the first part; in this 

respect it differs from ἀπὸ κοινώ. One may assume that the object is con-

strued with one verb and understood with the other. There are instances 

¹ I have cited the Greek from that given in Streitberg's Die Gotische Bibel (Heidel- 
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² Die Gotische Bibel, p. 89.

³ Ibid., p. 132.
where the object must be understood, such as

John 19, 1:

αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἔβαλεν Παῦλος τὸν Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐμπροσθενέν

Notwithstanding these considerations which would distinguish from ἁμαρτον the passages cited above, one must also recognize in them the possibility of a common element.

B. OLD ENGLISH

Here, even more noticeably than in Gothic, the customary method of joining sentences by a conjunction offers little opportunity for ἁμαρτον. It is common to find three or four and's strung along in succession; for example, Chronicle 98, 17: pa geman set hæo men hie of Hereforda . . . and hie wip gefahiot and hie giefliendo and ofstaelgan hie eorol . . . and hirbeor hie . . . and beseton hie . . . In Alfred's translation of Bede's History, in his translation of Orosius' History, and in the Chronicle there are the following examples which may be looked upon as ἁμαρτον.

Bede 3, 2121:

pa geman se engel sona bonne mann wearp eft in þet lyr
Quem angelus sanctus statim apprêhenendens in ignem releet

'In the Latin the relative quem is the object of the participle and of the main verb, but the order of words is such that the ἁμαρτον construction is excluded. Alfred translates in such a way that the common object falls immediately between the two verbs with which it is to be construed. If one construes the second part of the Old English as asyndetic, that is, if one takes wearp as joined without visible connective, then one feels a need for an object for wearp. But mann is obviously in thought the object of wearp and stands in a normal position to be construed grammatically so. In instances such as this there is no definite way of determining whether an object is to be used twice grammatically or used once and implied once. The question may be judged partly on context. Thus in the Anglo-Saxon Charms occur passages such as genim fínal wyl on þære styppán, where the abbreviated syntax of recipes permits one to translate 'take fennel, boil in the paste,' without feeling that the object of the second verb need be expressed.

Orosius 53, 6:

Æfter þam Læcenedmonic geccuron him to latetowe Irecldis was haten

It might be possible to interpret this passage 'then they chose to themselves a leader called Irecldis'; but then the preposition io must be construed with him, and it is much more likely that it is to be construed with lattowe, in which case the translation is 'they chose for their leader Irecldis (Irecldis) was he named.' Here the proper name has to serve at once as object of geccuron and subjective complement of wæs haten; since it is not given an Old English inflectional ending it may serve for both cases.

Chronicle 225, 17:

hyl he miltre wrocan his brother Rodbeard swildest wyncean

Literally, 'how he might punish his brother Rodbeard as much as possible oppress.' The chronicler here falls into an ἁμαρτον construction, perhaps in an attempt to be emphatic.

C. OLD NORSE

In the prose of the Old Norse sagas, the use of the conjunction ok is just as frequent as is the use of and in Old English. Frequent, too, are groups of unconnected sentences; for example, Sturlunga Saga 3, 25, 2: þórlaður het bondi hana var Svartsen hana hóa a Holmáuldr . . . Examples where one may discriminate between ἁμαρτον and asyndeton are rare. In the Gyfaginning and first six sagas of the Sturlunga group the following examples offer this possibility:

Sturlunga Saga 4, 13, 12:

Sprett up þagar ok taka óxar i hónd ser þér Austmenninir ganga til drykkju-stóru

If one does not interpret Austmenninir as subject of ganga, then ganga must be felt as somewhat detached. But the sequence of actions is here so direct —springing up, take arms, go—that it seems likely that þér Austmenninir could be taken without a break with the following verb.

Gyfaginning 45, 34:

i því biill valenar sa maðr stað up slaugt

The variation in tense of the two verbs may be indicative of a variation in mode of expression with perhaps a pause after maðr. On the other hand, these two verbs form a unit in the discourse of the story, and to this feeling of unity the ἁμαρτον interpretation would contribute.

* The Latin is cited from the text given in Schipper's edition.  
† Charms B4, 65.
COMPARISON WITH ASYNDETIC PARATAxis IN OLD HIGH GERMAN (TATIAN)

In his Beiträge zur Deutschen Syntax, Behaghel has collected forty examples of asynthetic parataxis from Tatian.10 With reference to Middle High German he remarks that the widespread figure of so-called ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes is nothing other than a certain form of asynthetic parataxis, and this view is adhered to in his Deutsche Syntax.11 Such a location as Tatian 99, 5, the arbolgau baud sin heroin salala unan watisnarin,12 would, he states, from a Middle High German point of view, be definitely considered ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes. Karg, in his work on ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes in Middle High German, disagrees with Behaghel and finds considerable difference between ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes and asynedeton. In the asynthetic construction, as for instance in Mons. Frug. Matth. 12, 14, Arugunun dzo us Pharisara userakhtun garati, he points out that there is always a pause at the end of the first sentence, in this particular case after Pharisara.13 This he substantiates by the fact that in poetry the first part of an asynthetic construction is usually followed by a metrical pause, for example:

Offrid 1, 5, 9:
Giang er in thia palinze faund sia drurenta

Behaghel, too, thinks that originally after the common element there was a pause but that this later vanished.14

It is apparent that if the question of the relation of ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes to asynedeton hinges wholly upon the presence or absence of a pause between the two parts of the construction, there will always be an uncertainty about the conclusions, for whether or not there was a pause here can never be definitely determined. The evidence of alliterative verse is indeed much in favor of the assumption that there is a pause; for the two parts of the asynthetic construction are very frequently separated by the caesura. But the great majority of asynthetic constructions in verse are such that the order of words prevents a common element, and in the question of relationship between ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes and asynedeton one is dealing, as Behaghel has stated, only with a specific form, that in which a possible common element falls at the end of the first part of the construction. One may well say that such a passage as giang er in thia palinze fand sia drurenta is felt to be enunciated with a pause after palinze, because here, obviously,

palinze could not be closely joined in thought with fand. It is not so certain that such a sentence as Tatian 143, 5, the arbolgau uam sin herro salala inan watisnarin, is enunciated in exactly the same manner.

