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The purpose of this article is to establish which grammatical contexts, and to what degree, determine the word-order of those structures involving verbs and localizers of the class of adverbal particles, in a corpus of Old and Middle English texts. In order to correlate patterns of structure to contextual frames I have devised a contextual grid of 4 major contexts (see table below). The patterns I have recorded in the material under examination are then systematically related to, or excluded from, these contexts. This required the previous classification of such patterns. To this end we may choose a theoretical model embracing all the possible positions of the basic constituents, that is, the verb (V) and the adverbial particle (P)\(^1\), not only in relation to each other (A\(_{0}\); PV, B\(_{0}\); P/V, C\(_{0}\); VP and D\(_{0}\); V/P)\(^2\) but also in terms of the objects (prepositional and non-prepositional—whether pronominal or non-pronominal) when they exist, as well as in terms of other elements (subject and modifiers) when they intervene between V and P or between P and V. Accordingly, pattern A would consist of "particle + verb" (with or without (a) a non-prepositional object or (b) a prepositional object). The presence of a non-prepositional object could be formulated as \(\beta_1\) or \(\beta_2\) according to the post- or front-position of such an object with regard to the entire verb-particle frame: VP or V/P or PV+\(\beta\), and \(\beta+VP\) or V/P or PV or P/V. Similarly, the presence of a prepositional object could be formulated as \(\gamma_1\) or \(\gamma_2\) accordingly. When such objects complete the directional modification of the adverbal particle, this might be indicated as \(\gamma_3\). Such objects may co-occur and they may theoretically precede

---

\(^1\) See text references.

\(^2\) Note that P—prepositional particle as distinct from P (adverbial). Note also that \([(P)]\)—unspecified particle and \(P\)——prefix.

\(^3\) The slanted line represents an intervening element between P and V or V and P.
or follow the unit 'particle + verb' (or 'verb + particle') in any of 6 possible combinations: +β1γ1, +γ1β1, β1γ1, γ1β1, β1γ1 + +γ1, and +γ1β1. These combinations could be formulated as δ1γ1, δ1γ1, δ1γ1, δ1γ1, and δ1γ1, with or without the subindex α according to whether or not the prepositional object completes the directional notion of the adverbal particle as in the case of γ. Pattern B would consist of 'particle + an intervening element + verb' (with or without a non-prepositional object or a prepositional object, as above). In this pattern, 5 subgroups could be distinguished according to the type of intervening element between P and V: subject (B1), modifier (B2), non-nominal object (B3), prepositional object (B4) or prepositional object (B5) (which may or may not complete the directional modification of P); B5 therefore could be specified accordingly: B5/B5. Pattern C would consist of 'verb + particle' (with or without the objects specified in pattern A and behaving likewise with regard to the verb-particle unit). Pattern D would consist of 'verb + an intervening element + particle', being in all respects like pattern B except for the reversed positions of P and V.

It is self-evident that in a study of context-sensitivity we could make full use of formulas of the type A → B/in the context X +...+ Y; P → Q in the context E +...+ F; P → Q/R in the context E +...+ F, etc. If, by way of an example, we choose the contrast 'transitive (I) /intransitive (I)'; taking I = direct object and J = prepositional object, we shall have V → V, in P +...+ I (or I +...+ P) and in P +...+ I + J (or I +...+ P +...+ J), that is, in a structure A and in a structure A/A. If we substitute P + subject for P we shall have the contexts for B1 + B1 and B1/B1. If we substitute P + modifier for P we shall have the contexts for B2 and B2/B2. If we substitute P + non-nominal object we shall have the contexts for B3 and B3/B3. If instead of a non-nominal object we put a pronoun we shall have the contexts for B4 and B4/B4. If we substitute P + prepositional object for P we shall have the contexts for B5/B5 and B5/B5/B5/B5. Likewise we shall have V → V, in (...)+P+I (or I +...+ P) and in (...)+P+I + J (or I +...+ P +...+ J), that is, in a structure C and in a structure C/C. If following the same method, we now replace P by subject + P or by modifier + P or by non-nominal object + P or by pronoun + object + P or by prepositional object + P (that is, systematically reversing the order of the elements we have arranged in A in order to obtain the subgroups of B), we shall have the complete series of the subpatterns δ and δ/δ in the group-pattern D which, like B, consists of the subgroups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. In the same way, we shall have V → V in P +...+ Q in P +...+ R, that is, in the structures A and A/A. Effecting the appropriate substitutions (P → P + subject, P → modifier and P + prepositional object) we shall obtain the contexts for B1 + B1/B1, B2 + B2/B2, B3/B5/B5, B5/B5/B5/B5. We shall also have V → V in P +...+ Q in P +...+ R, that is, in the structures C and C/C. If we effect the replacements P + subject, P + modifier, P + prepositional object + P, we shall obtain the contexts for D1 + D1/D1, D2 + D2/D2, and for D5/D5/D5/D5, respectively.

In this article, however, I have decided to avoid as far as possible the use of formulas which instead of simplifying the panorama would complicate it unnecessarily. For this reason I shall limit the formalizing to the expression of the basic context formula and the basic patterns or group-patterns, that is, A, B1, B2, B3, B5, B4, B4. The table below will enable us to trace the grammatical contexts of each pattern or group-pattern. After this analysis (which

---

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

(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V + object-goal</th>
<th>trans. direct object (reflexive or non-reflexive)</th>
<th>(1) underlying (passive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direct object alone</td>
<td>direct object + indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anticipatory object (direct object + direct object)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introns</td>
<td>no object</td>
<td>(3) no object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect object (including the reflexive dative and the dative of interest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial modality</td>
<td>(4) indirect object (including the reflexive dative and the dative of interest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) prepositional string</td>
<td>(6) affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) adverbial modifier</td>
<td>(7) negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) interrogative</td>
<td>(8) various types of relations according to the subordinating noun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii)

Contact Σ (main sentence and finite form of verb) (Σ) (phrase) subordination and non-finite form of verb

4 The subindex α stands for structure. Hence (Σ) refers to the string constituted by the verb-particle structure. The other abbreviations in the table are as follows: V = modal auxiliary, V = verbal constituent of the structure under study (V (i) P, P (ii) V), inf = infinitive, S/S = the subject of V (string Σ) is the same as that of V (string Σ), part = partiple, S1/S1 = the subject of V is not the same as that of V, V base = non-modal auxiliary.