Of a total of 50 examples of asynthetic parataxis in Tatian, 20 are of such a word order that the subject of the first clause stands in a position to serve also as subject of the following clause. In every case these constructions arise from the translation of a Latin participle, such as et respondens angelus dixit, which gives the German antingoto the ther engil quad. There are, in Tatian, 78 cases where the Latin word order is similar to that shown in the preceding example.15 In 37 cases the Germanic translation is participial, and in 21 cases it is a finite verb with conjunction. In these cases there can be no doubt that the translator felt that the noun was connected with the second verb. If he varies the translation a bit and in 20 cases makes the participle a finite verb and omits the conjunction, there is some reason to believe that he still feels the noun to be construed with the second verb. Just how close the connection is may, of course, vary with the context. Of the 20 cases in which an ᵙᴵ ᶻVotes interpretation is possible, 14 contain the verb quad or sageta in the second part. There is perhaps some feeling here that quad is a rather stereotyped introductory remark before what is to be said; but it possesses as much force as the preceding antiingota, and perhaps a bit more, as it translates the Latin dixit whereas antiingota corresponds to a participle. When the translator, however, makes from the Latin respondens autem alter in- crepabit illum16 the German tho antingota ther ander increbota inan, he must have felt that antiingota merely led up to the idea that 'the other rebuked him.'

In two cases in which the Latin participle expresses a movement and the main verb has to do with speaking, there is an abrupt change in idea which may justify one in believing that there is a pause between the two parts.

116.23: et accedentes discipuli eius rogabant
inti giengun tho sina iungoron hatum

157.10: Venientes autem et primi arbitratio sunt
Tho quamm thi eriston umantum thaz

In the following example,

82.19: Et surgens Iheus sequebatur eum
Ariston tho ther hellant folgeta imo

10 "Beiträge zur Deutschen Syntax, II," Germania XXIV, 167 ff.
11 Deutsche Syntax, III, 536.
12 Tatian 143, 5, according to citation by page and verse which I have used.
13 Karg, Syntaktische Studien, p. 9.
14 Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, III, 536.
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the sequence of action is such that there is little feeling of pause between the two parts. To punctuate with a comma after *keilant* makes a ragged break in two ideas which the translator from the Latin must have felt followed closely together.

In one case the Latin participle merely expresses a state of mind of the subject, and the following verb is one of action:

143.34: *et iratus dominus eius tradidit eum tortoribus the arboldian uard sin hero salt saltan usizinarin*

In such a case there is a definite feeling that the noun is more important with the verb of action than with the verb expressing the state of mind.

27.3: *Audiens aerem Herodes rex turbatus est Tho thaz ghirta Herodes ther cuning uard girubbit*

Here the drift of idea is in crescendo. If one interprets it as 'then that heard Herod the king was troubled,' there is a subordination in thought just as the most important point of the passage is reached.

All examples of asyndetic parataxis in which the first clause has the inverted word order cannot, of course, be considered *dnó xovóf*. If the translator of Tatian, for instance, can write *intetita sinon mund lerta sie* it is possible that he might write *antilgota tho engil quad* without feeling that the second verb was directly connected with the subject of the first verb. But it is beyond doubt that such constructions may very easily merge into *dnó xovóf*. Too much stress should not be laid on the assumption that these constructions were always enunciated with a pause between the two parts. The rhythm of the sentence must vary with the context, and not all asyndetic constructions are cast in the same mould.

### TABLE OF CITATIONS

I. Gothic (text: *Die Gotische Bibel*, ed. W. Streiberg, Heidelberg 1908): Skireins 6, 3; 1 Corinthians 12, 11; Mark 11, 2; 12, 3; 15; 17; 15; 46; Luke 1, 63; 9, 47; 15, 23; 19, 35; John 13, 26.


*The citations from *Orosius* and *Chronicle* are by page and line.*
CHAPTER V

CONSTRUCTIONS SIMILAR TO ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ BUT WITH
DISTINCTLY SUBORDINATE SECOND PART

It is characteristic of the ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ construction in the Old Germanic languages that the second part always contains an idea of approximately the same importance as the first part. This is especially true of the constructions in which the koïnon constitutes a half-line. In the examples in which the koïnon falls in the half-line with the second part of the construction, the context is usually that of repetition or slight variation in idea. Both the construction with the koïnon as a half-line and also the construction with the koïnon in the second part continue into the Middle Germanic period and here, too, without perceptible subordination in the second part of the construction. Whether or not there may have been, in thought, in some cases, a degree of subordination it is difficult to tell. There is, however, a construction common in Old English prose and also in the middle period in the Germanic languages which has been cited as ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ, although the second part is distinctly subordinate in idea. This is the construction in which the second part is an attributive clause.