---

* An element I or J in this position would obviously make the pattern mixed. Therefore (i) in the case of the simple patterns concerned =..., except for I or J.
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(iii)

Context \( \Sigma_1 \) (phrasal subordination; the verb of \( \Sigma_1 \) is in a finite form which complements the verb of \( \Sigma_2 \))

- **infinitive**: \( V_{\text{inf}} + V_s \) (infinitive, \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_1 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_2 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_3 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_4 \))
- **present participle**: \( V_{\text{part}} + V_s \) (present participle, \( V_{\text{part}} = V_5 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_6 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_7 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_8 \))
- **past participle**: \( V_{\text{past}} + V_s \) (past participle, \( V_{\text{past}} = V_9 \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{10} \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{11} \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{12} \))

(iv)

Context \( \Sigma_1 \) (phrasal subordination and finite form of the verb of \( \Sigma_2 \); such a verb does not complement any other verb)

- **infinitive**: \( V_{\text{inf}} + V_s \) (infinitive, \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_1 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_2 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_3 \), \( V_{\text{inf}} = V_4 \))
- **present participle**: \( V_{\text{part}} + V_s \) (present participle, \( V_{\text{part}} = V_5 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_6 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_7 \), \( V_{\text{part}} = V_8 \))
- **past participle**: \( V_{\text{past}} + V_s \) (past participle, \( V_{\text{past}} = V_9 \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{10} \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{11} \), \( V_{\text{past}} = V_{12} \))

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

My method will be as follows: (a) subcategorization analysis, (b) other contextual aspects, in each pattern or group-pattern, distinguishing the two linguistic periods. The subcategorization analysis makes reference to the points expressed in the contexts \( \Sigma \) (1, 2, 3, 4 - V-object-goal; 5, 6, 7, 8 - circumstantial, modal), \( \Sigma_1 \), \( \Sigma_2 \), (9, 10, 11 - infinitive; 12, 13, 14 - present participle; 15 - past participle) and \( \Sigma_1 \), \( \Sigma_2 \). The other contextual aspects are those expressed in the contexts (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 - judgement/question) and \( \Sigma \). It should be noted that at least two of the points from 1 to 7 of context \( \Sigma \) affects every structure in every context. If we took into account the combinations of two or more points of one or more contexts in each structure, we would have to formulate a complex series of inter-contextual combinations. Nevertheless, I shall simplify this issue, by dealing only with the "defining" or at least "typical" contexts of each pattern separately. So, if in a structure which exemplifies e.g. points 2 and 6 in context \( \Sigma \), we have a case of subordination (point 8, context \( \Sigma_1 \)) with the order "PV" (pattern A), I will not formulate the confluence. I shall limit myself to utilizing the structure of pattern A as a sample of the context \( \Sigma_1 \), which is its typically defining context (in OE). A pattern D, on the other hand, may due to the existence of a pronominal object, \( \Sigma_2 \) constituting then its defining context.

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

Initial: Aris, gong to cinin to pes

* Because of technical difficulties with the symbol \( f \), the symbol \( p \) has been used throughout the article (ed.)

---

halgen Oswalde les, site ber, sille winna... (Bede 186, 26). Ga jond pas vegas, lokes, byd hig p hig gin in. "p min hui si gejolde (Luke 14, 23) - imperative, "Wolde pa hine mid attre acedin, and weare hine wenne focin to bide mid attre gemenege (Ælfric, Homs. 11, 162, 19) - V in a structure \( V_{\text{red}} + V_{\text{red}} \), Mot nu cawainan [hvon hine fæste (Ælfric) p dieron ongietan maeg hwanon ic fin tilian scyle] hui (Boethius 12, 12) - inverted order in the same type of phrasal subordination (9) - cume an scearpna, hridlice pas her burfreu, cume burh o fer duru in, burh o fer ad gewute (Bede 136, 2). Wast nu hui ic gewand ymb Crocces peare Croce caynges, pa hine Cirrus Pessu cayning gefgenge hafde, hine forthanen woldel (Boethius 18, 18) - inverted order without phrasal subordination, see below in connection with the inverted order - Medial: Iome se heretega mid Iserhalo folce, beodec pa burh seofon si pnum, and 20 Godes donnas baron pas haligc serin mid dam heofonlicum haligdomme... (Ælfric, Homs. 11, 214, 33). Final: And se hæcht-egel mid ãeu wordum to keofonum gewut (Ibid. 1, 504, 3) - see below in connection with contexts \( \Sigma_1 \), \( \Sigma_2 \). To these positions we can add two other types: (1) the non-absolutely final positions, frequent in structures \( V_{\text{red}} + V_{\text{red}} \) in subordinate clauses, which we shall be dealing with shortly as one of the aspects of pattern A, and (2) the positions concerning the subject, in particular the inverted order 'VS'.

**PATTERN A**

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorization analysis.

The subcategorization aspects which concern us here relate to the contexts where \( V \) (or \( V_{\text{red}} \), in case the discontinuous verb complements another verb) is a finite form: infinitive, present participle or past participle. Such contexts are:

1. \( \Sigma_1 \) (underlying direct object: past participle) which also implies context \( \Sigma_2 \), (14, 15) - when the verb form concerned is a finite one: infinitive, present
participle, past participle). In the afore-mentioned contexts $V_v$ frequently occupies a final position in structures of verbs without a locative particle such as

\[ \text{Wolde be hine mid attre acceallan, and asende him anne focam to lice mid attre gemenged} (\text{Aelfric, Homs II, 162, 19), quoted above, and ic ongan be hem ccean intingan hweashtec geordor secemeg.} \]

On team fingum the folde God hie mannne saule yeogodan; fea is mid undeclincynse, and mid gescelde (ibid. I, 20, 1), where we also have an inverted order with regard to V. Nevertheless, we indeed encounter an entire range of sequences V $\rightarrow$ $V_v$ where $V_v$ appears in various non-absolutely final positions, although always after V. Cf. Ne meg ne manne secuest fulsumedec secemeg ne understandingum ymbde God (\text{Aelfric, Homs I, 12, 18}) — note also the inverted order with regard to V — as well as the cases in direct order: Ic allelyte metin man webbe betwenn me and now bi theu biehede... (ibid. 22, 10), Ic Aelfric wenne and maxweepest, even pene vacere fonde saxonoc houndum gbrygin, wæs ascende on Alfrede dey cymninges from Elflage bisecope, A beowolcde afterbrygan, to sunnun magunste be is Cereal gehan (ibid. 2, 12).

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

1 Except when the clause is subordinate. See below.

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

* Other complements, such as the simple objects and prepositional objects, vary in their position. In these cases where we have more than one complement, R. Hutton distinguished a variety of patterns expressed in the following formulas, where S=subject, V=verb, O=simple object without flexional case marker, P=participal object, SVO1, VSO1, VSIO, VOS1, SOTV, SOIV, SIVS, SVI12, S1V2, (S)1V2, (S)1V2, (S)2V12, (S)SIV, etc. As can be seen, the patterns in italics exhibit the precedence of the complements. Cf. R. Hutton (1923: 255 ff.).

final position: $\Sigma (1)$ for bid wap, tolfe gryst-lung; Danne ye gesoe $b$ abraham, $y$iacc., $z$acob., $e$alle witegen on godes rice, $g$ beald ut-adrifenne (Luke 13, 28).

For jam sole fe hine up-ahod. bid genynderad, so de hine wydraban se bid up-ahsan (ibid. 14, 11), $\Sigma$ hit nyt ne on eor orn ne on myenece ne hit bid ut-aworpen (ibid. 14, 35). $\Sigma$ wæs after wiste wop $e$ akhenmi/si morgen-sew (Bow. 128), $\Sigma$ (S)2V12 (9) Da beal he hine, wolde ingan (Luke 15, 28), $\Sigma$ hit nyt ne hine inbrygin, $\Sigma$ algenec before him (ibid. 5, 19), Ic ne wilde cued [en p] a goodan onginnenhulfe $b$ hit ne morgen forbrofan (Booth. 110, 32), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (10) Und after fone he hine gestere mednioc fe, da ahof hine up, ongan sewgan, gife he hwar amige freond meten mealke, fe his gymenne dyde, his wienda liecnioc wolde (Bed. 326, 9), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (11) fe com sum fora hina, chesope me, hit ulgan, cears... (ibid. 392, 28), $\Sigma$ hit him on gefræst, fe gofor after oer com, $\Sigma$ bedan he oer cumen wesan, hit he cyng fe eogan ut adun., $\Sigma$ yfian bilsinioc (O. E. Chron a. 1096, F 232, 21). $\Sigma$ hit him pa consulas Hasterbuie $b$ princfl of acceforan, $\Sigma$ waerpan hit beforeman Hnoblede wicstowe (Orosmus 189, 28), hit him pa onkde of acceforan (ibid. 218, 11), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (12) we ycanne sunne on himun namen deofol-seccnessa ut-drifende, we hine forbudon (Luke 9, 49), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (13) Da gestad he se bisecope set hiere, oracionen geweald after eorere, geblatode, geseganode, wæs utgongende (Bed. 392, 25), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (14) se intelgiga pan Gregorius, after fone he hit eft eor Romanisan cyrican, pare apostolic er brodtynne gear... eum domus, tym dynges willeterice heald, rehte, fe was forberdes, fe tam ealde pan heofonic rice laed (ibid. 84, 2), $\Sigma$ (S)1V2 (15) Da eawal se engel ingangende, hit waes du mid gyfe gefylled, dritten mid fe (Luke 1, 28), Da eawal se here heuld ingangende (ibid. 10, 30) purh ino jus ares godes melhteornese, on pan fe is gesoneode of eastale up-springende (ibid. 1, 78). Note that in a case like (11) and $\Sigma$ be he to pan haus cwen, ne he nanne mid him in-gan buton petrum, Johanne... (Luke 8, 51), the position of $V_v$ must be considered virtually final, and in circumstances such as those occurring in (15) Da gecoronten dage se hereul ut-gongende ferde on waste stibe (ibid. 4, 42), where the action of $V_v$ proceeds temporally that of V, it is difficult to conceive of greater relegation. It is also to be noted that the non-absolutely final position is often due to symmetrical balancing when we have two objects, for instance, I and J, resulting in a structure such as L+PV+P or J+PV+I: (9), $\Sigma$ hit ne hine inbrygin, for pare meahe (Mark 2, 4), (10) Da ougan he of jam tempel ut-drifdon, da yllendan, da biegendan (Luke 19, 45), (11) Da he da inne wea, da heht he his tunan forahlon of his mode, him hewun: genen hine da bi his cinne, mid tanne dore hulgan rode his gesegane (Bed. 388, 24). Obviously a case like (9) ... hit yfel upserunan to dam sticle fulsumedec secemeg (Cura Past. 65, 15) with V between I and PV, belongs to the same category.

The situation gets complicated in cases of confluence of contexts, for
instance, $\Sigma-(\Sigma_{23})_{1}+\Sigma(1)$. Cf. *pa gesah heo faere forespeccwan Godes hieo saused* *Hilde faere abrudissun in faem scelyfan lehie, engla wercnum geladendum, de heofonum up borecem beah* (Bede 340, 10), where the underlying direct object of the passive construction appears in the surface string of the active structure $(V+O)$ $(S_{O}paw)+(V_{2}+V_{exw,paw})$ whose $V_{exw,paw}$ assumes the absolute final position. It should be observed that $V_{2}$ complements such an auxiliary and that both $V_{2}$ and the auxiliary complement $V$. Note that such a complementizing hierarchy is not reflected in the sequental order of the string. A special interest has the confluence $\Sigma-(\Sigma_{23})_{1}+\Sigma-(\Sigma_{1})_{1}$, that is, infinitives and participes complementing $V$ in subordinate clauses, but I shall leave this for the moment until we have discussed such clauses in section (b).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

I refer here fundamentally to $\Sigma-(\Sigma_{1})_{1}$ (8). The ordinary structures of verb without a locative particle subordinated to a main clause show a clear tendency to the final position of their verb: *Gif du monne his lytel behold toreost, fana scelte deu sylfer* (Aelfric, Hom. I, 14, 12), *Maran lea lif lif nu se herdage on gefeshte to dom cemann, fe after fleasne his wiwerinnum deeganlice ofwerend* (ibid 342, 2). This is the reason why we frequently have pattern $A$ when in the structure there is no particle directly modifying a $V_{2}$.

The particle $n$ would split the unit $PV$ (see the next pattern). So we shall easily encounter cases like *gif hit tobyrst, ni fer gewit, oddge upasthit* (Lechdoms II, 160, 27), *fe slog hie mon um hit frum cirre, hit hira fgan on weg cwumi* (O. E. Chron. a. 918, A. 98, 29), *by ha hine min wage dydon, fe exum of innuwerde pere byrgeonne swe anscele sterne* (Bede 174, 28), *laedan hine ofer don mundes cansepp, ofer fone burah getinbrud weas, p hit hine nyefor beascan* (Luke 4, 29), *fe erde he a sona on su diurum hond, me ongum laedan suadett on don rodr swe suon on wintre suone upp gonged* (Bede 423, 23), *se fe hine from su monegum erum pam, towean generde, de hianesse cynricres fordeggelde* (ibid. 130, 11), *for-fam fe ge secead hit on bel-sleb doefol-secensa ut adrif* (Luke 11, 18).

As I have already pointed out, the situation gets complicated when there are confluences. Here we must have a close look at the confluence $\Sigma-(\Sigma_{23})_{1}+\Sigma-(\Sigma_{1})_{1}$ already mentioned. In these cases, the absolutely final position is frequently assumed by the non-finite form $(V)$ immediately or almost im-

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

mine pattern A are: (1) the passive relative constructions of the prepositional verb (category 'a'); just as her wear p. da forburnam. Indem, fom aman prose / f. hast halige dust on alswagen was se mot an. asted ond. un mid. fom duste. / and hye sceolden wundes. faw. halpen vegere gewarne / just fest for ne mid fom. moldan forburnan (Alfric's Lives of Saints XXVI, 140, 232); (2) the relative constructions of the two categories of the prepositional verb: (a) After faw. he gesagedore f.erd. wolde faram on Perse, / beided. fom. hef esse. easte. handwear. faw. mon hafode. andilustrum geworun se Herestal. / etc. micle Godes peowes on don, faw. his dier. fornuna. abite (Orosius 286, 9), (b) Da cawed he: Hwezt, p. waust dat ic. se ear. sade. p. sio. sede. gesedw. were. good. / of. fom. gode gesedw. he. cawed. haw. call = da. odru. good. / faw. we. we. a. spreone. / right to Boethius 86, 16). To this must be added the postpositional use of prepositions with respect to their objects during the Old period, which is represented by the patterns 'OPV' and 'O'PV'. Note that the postposition with respect to the object results in a front-position with respect to the verb: se engel hrye frem gewitt (Lukke 1, 38), engel hrye costumge gefylledere. / etc. and cawed he: sone. hylde. frem gewitt (ibid. 4, 13), / etc. / cawed. / ic eyst. ic. se. gehesaned. / And so. se. krafte. him. forde. (ibid. 5, 13). His mother. his geboren. him. to. comm. / she. mihont. hine. for. meneg. geman. (ibid. 8, 10), / cawed. he. sum. me. setr. / ic. wiste. | faw. maing. me. of. cod. (ibid. 8, 46 - Hatton). Needless to say, the postpositional variety 'OPV' is also very frequent (see below in connection with pattern 0).