Chronicle 94, 20:

Her on ðys geomet ðefor Ælfred was at Baldum gerefa

The second clause often expresses the name of a noun in the main clause.

Alexander 2106:

ðen sode he oure into an Ie Ysama was hatten

Kellner considers such constructions “two sentences put together without any outward mark of connection” and terms them ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ. He states that the second part was felt as subordinate from the very beginning. 1 Jespersen gives the Chronicle passage cited above as an early type of contact-clause, his term for the Modern English type, “There is a man below wants to speak to you,” and suggests that such constructions were originally two independent units which later came to be felt as one sentence. He points out that wæs or its original was often equivalent to our ‘he was’ in quite the same way as, for instance, Latin era. He feels, however, that an ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ interpretation might apply in some instances. 2 Paul considers as a kind of ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ constructions with apparently subordinate second

---

1 Historical Outlines of English Syntax, pp. 61-62.
2 Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar, III, 153-34.

---

part; for example: das si se scherme tragen eines heisat tarnkappen. But he distinguishes them from constructions of two co-ordinate parts, such as do spranc von dem gesidele her Hagene also sprach. Of the former he states:

Eine andere art von ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ ist es, wenn bei anstellung eines nicht der form nach, aber logisch abhangigen satzes das subject desselben in einem satztheile des regierenden satzes liegt .... Besonders haufig ist diese construction bei heisat. 3

Karg rejects from the category of ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ constructions of this type, called by him heis-Konstruktion. 4

Considered from the common Germanic point of view, the fact that the second part of the attributive-clause construction is always descriptive differentiates it in one respect right away from ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ. One is led to believe that the construction may differ in other respects. To determine this, the attributive-clause construction may be investigated from three points of view: (1) its relation to other constructions; (2) its grammatical peculiarities; (3) its position in verse.

RELATION TO OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS

If it were probable that the feeling of subordination in the second part of such a construction as On ðys geare gefor Ælfred wæs at Baldum gerefa is a development from the time when the two parts were felt to be equal in value, the origin of such constructions might lie in two originally independent statements; thus: gefor Ælfred. Wæs at Baldum gerefa, where the personal pronoun is understood in the verb. This is Jespersen’s suggestion. Were this so, these constructions could be considered to have in origin some similarity with ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ, that is, when the personal pronoun was no longer understood in the verb, the expression might have been felt as a unit formed of two independent ideas. But in all the Old Germanic languages, constructions of this type are rare in comparison with constructions expressing exactly the same kind of thought relatively with a pronoun. From an examination of sentences of the type gefor Ælfred wæs at Baldum gerefa in Gothic, Old Saxon, Old High German, Old Norse, and Old English, one is led to the conclusion that the attributive-clause construction is not a development from a time when the two parts stood independently side by side but is rather a construction in which at an early period the second part was felt to be distinctly subordinate.

---

3 Paul, Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik, fünfte auflage (Halle, 1900), p. 177. In the twelfth edition of his Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik (bearbeitet von Erich Gierach, Halle, 1929), p. 244, the distinction is more sharply put: “Vom echten ΔΑΘ ΝΟΨΩΤ ist zu scheiden die sogenannte heis-Konstruktion, bei welcher das Verbum die Geltung einer attributiven Bestimmung hat.”
4 Karg, Syntaxtische Studien, p. 52.
In Gothic the attributive-clause construction does not occur, but the relative construction is normal, as in
Luke 19, 29:
bihe nehwu was ... at fairgynja jatei haitada slavejo
John 11, 16:
şanuq šaq šonmas saei haitada Didimus išim gahalabam seinaim
In the Heiland there are a few asyndetic constructions in which the second part may be looked upon as an attributive clause.
Heiland 1227:
Same warun sie im etf Judeono kumans
fpelki folkskepi warun im thar gifara ra thiis
At times the personal pronoun is expressed.
Heiland 3334:
gelebod an is ikhannon Lazarus was he betan
But also in similar expressions the relatively used demonstrative occurs.
Heiland 2704:
He sobta imu tho thana Judeono kuming
thena heritogon at hus the betan was|Erodes
In Old High German the attributive clause is less infrequent, as shown in these examples.
Tatian 49, 25, 2:
thaq is lochte allen then in huse sint
Tatian 255, 12:
sum lunyo folgeta ino uvas giunat mit sabamu
Tatian 266, 5:
fundun man quemanten fon thorf in naman Simon hiez
Otfrid I, 17, 24:
ist lamin hiar in lante es iawhit thoh firthante
Otfrid I, 17, 1:
nist man sibhein in worolti thaz saman al irasgeti

9 A construction similar to the attributive-clause occurs, for example, in bi wallswynja jammei frauja fraqaf mist, 2 Corinthians, 13, 10. It has been convincingly maintained that in these constructions such a form as jammei is not a relative but a demonstrative; cf. Carmer, "Is the Gothic Bible Gothic," Journal of English and German Philology, X, 344 ff. But whether or not such a form as jammei was felt as a relative, there is in it a pointer to the following clause which is lacking in the attributive-clause construction, as illustrated in a possible translation of this Gothic passage, 'by that power the Lord gave me.'
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Prayers 4, 1:  
þu gesecce hofoon ond corþan  
ond wunder call  
nin wundorcyning  
þær on sîndon  

Christ and Satan 543:  
þæt wære se depæpa  
Dôdimus wære hæten  

In Old English prose this construction is very common with the verb hæten. Grossmann has cited some 83 examples from various prose sources. From the Old English translation of Orosius’ History, and that of Bede’s History and from the Chronicle, I have noted 102 examples, 82 of which are with the verb hæten; they may be illustrated by these examples.