Of course the spelling is not a reliable criterion for distinguishing any of the structural types concerned. Of the prepositional structures set summum (O. E. Chron. a. 918, A 98, 29), be santon (ibid. a. 1016, E 150, 19), ge seaxwe (ibid. a. 1052, E 177, 24), ofer cwen (ibid. a. 1096, E 322, 21), and the strings of particle and verb separated, joined with or without a hyphen, both adverbial — up gonge (Bede 428, 25), ni fer gewitt... upstafet (Leshdome I, 160, 27), — and prepositional: as gaf. du. cawed. dito med wyman. / mod. Godes. fulnum. de. de. u. eme. spreone; / sono. mede. du. ongipt. p. (Boethius 104, 18), / etc. after. first. hine. lyst. lade. / siete. dara. / if. butan. sige. / de. he. gebrife. / se. engel. hrye frem. gewitt (Curia Past. 279, 8), / etc. cawed. he. sum. me. setr. / ic. wiste. | faw. maing. me. of. cod. (ibid. 8, 46 - Hatton).
ence of one of these particles between the locative particle \([P]\) and the
verb normally rules out the possibility of prefixation when those same
elements of the verb-particle structure (including the units of the propositional verb)
appear, whether joined or one following immediately after the other in a
sequence \([PV]\) in other circumstances. Cf. ... for to breconer (Cura Past.
417, 10), ... ut ne sprecar (ibid. 273, 10), ... on to lociene (Boethius 14, 13), ... 
from ne geote (Luke 4, 42). These strings constitute precisely (the adverbial
and the propositional ones alike) the order of our pattern group B2, sub
group B2 (see below). The prefixal structures in identical circumstances exhibit
the order 'to+ne+P+V' instead of 'P+to+ne+V' & his bid micle de tre to
ofracaethan de his self felt wi his self ofremerce to fullome dam west
fohhende (Cura Past. 277, 24), Du donne hie beras on swice weamodesne his
sindun sa micle weamlicher to ofracaethan sa mien onget hie on moran
uwegeite beod (ibid. 295, 20). Du dis fa gespreken was, fa gesgode p Mod, ... see
Geceadulmes angen speeran, fa uwea Kula, Mod, ead, an uwe is suwede to
uwecanmann (Boethius 41, 7), ... wulda dier dor woldon to irran; sindan swice
hi tann waren, saa stille, deas hie men odde hundas wi eode, deas hie na ne
uwecanmann (ibid. 101, 28). Cf. the structural ambiguity, theoretically speaking
only, illustrated in Onjig nu hie uumteige fa ylfan men biot, nu hie ne uwe
uwecan mien uileder dea uwegeite uwecanale wilniud to to uwecan
(Boethius 108, 3). The only point in favour of the interpretation 'to (prep.) + to (infinite
de particle) + V' instead of 'to (infinite particle) + to (prefix)' is the fact that
to-uwecan 'come to' does not exhibit in other circumstances any prefixal state.

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

preposition a continuous nexus (subordinating continuity): ... bad Cewayne
forme cyninge hást he par forgoce stome mynster on to tumbrena from foresprecan
Godes leowe Trumhere... (Boethius 238, 22). Ne salond fo woruldeal fo ana uwea
to pemecne be nae pe hafed, ne eow gleaw mod behald hawedene endil hi habba
(Boethius 16, 19). Note that the infinitive in both categories may be connected
either with a simple direct object (or an adjective qualifying such an
object), or with a noun or predicative adjective of a copulative verb.

The structures 'P+to+V' of the categories 'a' and 'b' of the propositional
verb constitute part of a tightly knit system which in Old English does not
only consist of the afore-mentioned structures (in the active voice), but also
of relative structures in both active and passive in the case of category 'a'
and only in the active in the case of category 'b'. (From the middle of
the Middle English period onwards, and with the new order 'VP' — like our pattern
C —, the system comes eventually to acquire the essential complexity
by which it is at present characterized, with infinitive structures in the passive,
relative structures in both active and passive not only of category 'a' but also
of category 'b', and pure passive structures of category 'b'). The structures
of the Old English system, though not necessarily transformable into alternative
structures with the normal order 'P+O+to+V' 13, are generated from
basic prepositional phrase-markers at deep-structure level. Moreover, I would
postulate that infinitive structures such as for(ham he wease ... hit bid swi
of dis order to done, ge wud done to citanne ge yfes deo, ge eow swede to
hollowe (Pura Past. 355, 21), or even non-infinitive structures of the type
Hlu ne mueg fo p hit naegh geype se naegh swemeal fo emi uweord
fing bieon gemenged wi draf wi uweordre, ode emi aef foreremda wi hadda
(Boethius 37, 17) 14 imply a propositional relationship. It could be argued that

11 Note that the infinitive of both categories may be connected (1) with the direct
object of a verb (ModE, I gave you a (good) pencil to write with), (2) with a predicate
nominate qualifying the direct object of a verb (ModE, I gave you a pencil good
eough to write with), (3) with the predicate nominative of a copula (ModE, this is (a)
good (pencil) to write with), (4) with the predicate nominative (adjective) qualifying the predicate
eruminate (noun) of a copula (ModE, this is a pencil good enough to write with), (5)
directly with the copula (ModE, this (good) (pencil) is to write with). As to the general
constraint I have mentioned, it should be noted that it is not exclusive to Old English or to
Middle English, just as the normal propositional position in cases like person with whom
he could love as against person he could live with are not exclusive to the Modern period
either (although in the Old period there is no doubt that the normal propositional
positions in relative clauses are much less frequent). So in Middle English we cannot
effect the relative transformation with normal order except in (1) and in (3) when the non
predicate is or includes a noun. For the concept of 'alternative' cf. J. M. de la Cruz (1970:
339 - 340).

14 Cf. also the now well known 'elliptical usage' in cases like & nu fundanc [foundant]
nescce uerescan & to (Cura Past. 59, 22), Boræd here to bræd, & gewilce his, & gæ
so to mid rampam (ibid. 102, 19), etc.
these structures do not contain any object with which the particle can be related within their boundaries and that the particle represents therefore an elliptical or adverbal usage, not to mention the fact that the structures concerned do not constitute a part of any tightly knit system which can be even remotely compared to that of the infinitive and relative structures of categories 'a' and 'b' of the propositional verb. Nevertheless, the majority of the so-called elliptical usages are normally no more than the result of the omission of an anaphoric logical object. By this I mean that the proper object appears at some point in the sentence in which the verb-phrase structure is a constituent. This can be verified in the above-mentioned examples. It is clear that we have a parasitic discontinuity instead of a hypotactic continuity, but the propositional relation is no less obvious. The object the proposition refers to is implicit in the prepositional structure since it is explicit in the wider frame of the sentence. This situation represents an early exponent of the tendency of English to confer various degrees of adverbialization upon the prepositional particles, without these undergoing the full process of adverbialization (cf. de la Cruz 1970: 339–340). It could be argued that the treatment of the last two types of structures mentioned implies that I give too much emphasis to the concept of 'directional goal' whereby I distinguish an adverbial structure from a prepositional one (the goal of the former is the adverb, whereas that of the latter is the object of the preposition). In principle, the concept of directional goal must be supported by formal analysis. Cf. the evidence in German of the verb sprechen with the particle zu (a) as preposition and (b) as adverb. It must be said, however, that in English, formal analysis and directional goal usually agree. On the other hand, given the fact that anaphoric positions are normal in the Old period, it is difficult to assign an exclusively adverbial role to to in where, which is, for instance. In the great majority of cases, there is no doubt that our pattern A can be isolated not only from the prefixal P–V structures but also from the prepositional PV structures.