Orosius 42, 5:  
Tarcuinius ... aspeon Tusca cyming him on fultum Porosna wæs hæten  

Orosius 32, 35:  
wurden twesen ægelingas aflynde of Scilidian Plenius ond Scylopetius waran hæten  

Orosius 45, 21:  
syðan wæs farande þær þæs cyminges modor mid þam twam dadum þæs folces wunincges wæs  

Bede 5, 1930:  
Wæs ... sum weor on lawedum hæde wæs cyminges þegn  

Chronicle 92, 15:  
forðerde Ælfered wæs on Defenem ealdormon  

Chronicle 94, 20:  
gefor Ælfric wæs æt Baðham gerefa  

The attributive-clause construction in the Old Germanic languages in comparison with constructions where a relative is expressed is rare everywhere except in Old English prose, and here it is confined largely to the verb hæten. A possible explanation for the sudden profusion of this construction in Old English is the influence of the Latin, from which much Old English prose is a translation. The Latin model for such an expression as, for instance, Osrisc wæs hæten, is vocabulo Osrisc; Eamfreð wæs hæten-nominie Eamfreð. Such constructions in the Latin must have been felt as decidedly subordinate insertions which could be expressed in a rather brief way in translation. Along with this attributive-clause construction in Old English prose the use of a relative with the verb hæten is very common.

Orosius 15, 26:  
at hãm islende þette Godes þatte  
Orosius 45, 7:  
ofer þa ea þe hæte Araxis  
Orosius 24, 45:  
þone Wendel se þe man hæt Adriaticum  
Orosius 24, 6:  
ongean þe islend þe Godes þatte  
Orosius 67, 33:  
ofsloth Poros Alexandres hûs þe Bucelât wæs hæten  

How frequently this construction with the relative particle occurs may be seen from the fact that in the first four books of Orosius there are at least 78 examples. It appears that even in Old English prose, where the attributive-clause construction occurs with some frequency, it is just as usual to express the same form of idea by means of a relative clause with relative expressed. Here, where the two forms stand side by side in confusion, there can be no doubt that the attributive clause was distinctly felt to be subordinate and that the two parts were not felt to be independent parts expressed one after the other. In all the Old Germanic languages, wherever it occurs, the attributive-clause construction may in some instances be due to the omission of the relative and in some instances it may continue an early asyndetic means of joining before the use of relatives; but its occurrence always along with similar expressions where a kind of relative is used justifies one in holding that the construction was always one of hypotaxis. And in this it is distinguished from asyndetic parataxis, which bears some similarity to ðæo hæten.

THE GRAMMATICAL NATURE OF THE ATTRIBUTIVE-CLAUSE CONSTRUCTION AND ITS POSITION IN VERSE

That the second part of the attributive-clause construction is not felt to be attached to the first part by means of a common element appears clearly from the various forms in which the construction is to be found.

9 H. Grossmann, Das angelsächsische Relativ (Berlin, 1906).
There are four main points here to be noted: (1) the assumed koinon often must represent two cases to one of which its inflectional ending does not conform; (2) the second clause is often placed in such a position that intervening words destroy any possibility of a koinon; (3) it is often inserted as a parenthetic expression; and (4) commonly in poetry the assumed koinon is followed by a caesura. These features are illustrated by the following examples.

A. OLD HIGH GERMAN

1. Divergence in case
   
   Tatian 49, 25, 2:
   
   that is lihted allen then in huse sint

   Otfrid I, 4, 21:
   
   Thar gisah er stantan gotes boton seuman
   
   si dyes halerse zeiawi was sia hentonti

2. Intervening words

   Tatian 255, 12:
   
   sum iungo folgeta ino uus giusuati mit sabamu

   In the following examples grammar, word order, and meter would permit an ἄνευ κοινοῦ construction.

   Otfrid II, 4, 66:
   
   odo outh wit ni duelle then weg ther faran wolde

   Otfrid I, 17, 74:
   
   in droume sie in zelitum then weg sie faran scotum

B. OLD NORSE

1. Divergence in case

   Gylfaginning 14, 12:
   
   in þeim stað kalla men glaðsheim

2. Intervening words

   Volosopo 19:
   
   Ask veitk standa heiter Yggdrasels

3. Metrical pause

   Rigspula 47:
   
   þa levb þat kraka sat a kviste cin

   Also Otfrid I, 11, 13; I, 17, 1; I, 17, 24; IV, 16, 46; Tatian 266, 5.

   Also Sturlungo Saga V, 12, 27.

   Also Grimnesmoi 6, Rigspula 4.

C. OLD ENGLISH

1. Divergence of case

   Orosius 42, 33:
   
   under þan twam consulfum Tita and Publiæ hattun

   Orosius 121, 8:
   
   þurh sunne þara apostola georgena Quadratus was haten

2. Intervening words

   Orosius 32, 35:
   
   wurdon tugen wypelingas alymode of Seiðulf Plenius and Scopetius wæran hîtene

   Bede 1, 734:
   
   fram þam biscope þære Romanican cyrean Celestinus was haten

3. Metrical pause

   Christ and Satan 543:
   
   Þat wæs se deora Didimus was haten

4. Parenthetic insertion

   Chronicle 222, 9:
   
   æfter his deade þis sume Wilelm hæt eallawa þe fæder læg to þam rice

   Chronicle 253, 25:
   
   ferde fram his an castel Belmont het to his an ðer castel Watenele

   In the following instance, grammar, word order, and meter would permit an ἄνευ κοινοῦ interpretation.

   Christ and Satan 75:
   
   Eft reordade ðære sife
   
   feonda aldor was þa forworht agen

D. MIDDLE GERMANIC

This attributive-clause construction, especially with the verb to be named, while confined in Old Germanic pretty much to Old English, is widespread in the Middle Germanic period. In Middle English, Middle Dutch, and Middle High German the usages of the construction present several points in common. The clause with the verb to be named in all these three languages shows that the expression has become generally stereotyped. It is often a parenthetic insertion.

Bruce 18, 462:

For a knyght hat schir Johane bretane

That lichit was abovyn the bra

With his men gret deles cna ma
these examples the caesura separates the two parts of the construction, as in

Alexander 1277:

\begin{align*}
&\text{Than aires him forth Arestes was angrily wondid} \\
&\text{Alexander 2150:} \\
&\text{Then wyrdis he to a wath toon was Wythyby hatten} \\
P.P. B1, 39: \\
&\text{That is the wrecched worlde wolde the bitrate} \\
Palerne 249: \\
&\text{Go calle to me þe cowherde þow deugus þi fadere}
\end{align*}

The metrical pause does not, of course, prevent the direct connection of the following part; but this practice in Middle English alliterative verse of separating the two parts by the caesura is so uniform that one is justified in believing that it does represent a natural break and not a mere poetical peculiarity.

So far as rhymed verse is concerned, there is little distinction to be made in regard to the position of the attributive clause as it is placed just about at will. Very often the whole construction falls in one line and here so far as one can judge by the meter, the two parts are closely connected.

Cursor Mundi 3359:

\begin{align*}
&\text{Yon es bı keiser sal be bın} \\
&Walnewt 3503: \\
&\text{Daer staet een boom es so ghdac} \\
Ferguat 3735: \\
&\text{Vore ere stat heet Baviere} \\
Jäng. Judith 140, 3: \\
&\text{So helset ein lant lıt och da}
\end{align*}

Of 75 instances in Middle English rhymed verse in which the word order would permit an \textit{aðo xoovø} construction, 62 fall so within one line; of 38 in six there are intervening words, and in two instances the attributive clause takes an \textit{aðo xoovø} position,

\begin{align*}
P.P. B17, 48: \\
&\text{Thanne seere we a Samaritan sitteade on a mule} \\
&\text{Hydryge ful rapely the right waye we yeden} \\
P.P. B19, 356: \\
&\text{And whan this deke was done Grace despised} \\
&\text{A carte hyghte Cristendome to carrye Piers sheues}
\end{align*}


\textit{Ibid.}, p. 15.

\textit{Ibid.}, p. 15.

\textit{Ibid.}, p. 15.
instances in Middle Dutch in which word order and grammar would permit \( \text{dán} \ \text{koomen} \), 23 fall so within one line. From these instances it obviously cannot be said to be characteristic of rhymed verse to find the assumed koinon at the end of the line and so perhaps metrically separated by a pause from the following attributive clause. This occurs in only four of these Middle English instances and in only four of these Middle Dutch instances, as in:

\[
\text{Cursor Mundi 2761:} \\
\text{Jus' said our lauerd bot jàr was nan} \\
\text{Was funden lele bot loth allan}
\]

\[
\text{Alexander 2, 589:} \\
\text{Sat hi up sijn snele wreen} \\
\text{Het Buicifal der bester een}
\]

In fact, more often the position is that characteristic of \( \text{dán} \ \text{koomen} \) where the word which might be taken in common is metrically more closely related to the second part.

\[
\text{Cursor Mundi 1885:} \\
\text{Apon le watue welcom he fand} \\
\text{A druned beist jàr lai flottand}
\]

\[
\text{Cursor Mundi 3185:} \\
\text{Our lauerd forbedes le to sla} \\
\text{bi dere sun þou loves sàa}
\]

\[
\text{Waldevein 6044:} \\
\text{Daer ghine die vos ende hi oantde} \\
\text{Ene duere stont in die aerd}
\]

\[
\text{Lancelot 34047:} \\
\text{Doe quam daer out den bosche thant} \\
\text{Een riddre was Julias genant}
\]

In such constructions in Middle High German Karg notes that 73 out of 162 cases show the possible koinon at the beginning of the line, but in 52 of these examples there is a divergence of case. 28 It must be admitted, however, that in the remaining 21 instances of his citations, as well as in these just mentioned from Middle English and from Middle Dutch, the attributive-clause construction is felt to be less detached. The question arises whether this construction as a whole is to be excluded from \( \text{dán} \ \text{koomen} \) or whether the two may sometimes merge.

---
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a feeling of pause at the completion of the preceding full line adds to one's hesitancy in closely linking up the attributive clause to a possible koinion in this preceding line.

Of the 152 remaining examples, 29 are Old English constructions with the verb hatan, and in each instance the name precedes the verb, as in:

Chronicle 251, 33:
Ja cusan hi an cler Willem of Curboil was gelaten.
he was canonie of an mystre Cicc hattre.