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

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

heo wolde pet derf. faludelic folien (Anc. RWIe 46, 18) — context Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (9) — and so siste resoun is, houe ye habbel y-em world i flower. familliain. pet is, some benne prose mid ye rower we (ibid. 74, 33) — context Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (14) — it is logical that we should have a certain 'lingering on' of patterns A with infinitives and participles, relics to a greater or lesser extent, of the previous situation. It should be noted, however, that these patterns do not necessarily appear in an absolutely final position, even when they follow the verb they complement. Cf. kunwed be come amonrith, reme hire, hire eiron, friat of p的价值 schul-de word bringen hire cuke bridges (Anc. RWi 28, 35) — confinence of contexts Σ — (Σ)_{1b} (8) and Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (9) where the subordination does not alter the order V_{ax} — V_{y}, and Uor alle p be soul. p heed forfaren the bileue of p be your gospelles p beheld al cristen men up erednhall (ibid. 13, 7) — confinence of contexts Σ — (Σ)_{1b} (8) and Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (14) — where the subordination does not alter the order V_{ax} — V_{y} either. This structure also exhibits an extreme tendency towards the fossilization (PV) already from the Old period onwards. The context Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (with or without confinence of Σ — (Σ)_{1b}) in general leaves a trace which is also perceived in later works: (prose) pet wert wel, dowdly, pat pe Dowyl hath no charite, for he is ful wroth with pe de be myght ou hasten pe (Kempe 158, 7), Wiht dat sir Hagymode cum ou sterie wiht his heile all body and sin strete unto sir Launcelot (Arthur 276, 28), And pan our Lord yeide to Mary Mauodeln, "Go telle my bretheren & petry pat I am vre-prone" (Kempe 107, 27) (prose) And you cou alle fo dere est dryf! And fro pat sworlyng at ofr depes (Pearl 777), Ye ben unbridled with comitie ye come not out crepe, / So horda hath awarcse haspide vou togider! (Piers L 170), He wande mid his crucche us adum frouche (Log 2007), Thanne, whone thou gost thy body fro, / Fre in the eir thou shalt up go (Rooke 6552), Ne thou men skode smygent of hire hod, / She korne the notes a word wright ou breynge (Troilus III, 688), I can my hand unche and koup out the skals (Town, Plays X, 409). We also have a certain 'lingering on' in the context Σ — (Σ)_{2b} (15) above all with participles: (prose), bigynned anow veni creator... mid up wwe heweien and (town) hondem (Anc. RWIe 6, 34) (verse), heo biheold upward, / ed wwe heweien hearte (St. Katherine 2372).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

What I have said in the previous section (a) also applies to the context Σ — (Σ)_{1b} (8). The Old English tendency to relegate the verb to the end of the phrase in subordinate clauses is still manifested at times in Middle English, particularly in the earlier texts: Bide se sumne time ofer bi wove, fonde, ge-

\[13\] Cf. the result of participial fossilization in Modern English.

\[14\] Cf. Lord, what tor ar weyl? that have ar fist/for they wight fayl/theym to done caste (Town, Plays XII, 1).
der in owre hearte alle sike, alle soure p wo, poure folied (Anc. Riwle 13, 18). Needless to say, the possible confluence $\Sigma - (\Sigma \alpha \beta)$ and $\Sigma - (\Sigma \epsilon \alpha)$ does not always result in the loss of the primacy of the absolutely final position for $V_s$, as I have pointed out in connection with the Old English discussion and also in the previous section (n). Only in a very reduced number of cases does the verb of the subordinate clause maintain the tendency to a final position which, in addition, is only relative in the case of the afore mentioned confluence. Cf. Vor fof ten heoten p ich brochen habbe, summe oder alle unde me self toward te... (Anc. Riwle 12, 18), as against alle kawred wel feos asample amon jet teie in proune, onthe mauche roun-srun, onme wilde ne schuidde ne mache ne batte zif hit were vorne hengen, er he heife al his rauuen fulliche ipeide (ibid. 54, 37). The fact is that in Middle English the final positions still persist in the context $\Sigma - (\Sigma \epsilon \alpha)$. This is surely the reason for the survival of pattern A in such a context: (prose) He dalf up precious periles. (That is to say, that he that hem first up dalf, he dalf up a precious peril...) (Boece L. II, M. V, 86, (verse) And blusched on pe burghc, as I forth dreawd (Pearl 980), “Beterere is that bothe bale aildom bringe, / Thame bale bale be bet, and bote never the belter” (Piers IV, 79), and many mynions moe of men and of women / That of Seth and his sistar sithhe forth come (ibid. X, 147).

We are not going to concern ourselves here with the study of the evolution of pattern A. What interests us here is the interpretation of the late evidence of such a pattern. However, now it is convenient to bear in mind that in Middle English, when pattern A gradually retreats in the circumstances which fundamentally determined its occurrence in the previous period, there are other contextual aspects of an external character which acquire a greater relevance. I refer (1) to the Latin influence which becomes much more visible, and (2) to the specifically poetical legacy of the order ‘P V’ frequently endowed with a certain archaic flavour. I have dealt elsewhere with the aspect of the Latin influence (de la Cruz 1972; 18 ff.). It involves positional calques from Latin: Now myr swas it was that thers shulen up breks the gates (Wyclif, Genesis 19, 9) - referering - ppe leke he oppygat and up grofe it (Hampole Ps. xvii, 16) - effetit - Awti-brendar for to wende (Fights to pe landes ende) (EEF. xly, 10) - aufere - poun out-bren for doun when up-hoven were pae (ibid. lxxxvii, 15) - dejecti - adelventur - Whar-to, Lovers, awai-pattes poun bles mine (ibid. lxxxvii, 15) - repelis - As far as the poetical relevance of pattern A is concerned, it suffices to consider that those structures ‘P V’ which lie outside the scope of the contexts which we have regarded as determining pattern A (and which are not calques) are more rare in prose than in verse. It is true that in both styles an emphatic type develops which survives to the present day and which is characterized by the inversion ‘VS’ when S is not a ‘light’ pronominal subject. But, apart from this, pattern A appears more frequently in verse: Ah swa he, wibten woh, / adwesche, adun waphe / pene widwine of helle (St. Katherine 1189). Flor and frye may not be fede / per hit doun drof in molde danne (Pearl 29). Of his grate sale his blid ophout (ibid. 1137). And forth his heed and neks outfoughte (Rose 1516), "...I wolde holde hym for a man; / Now late hym come" — and he forth ran (ibid. 6059). At the moyes the heid upwes, / No never sithen slept it faste (ibid. 7129). Of course the recourse of the stylistic variation in poetical language is a factor that must be taken into consideration even in structures of the type ‘Ich’, quod fe meiden, / "sone se ich aweip / over wiltese le"... (St. Katherine 829), Forde, uu, me, mine, / ppe, acreges pin heast, / ppe bome aweip loden, / loden in wode (ibid. 2217). So shet, that I ne myught in gon (Rose 529). If, on the other hand, we consider that the persistence of contextual restriction is only relative in the prose works themselves, it will be easily understood why the material contained in the works in verse is even more doubtful as testimony of contextual restriction properly speaking, and hence the fact that I have distinguished between prose and verse in my previous evidence. In prose, those patterns A which lie outside the scope of the restrictive contexts, normally constitute the inverted order type which, as has been pointed out, crystallizes fundamentally as an emphatic variation with a non-pronominal subject. So, compared with very few cases like the other saw that and caste up hys sheldes and aiperd hys hors forwarde, but the stroke of knygh Ban dowme felde and care a castell of the skeldes (Arthur 33, 19). Tham into Trubasyn he turned when he tymed semed, and there he wynnys towery and townys full hygie, and all he waited in his warres there he awy rydys (ibid. 244, 4), the normal are strings ‘P V S nonren’: The meunwealy as thys was axleynge, in com Merlin to knygh Markes and saw all thys domynge (Arthur 72, 19), Then onto ran the Bosneys on every syde, both on horse and on foote, to many oute of number (ibid. 209, 20). So forth rode thys three knyghes and assyued in the woodis men of armys rydayng on sterre horsys (ibid. 213, 7). So with that forth gode Sir Flores, and his felighes was some redy, and so they rode thowre holys and hethis, thowre forestes and over hygie (ibid. 228, 14). In the same category we must classify the following structures despite the consecutive nexus: Than the knygh starte upo hym and rought hym a buffete and but his bolie in swund, that oute wente the gore, that the grasse and the grounde all foule was bope (ibid. 203, 15). Than were they so worthy that awye woldy they never, but ratly rushes oute their swyned... (ibid. 229, 21). Note that in this last structure the subject is pronominal.