Keller thinks that such a construction as Se fader hire souldhe one peon Bala hattre may perhaps be considered two independent sentences. 23 It is, at best, an odd construction. Against taking it as two independent sentences is the fact that these constructions occur frequently with the relative particle the with the words in just the same order, and this is the recurrent construction in the Gyfloghynning, with the particle er. Also against taking them as independent sentences, is the fact that the construction is frequently inserted between a subject and its main verb. Nor is there any feeling of a common element here. If the order of words were, for example, he was canonie of an mystre hatte Cicc, there might be some feeling that mystre was both object of of and subject of hatte; but, as the order stands, Cicc hatte, any feeling that mystre is subject of hatte is lessened by the intervening proper name. It seems probable that such expressions as this became stereotyped in Old English prose and were used in a sentence without any definite feeling of value in the verb.

From a total of 381 examples there are 123 instances in which the attributive-clause construction differs from ðað hawoð neither in grammatical form, in word order, nor in meter. Nearly all of these are from Middle Germanic rhymed verse. Viewing the construction as a whole, since two-thirds of the examples differ from ðað hawoð, one is justified in doubting if the remaining ones are to be so construed.

With regard to the verb to be named, a definite decision can be made. This construction has from the beginning never had any characteristic that would recommend an ðað hawoð interpretation. Twenty-seven of the 46 examples of insertion are ones in which a name is mentioned. Such an Old English expression as

Chronicle 253, 25:
ferde froum hi an castel Belmont het to his an efer castel Watteuille

shows clearly that the addition of the verb to be named amounted here really to saying 'his castel called Belmont' with practically no inherent value in the verb. Since early in the language this verb lost all its force,

there is no reason to believe that when Chaucer, for instance, writes "she hadde a cox highte Chaunticleer" he was making a noun serve a double function. The occurrence of this type so frequently where there can be no ðað hawoð interpretation and its evident reduction to a mere tag are sufficient to exclude it entirely from the category of ðað hawoð.

The spread of the attributive-clause construction within the Middle Germanic group has not, however, been the same in each branch, and one cannot exclude the whole class on the basis of the one verb to be named. In Middle High German, such constructions as es souch es ein meszer was schone unde woz en sacen have always been confined to a fairly limited number of verbs which might form the predicates of the second clause. Karg notes that the great majority of cases contain either was or kies or else their synonyms. 21 This form of expression did not continue in favor in modern German. Karg finds the last traces of it in literature about the nineteenth century. 24

Here where the construction is pretty much confined to a few words of the attributive nature of which there can be no doubt, it is justifiable to exclude, as Karg does, the whole class from the category of ðað hawoð.

In Middle Dutch, too, my examples are mainly confined to the verb hiet. From 70 cases, 57 are of this nature. And in 34 cases where meter, word order, and grammar would favor an ðað hawoð interpretation, 29 are with the verb hiet. Thus in these 70 cases from Middle Dutch there are only 5 in which there is any likelihood that the construction is to be taken ðað hawoð.

Wallewein 3503:
Daer start een boom as so ghechien

These clauses with was or ez are almost as colorless as those with the verb hiet. It is possible that such phrases as was genaunt contributed to the use of was in other expressions where there is but little force in the verbal element. Such an expression as mijn vader was hertoe van Rochedon begaunte erloegen amounts really to saying 'my father, the duke of Rochedon, began to fight.' In the following instance,

Alexander 5, 720:
Dats ene stat start up die see

one might feel that stat stands ðað hawoð; but the use of just such expressions where there can be no possibility of a common element makes

23 Historical Outline of English Syntax, par. 109.
21 ibid., p. 51.
it doubtful if the writer felt it that way. Such a case as

\textit{Alexander 9, 30:}

\begin{quote}
Hets na eun flume ghenant
Heet Indus left in die nautside
\end{quote}

shows that these attributive expressions were felt to be very loosely related to the word which they explain. Even in instances where the possible koinon stands in a line with the second part of the construction, as

\textit{Walewein 6045:}

\begin{quote}
ende hi omtedede
one duere stont in die aerde
\end{quote}

it is very doubtful if \textit{stont} is felt to be grammatically related with \textit{duere}. Here the accusative and nominative case fall together; but there would be no hesitancy in placing \textit{stont} in this position, no matter what case \textit{duere} happened to be. Similarly the two cases fall together in the following example.

\textit{Alexander 8, 145:}

\begin{quote}
In hare recht he uel se droucht
Twee sipe se waer in dier ghenouch
\end{quote}

But the attributive clause could be put in regardless of case, as in the following example.

\textit{Lancelot 23872:}

\begin{quote}
Mettien Lancelot geware wart
Eens knepen ginc ten castide wart
\end{quote}

Judging from the material covered, in Middle Dutch the attributive-clause construction is distinct from ðazu xowovo. There are but few borderline cases, as an example of which one might perhaps take

\textit{Lancelot 43320:}

\begin{quote}
Ende hi was langer un halven voet
Dan eneuch riijder bi hem stote
\end{quote}

Generally, the clauses which express an attribute of a word in the main clause are strung in the syntax of the sentence so loosely that there is rarely any feeling of a direct connection. The verb of the second clause, too, usually has such a semantic value that there is little doubt in deciding just when the clause is attributive and when it may perhaps take on sufficient independence to be felt to require a word already used in the first part. If one compares such a construction as

\begin{quote}
Ende se scoot in haer ansichte
Met hare naglen trac se die hant
\end{quote}

with either of the following,

\begin{quote}
Ende bi ontdeke
Ene duere stont in die aerde
\end{quote}

there is in the first a perceptible quick joining of two ideas which is lacking in the other two. Here is an immediate feeling of completion when the first part is ended and the thought drops, as it were, to continue the attributive clause.