The patterns A of Middle English must not be confused with the prefical structures either. All I have said in connection with this distinction in Old English applies also to the Middle period, both with regard to the contrast 'prefical structures / phrasal structures' and also with regard to the distinction 'adverbial structures / prepositional structures'. In Middle English (where there is a gradual loss of prefixes) the following cases must beyond any doubt be regarded as prepositional structures of category 'b': Ne no beggere ele bret that
benis in come, / But coket or clermayn, or of cleene whete (Piers VII, 287). For this Fortune that I of tolle... (Rose 5493), and there they shewed hym the letters of kynges Arturthe, and how he was the gustyest man that ever they oon loked (Arthur 191, 21). Although the prefixal claim is stronger for the Old English counterparts, there is no conclusive evidence even for this period.17 On the other hand, we do not lack the contrastive evidence of phrasal structures [in]P to ne + V both of the adverbial and prepositional types: ... down to go (Rose 6934), ... up to spone (Pearl 35), ... in to be laide (St. Cuthb. 4653), ... of of to write (Prl. of Fowls 167) (structures which will constitute our next objective), as against the prefixal order to ne + P - V in fossilized units: parum det heo wuond um der de chiere. awe worte unstergracen hire (Ane. Riwle 63, 8) p let wake ules / ne wursi nuwen ni mod / auo, iuch slukie / to ofswirn hoenrenicke (St. Katherine 2134), As Wisdom and Wyte were aboute faste / To overcome the king with cote llyf the mighte (Piers IV, 68). An interesting case is parum soon in the following example, where it appears with the prefixal order: p blake ciud also tekepe biicorame deo lece eile to ben cien, is picheu again bi pend, / worse to parum soon (Ane. Riwle 22, 6). The prepositional use of parum, which is fully attested, would require the order parum to soon in an infinitive-relative structure. As regards the distinction 'adverbial' / prepositional', it is self-evident that there is nothing to add here to what I have already said in connection with the Old period.

GROUP-PATTERN B
(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

The aspects of subcategorization of the present group-pattern, as well as one of the other aspects that interest us here, lie in the common determining factor of our previous pattern: the relegation of the verb to a final position (conditioned by the contextual circumstances exposed). That is to say, they essentially represent a complication of the same contextual circumstances by reason of additional restrictive factors which produce a sequence 'PV'. In the absence of such factors, given that the other circumstances remain constant, the most probable is that we should have an order 'PV'. The subcategorial factor par excellence is the presence of the infinitive particle to before an infinitive; less important is the existence of a string 'to' which frequently follows immediately P, and still less important, although not totally irrelevant, are the other modifiers, whether verbal or adverbial. The non-subcategorial factor which, like 'to - inflected' also operates in absolutely restrictive terms upon the contextual base of the previous pattern, is represented by the negative particle ne immediately before the verb. This I shall discuss in the appropriate place, that is, in section (b). The subcategorial interpretation is reduced to the restricting effect of to which naturally affects the contexts Σ - (Σ)_2a (10) (when we have an inflected infinitive), Σ - (Σ)_2b (11) (also when we have an inflected infinitive), and Σ - (Σ)_2c (12) (when we have an infinitive complementing a noun or when we have an inflected final infinitive). As is well known, in Old English the non-inflected infinitive could not only complement seol, will, and other v-n0, but also other verbs: me gefrahto wirtan be (Luk 1, 3) instead of ... to writem. Hence in contexts 10 and 11 we can have either a non-inflected infinitive without to, or an inflected infinitive with to. In context 15, in its final variety, we can also find other alternatives. Here we are logically concerned only with those cases in which the inflected variety appears. (See below in connection with the traces left after the struggle for survival between both infinitives.)

We must bear in mind the fact that the infinitive particle to is a modifier more intimately associated with the verb (in the infinitive) than are the locative particles, for the simple reason that to is an integral constituent of the so-called inflected infinitive. According to this, the priority of its front-position with respect to the verb will be easily understood. In this way, the locative particles are left second from the front when the verb would normally immediately precede an inflected infinitive. This reminds us of the frequent mechanism in cases of conjunction Σ - (Σ)_2a and Σ - (Σ)_1 in which the absolutely final position could be assumed by the non-final form (V) immediately or almost immediately preceded by the infinitive or particle (V). The only remark to be made here is that in the present case the restriction is absolute. This amounts to the cut and dried distinction 'phrasal structure/prefixal structure' to which I have already referred: the infinitive particle to immediately precedes the verbal constituent, whether simplex or compounded of 'prefix + stem', but it does not precede the phrasal structure 'PV' (including the prepositional structures of the same form). The structure [PV] is broken both in the adverbial and in the prepositional structures when to is introduced into the only slot available. What is never broken, in Old English at least, is the unit 'to - inflected infinitive:

17 Note that a structure of the type ... ge-mol to in-ges'ampe file sin gefylid haus min (Luk 14, 23 - Lindseyarn.) must in theory be regarded as prefixal by reason of the position of to, as against ... gion in to ges'ampe (ibid. - Rushworth.), but of course the 'to P-V' structure may also be interpreted as an extreme case of Latin 'calque'. Similar is the case with ge in ne chton, ge forhledun fet te in-codon (ibid. 11, 32 - Corpus), ge in in-codon te in-codon (ibid. - Lindseyarn.), he i ginnin forbon... (ibid. - Rushworth.). Cf. also ... ne son as of-does hine doese symbles (ibid. 14, 5 - Lindseyarn.), ne son as of-does hine doese symbles (ibid. - Rushworth.), truns lastin Z. extrakt.