The distinction is not so clear-cut in Middle English. In Old English the attributive clause is confined largely to the verbs \textit{hean} or \textit{wes}, and here there is little doubt about its category; but in Middle English a similar usage is spread to so many verbs that it is possible that at times it may merge with ðazu xowovo. Here it is at times a matter of fine discrimination as to whether one is to interpret the construction as ðazu xowovo or as an attributive clause. The following examples are representative of the type in Middle English here under discussion:

\textit{Cursor Mundi 3185:}

\begin{quote}
Our lanerd forbodes þe to sla
þi dere son þou loves su
\end{quote}

\textit{Cursor Mundi 1885:}

\begin{quote}
Apon þe watur welen he fand
A durned heist þar lai flettand
\end{quote}

\textit{Genesis and Exodus 297:}

\begin{quote}
Adam ben king and eue canen
Of alle se sange in werde ben
\end{quote}

While the last two examples may be classed definitely as attributive clauses similar to those found in Middle Dutch and Middle High German, in which a verb such as \textit{was}, \textit{lies}, or \textit{stands} qualifies a noun in the main clause, in the first example the verb of the second clause is no longer confined to expressing so obviously a state or condition of a noun in the main clause.\textsuperscript{26} It is clear that here at times it is difficult to determine just when an attributive clause ceases to be that and assumes an independent value.

\textsuperscript{26} While my reading leads me to look upon this extension of the attributive clause as largely a Middle English development in comparison with Middle Dutch and Middle High German, it is to be noted that it does occur in Middle Dutch, as in \textit{Nu hoort een geluckensice geft een xit man}, cited by Stoeff, \textit{Middelnederlandische Spraakkunst, Syn-}\textit{taxis}, p. 42.
such that one may feel that the noun in the main clause is directly construed with it. In such an example as

**Cursor Mundi 2019:**

For þô he was þe first it wroght

there is certainly no feeling that first is directly the subject of wroght.

Nor in

**Cursor Mundi 3359:**

Yon es þi keiser sal be bin.

In such an example as

**Cursor Mundi 431:**

He ches til him þat lauerd hend þe men suld make þe ordre tend

there is some feeling that men is construed directly with suld. In the following case, this is even stronger.

**Cursor Mundi 3993:**

Lauerd þou sende me now þi rede

Gains esau has sworn mi dede

The distinction between such an example as this and such a one as for þof he was þe first it wroght if, of course, to some extent a matter of personal interpretation, but a discrimination certainly must be made.

If the second clause expresses definitely a state, condition, or attribute of a word in the main clause, there is reason to believe that it is essentially the same type as constructions containing the verb to be named. If there is any feeling that the possible koinon picks up a new—and not merely explanatory—idea in the second clause, there is a possibility that the construction may be ðað soðwef. This may be illustrated from the following examples.

In the location For than was none durst him withstand, the second clause is definitely explanatory of none. If one compares this construction with such a one as

**P.P. A3, 151:**

Heo buggetteth with heore Inveles

this essential difference may be noted. In the second case the koinon, taken with either part, leaves an independent sentence which may stand by itself. In the first example, if the word none be taken as a koinon and the sentence be resolved into two portions, the first is incomplete without the other. There is no immediate joining of independent ideas here. Rather the whole

---

26 Bruce 10, 702.

This idea must have been in mind before the thought was given expression. This does not cover all instances, but it is one criterion. In the following, *He ches til him pat lauerd hend þe men suld make þe ordre tend, it is not impossible to interpret it as the expression of two ideas, the second of which came into mind as the first was enunciated.* In the location, *Lauerd þou sende me now þi rede | Gains esau has sworn mi dede,* there is a perceptible picking up of a new idea as soon as the word esau is reached. It easily falls into two parts: *Send me thy advice against Esau (Esau) has sworn my death.*

This distinction may be noted in Modern English. Here it is everyday speech to use such an expression as: *"I know a man has two Packards,"* or *"I have a box will hold it."* Here the whole idea is in mind before the sentence is uttered. When one says, however: *"Look out, here comes a car makes straight for us,"* he is linking up two independent ideas and the construction is ðað soðwef.

In making a summary of the relation of the attributive-clause construction to ðað soðwef one may well hold that the two have always been and still are distinct from each other. There is good evidence from the Old Germanic languages that clauses which were attributive in value were usually expressed by means of some form of relative. When they appear, in considerable number, in Old English prose and in the middle period of Germanic with no pronoun expressed, it is a fair deduction that in some instances the relative has been dropped out as unnecessary and that the contact of the two parts is a matter of ellipsis and not of ðað soðwef. In other instances the attributive-clause construction may continue an early method of asyndetic joining, but the occurrence in Old Germanic of similar expressions grammatically marked as relative is evidence that such constructions were always hypothetic, subordinating without pronoun, and not two parts of equal value which might be taken ðað soðwef under proper conditions of word order and grammar. Also indicative of this is the fact that the attributive clause is frequently tucked in where these conditions do not exist. In Middle Dutch and Middle High German there is little difficulty in determining when a clause is an attributive clause and when it is not. In Middle English the extension in use of this construction makes it at times difficult to discriminate between it and ðað soðwef. In making this discrimination, a good method of procedure is to take the construction as ðað soðwef only when the relative subordination of the second part is almost imperceptible.
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CHAPTER VI