18 Cf. the case mentioned below: ... ne onchug de ate ford to breognane... with othagian.
The occurrence of other modifiers between P and V can be due to a similar attraction. In the case of generic locative modifiers or temporal modifiers we undoubtedly have a parallel complementation. Cf. Sono swa e hit gedwreng hafst, swa ora no kate ethe, hwe e vort den untrumasse vetumad wass, hwee nggorendi dhi his hafst, ut fannan evod (Boethius 389, 3). In dagnage he et acetode, semmings heh asat (ibid. 422, 28). Nahe is eiria feoda | frionda on fofar. Ac he for hevomin | gacum of worulde dreamum (Dream of the Rood 131), Gesedh dhi be werte, et de worma fela | gom-oyestum god, guda godiga, | hilde-hlemma, fonna kiten feth, | stoform eit lmen-bogen, stream ut fomar | breac of boerge (Boow. 2542). Da hit ou agame evod, da yrede Cain wi dhi broder Abel, ytost his (Ælfric, Genesis 4, 8). A rapprochement "verbal modifier + discontinuous verb" can be seen in strings of the type 'V{	extasciitilde}wV{	extasciitilde}wV'.

(b) Other contextual aspects.

There is a context where the restriction is absolute. This is context Σ (6b) where the judgement involves negation which is formally expressed by means of the particle ne. The close connection between this particle and the verb it modifies frequently results in cases of agglutination as is well known: nabban, narom, nodle, etc. The same happens in other circumstances: ne+a+ne, ne+ami we neam. Independently of the reinforcement of the negation (two negations far from cancelling each other out; they do in fact reinforce each other) the particle ne, when it appears, inevitably precedes the verb. In such an event this is what conditions the existence of pattern B when all circumstances but this would determine that P appears immediately before the verb as in the previous pattern. P then cedes the order of priority of front-position to ne. The case is similar to that of the infinitive particle to. A space is opened.
between P and V as the only possible slot for ne: We men wexen for pam pe se aethidum pes meghyls cage ge in ne codun, ge for buodon pa pe in-codun (Luke 11, 52), for man flood on wacum pa de on itude synt, nyder na asidg pa de on hore middle synt (ibid. 21, 21), blod ut ne com, i heofor of ne hie, pa bec mæc hoard bite / altec style (Riddle 93, 16). Ac des xis man adnese, for da bet ne wacum swelge sealm ford ne bring(0), as suna on da ywyrman abstered da medda (Cura Past. 341, 22). Oft cac da suicide swilgan, doone his monige wacum galehals innan hæbbad, doone teared him to by manan wacum innan, gil hi ut ne spreadd (ibid. 273, 17), Forda gearse de larowe dat he unwerar ford de rose on da spreadd (ibid. 98, 8), wælec p, gehilded com ge in ne gmon on costune (Mathew 26, 41). It should be noted that in cases of precedence, such as the existence of the context $\Sigma (5b)+\Sigma (6b)$, the priority corresponds to ne: Ari, gong to cirraces to hes healden Unwelles here, site har, stille suna, gesed fort pa ut famon ne gonge, we see aeth from pe gewilien et (Bedae 186, 26). The immediate precedence of ne acting as a wedge between P and V has a counterpart in the prepositional structures: hi comon to him, be hoefdon hinter. P be him from ne gewil (Luke 4, 42). For pam sint das scofalta pas sceupanig pa da unstyriandan hi ne alleben offer da styriandan, ne him wi ne wumnan, ne da styriandan offer pa men, pa ne men offer pa englas, pa na englas with God (Boethius 140, 10), feot his he Sicilien ne to tigen (Orosius 180, 12).

What we have seen up till now is more than a replica of pattern A, except that it has been subjected to the restriction I have mentioned, whereby the structure acquires a discontinuous form and the particle achieves greater prominence. So, in a case like God man of godum gold-borde hys heorsoon, god forð-bríng, iefel man of yfelum gold-borde yfel forð-bríng (Luke 8, 45), we have a mere counterpart (non-restricted) of our previous examples: forð to breonam mea ecornan (Cura Past. 341, 17) and ... forð ne bring (ibid. 341, 22). Nevertheless, in addition to the subgroups B2 and B3, B4, I must mention subgroup B1. This type also serves the purpose of giving prominence to P, constituting a powerful resource for stylistic emphasis, with a pronominal subject which appears between the two basic constituents of the "discontinuous structure": da ut he gan wolde, da cewd he jast gænedlice word fora freftrea: Trumhe fee brace, wel (Bedae 396, 29) (see below in Middle English).

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

As in the case of the previous pattern, the aspects of subcategorization are here essentially the same as in the Old period. But I must make the following remark: the structures occur in direct proportion to the preservation of the Old English verb-position which defines pattern A, of which B is a variation by reason of an additional factor. To this must be added that the persistence of our group-pattern in Middle English mainly happens in poetry, in particular as far as the restriction of the infinitive particle to is concerned. This must be interpreted not only as a mere perpetuation with archaic flavour but also as a highly stylistic resource. Cf. the following cases of B2 in Chaucer's poetry:

- (context $\Sigma (11)$) And for to maken hym down to go, / With trouson we wolde hym defame (Rose 6534). I rede te Love away to dryye, / That nothlich te rede ne of thi lyne (ibid. 3295). That ethyl folk, in many gise, / To take and yves right nought agree, / And yret grezors up to beynge (ibid. 182), Thanne shal Deitl and Wel-Heldeynge / Ponde Shamo adown to byngane (ibid. 5587)
- (context $\Sigma (15)$) A swete perell, in to droun, / An hezy birthen, lyght to hire; / A selked weare, away to were (ibid. 4710). That noth moht hardly be ne hold, / Were he yong or were he old, / Agyen hir willy away to hire / Botouns ne roses that there were (ibid. 3061), Wherefore to the bestter is / From these folk away to fare (ibid. 5266).

The same applies to prepositional structures which are comparable from the point of view of their positional order, both of category 'a' and of category 'b': (a) To the chymnysse forth he golth / And caute a bjorne him to smyte (Sowd. of Bah. 2009). [For, his god were decid.] / Some worthy place in to be made / His course he wolde hole pursualwe, / And to us som hostell (St. Cuthb. 4653), (b) And if thon haddest songaing for tendum, / I shall the sheew matter of to wryde (Varl. of Fowls 167), A swete perell, in to droun (Rose 4708).

I have already pointed out that in the Old period, except in the context $\Sigma (4)$ (non-final), the infinitive may be non-inflected without to or infused with to. The latter has been gaining ground and in contemporary English there is only a reduced group of verbs that have preserved the infinitive function without to, apart from the auxiliaries and modal auxiliaries: bid, see, hear, feel, make, etc. Note the use of simple infinitives normalized without to in Middle English: Reden bin, cewad bin is of such religions, of sfrich ordre, of god, also strangest (Anon. Rawle 2, 16). Eow, iemon swylche, eowum ham, helpan mid folc of holte borg / for til religion he wel wint came (ibid. 4, 27). Cf. also the constructions of the type I list not propyly (Wint. Tace IV, 1, 25) beside I would no more/betere this wooden elowen than to sufere/The flash-fly blow my mouth (Tempest III, 1, 62), in the Modern period. As can be seen, the 'to' infinitive came to be used for something even after the modal and other auxiliaries.

Semipositional in the sense that we have an elliptical from.

It should be observed that grammatically we have a subject-infinitive but, notionally, this infinitive complements to the better i.e. Cf. the case of onhynan mentioned above.