THE ORIGIN OF THE CONSTRUCTION ðóno saxwóþ
IN GERMANIC

It is noticeable that ðóno saxwóþ occurs most frequently in poetry. Here the construction often is such that the koinon constitutes a line or half-line, so that as one reads the line there is an uninterrupted flow of thought from the first part through the koinon on into the second part of the construction. As one reads, for instance, in Beowulf:

no by cr in gescd
halan lice hring utan ymbearh

the two ideas, 'yet she did no injury within to the sound body the armor without gave protection,' join smoothly, the koinon completes the thought of the first part but at once leads into the following idea. There is nothing abnormal about such a construction. One does not feel that halan lice was placed in the half-line from necessity; it falls there naturally. The order of words would not be incongruous in prose. Aside from the fact that one occurs in poetry and the other in prose, there is no inherent difference between the case just cited and such a sentence as Alfred's: ha genam se engel sóna bone mann svæfr eð in pet fyr. Both of these cases are in form a kind of asyndetic parataxis. In both the verb of the second part may be said to be added without connective, but each of the verbs has as its obvious object the noun immediately preceding. It is asyndetic parataxis that has become ðóno saxwóþ.

In taking asyndeton as one origin for this construction, there is in the first place some likelihood that a noun falling between two verbs, each of which invites its contact both grammatically and contextually, was felt to be somewhat connected with both. When one finds a Germanic translation such as: Tho arbolgan uward sin herro salute inan, arising from a Latin original: et iratus dominus eius tradidit eum, there is permissible some belief that the translator felt that herro was subject of the following verb. If the possible koinon happens to be an object which the following verb requires, there is good reason to believe that the construction has ceased to be asyndetic. In all cases of asyndetic parataxis in which the first clause has the inverted word order, the difference from ðóno saxwóþ is but little and the two may easily merge. In prose the conscious effort to make an art out of syntax, the solid linking by means of conjunctions of every unit of thought in the sentence, has never been conducive to this form of expres-

sion wherein ideas join unhamped by style. But it appears frequently in Old Germanic verse and is also found in the Middle Germanic period. When Langland writes:

Corteisliche the kyng cousineth to telle
To Meede the mayden meleth thosse wordes

he is using a form of expression which is to be found in the Heliand, Otfrid, Beowulf, and the Edda. In the modern period the mechanical regulating by punctuation of every part of a sentence into its particular niche has contributed to the disappearance of such expressions in literature. But it is doubtful if punctuation corresponds with actual speech. When one says: "So I spoke to the wairter I said 'See here,'" he is linking one idea with another without any break either in thought or in speech. It would seem likely that there is no dark secret about such constructions and that they were felt as normal speech from the earliest period of Germanic.

The ðóno saxwóþ construction in which the koinon stands more closely connected to the second part differs in its earliest form from the kind just discussed. While in the one there is an unbroken flow of thought, in the other as soon as the thought of the first part is completed a somewhat jarring repetitive idea is added. There are passages in Old Germanic verse from which it is easy to see how such constructions may develop. When one reads, in the Heliand:

that imu thar unholt man after saida
fund fæknì knud

It is obvious that the arrangement of words is a poetic device. Free as early word order may have been, it is doubtful if such an expression was common to everyday habits of speech. Yet this rather nonchalant method of arranging words to fit metrical requirements may very easily take such a form that a word falls between two others with which it must be construed. In the case just cited, one may look upon the second noun as an appositional word with no direct connection with the verb. Indeed, it is common to fill out a half-line with an appositional group. But clearly here there may be cases where one wonders just whether the phrase is merely an addition or whether there is a feeling that a word is to be construed in common. Heliand 140 is such a case:

endì imu therad dacalo bigan
wambrnu theru wordos

Remembering the common usage of appositional phrases in Old Germanic verse, one may perhaps consider this such, but it is approaching ðóno saxwóþ. It is essentially the same type of construction which one finds in Otfrid. When Otfrid writes:

thar er fon tote irwagta Lazarum irqua

[ 264 ]
he is using the same method of completing a verse as that which appears in the *Heliand*, but he does it a little less obviously. In the Middle Germanic period, one finds similar constructions:

For thy hertis skyn in circute gan hold
To miles aboute gan it comprehende

Got hat di bruder min getan
Von mir verre geviet den

Hi nam orlof ende keerde saen
Te sire ploech quam bi gegane

Here too one finds constructions in which the second part carries on a more individual idea, for example:

ful derrli he hem taunst
Bi contenaunce wel thi kneu

If one considers how such constructions might arise, there is a probable solution. Having filled out a line the poet occasionally found that to complete his expression it was necessary to put a small part thereof at the beginning of the following line. He was then faced with the question of taking up from there a new point in his theme or of carrying on, by elaboration, to the normal pause of caesura or line-end. The following of the latter possibility in Old Germanic verse not infrequently took the form of abrupt appositional additions or of locutions of slight variation which might be taken as *di xoxov*. The context of these constructions in Old Germanic is seldom more than variation. The same question was met by poets of the Middle Germanic period and at times was solved with no less abruptness. Here, too, the second line was carried on by variation in idea. In Middle Germanic poetry, moreover, the second line was at times carried on by an expression no longer confined to variation, though still utilizing a part of the preceding expression as a common element.

So protein is speech that in individual instances an *di xoxov* construction might arise in numerous ways, and one will always be justified in making conjectures. Two sources of development which can be traced with more than conjecture are andyetic *parataxis* and the requirements of verse.
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