It should be noted that the impossibility of splitting the infinitive unit (to-infinitive) during the Old and early Middle periods gives way already in the 14th century in constructions of 'to' infinitive modified by adverbs of mood to be brought to leave upper to longe lye or to longe sitt (Geaves 33, 87). This is precisely the so-called 'split infinitive' which has attracted so much attention since last century. In the 14th century our pattern was already being relegated except in emphatic positions.
The examination of the subgroups B with object (J-): B3, B4, (J-): B5, B5', confirms in the Middle period what I have said with reference to the Old period: the strings -J, especially 'J', are frequent, but the strings -I are not. Except for very frequent cases such as Thanke tok I with myn hondis twaie | The aros, and ful fast it plights (Rose 1744) where we have an object -J (B4), the structures B5' y abound. And ethir of hem gate their sweardis in their hondis, and ute at the pasyoun dome were the knyght of the knyghtes, and sir Launcelot folowed hym (Arthur 259, 34), He straithe up to his are drouthe | The same bone, that was so tough (Rose 1725), His heir down to his helis wente (ibid. 1218). Cf. also the sequence 'ut of' in he was on haldene grove, ut of Saxon's issues (Lag. 1099).

As in the Old period, in Middle English there are other modifiers than can appear between P and V: (non-verbal) Lef brother, say not so, bot let vs fairth together go (Town. Plays II, 130). And toward God have no memorie, But forth as approcites trace, / And to her soules desti purchase (Rose 5732), (verbal) Whiches causen his to mourne in wo | That Yttele hath his bigged so, / Which sederly awey is hasted (Rose 5007). Whall ye goe no further, mors! / Wart let me so how down will draw (Town. Plays II, 28), Thisse thones and lotyn / done gar fall full stout, / Both holles and bowers / Castles and towres (ibid. III, 347).

Both types of modifiers can of course appear in mixed patterns, co-existing with other intervening elements. Cf. he is of de briddes det are lourd spoyled of; de mid hore fustes he holde no-at advanowder ess seo do de weves. det berd falses ancre. ah habbe sp up an heith use briddes of houene iost hore nest (Ance. 57, 18) -B3+B2. That thou awey ne shol not wynde (Rose 2056) -B2 (non-verbal, gram.) +B2 (verbal), yaru wes hes ferde, and for he was gun veno, / Swa longe pat heo comen per laiuen Brutes on (Lag. 940) -B1+B2.

(b) Other contextual aspects.

As in Old English, the context Σ (6b) implies strict restriction with regard to the only possible position of particle ne as the immediate modifier of the verb, whereby the order 'P V' is split in order to allow ne in. The normal expression of negation by means of the particle not (OE. næwht, MB. nought, etc.) and the auxiliary do (like the use of the latter in direct questions), is not properly established until well into the Modern period after a process of effacement in which these new procedures struggle, without order or regularity of any kind, to crystallize and establish themselves. There is also the post-verbal negation with not (see below the inverted order in group-pattern D) which is not only used on its own, but also as reinforcement of the pre-verbal negation with ne, as can be seen in For theo the soare I whole now bynde | That thou away ne shal not wynde (Rose 2055). This reinforcement is very marked during the period that precedes the crystallization of the negation with do. The fact is that as long as the tenosity to the front-position of P with respect to V persists, because of the circumstances I have been discussing, the normal negation in Middle English will produce our pattern B2: So somly a maue motly fuly not, / But semyngynd o speyce vp ne sponne | Of bat precies perle wohuton spotte (Pearl 84).

As I have already said, this pattern does eventually constitute a powerful stylistic tool when the intervening element is a pronounal subject. The evidence afforded by Middle English is abundant: Be forde ful erly vp he ros | To hyre warkmen to bys synne (Pearl 506), And up I ros, and gan me clothe. / Ancon I wish myn hondis bothe (Rose 95), Unto the welle thane wente I me, / And down I louete for to see | The cleris wyter in the storm (ibid. 1553), But up it stert, and armed toke / Ayens this fesky horrible boke (ibid. 7131), And thon sir Launcelot ocked at the gate with the posnel of his awarde; and that with come his ost, and in they entyrde, he and sir Kay (Arthur 274, 15), And therewith away skir Bewavernes, and up we lepte lyghtly and save where the blok knyght rode his way wyth the durnor (ibid. 328, 30), So forth they wered with the kynge, the knyghtes of the Round Table (ibid. 221, 19), 19 and forth they flungred a faste tro(t)ie and the folke of the bestes dryngs (ibid. 236, 6), And than sir Phelot layenished at hym egerly to have slaym hym, but sir Launcelot put away the stroke with the rough spigg, and therewith toke hym on the hede, that downe he fell in a soughe to the grounde (ibid. 253, 33), Hir tresesse yelow, and longe strowghten, / Unto knir helpe down they raughten (Rose 2021), To the chymnye forth he goth (Sowd. of Bab. 2009), A spere nedle forth drouthe | Out of an aguler qeysent yngroth (Rose 97). As can be seen, the intervening pronounal subject frequently has an anaphoric or anticipatory value with respect to the nominal subject.

**PATTERN C**

(OE.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

Here we have the properly unmarked pattern as against pattern A and the group-pattern B and D. Pattern C is the specifically neutral pattern with no reason for its existence other than the fact that it constitutes the normal order as long as this is not prevented by the specific circumstances determining the other patterns. In Old and early Middle English, the factors which are negative to A and B define C. At all periods of the language (with only very limited and specific deviations) we have an important factor which, when negative to D, defines C: the presence of a pronounal object which in normal order assumes an
interposing position between V and P, so defining the group-pattern D as against our pattern C. In Old English, where all the determining factors of patterns A and B are fully operative, we observe that pattern C does not occur in the contexts Σ (1), Σ (2), Σ (2b), Σ (11), Σ (12), Σ (13), Σ (14), Σ (15). In our corpus, of those contexts containing a nonfinite verbal form complementing a finite one, it is only in the following that pattern C occurs: Σ (11), Σ (12), Σ (13), Σ (14), Σ (15). In the case of patterns A and B we saw a certain amount of evidence in Middle English, although their diminished frequency indicated to us the competence of alternative structures. However, the Old English evidence of pattern C is very rare in contexts in which it is firmly established in Middle English. The frequent lack of patterns C and D in Old English and of patterns A and B in Middle English is self-evident in certain contexts. If we examine the various contextual frames, we find that in Σ (1) we do not have C nor D in the Old period, nor B in the Middle period, but we do have C in the Middle period; in Σ (2b) we do not find B in the Old and Middle periods, nor A in the Middle period, but we find C in the Middle period; in Σ (11), Σ (12), Σ (13), Σ (14) we do not find C nor D in the Old period but at least in Σ (11), Σ (12), Σ (13), Σ (14) we find C in the Middle period; in Σ (15) we do not find B, C, nor D in the Old period, but we do find C in the Middle period (see below). Where both Old English and Middle English agree is in the nonexistence of the sequence V O P O when O is pronominal. The post-position of the object (whether immediately after P or with one or more elements between it and P) can only occur when the object is non-pronominal: De sceolde se ealdor man lip in feale, ac he teah ford fa his ealdor wormen (O. E. Chron. a. 1003, E., 15, 10). In Old English there are other alternatives (in the case of a pronominal object) in addition to V O P, namely, pattern A and group-pattern B (see above). In Middle English, notwithstanding the relics of the order P (i) V it is the alternative V O P that firmly establishes itself. Let me add here that the existence of a preceding object is evidently a contributory factor to the configuration of pattern C: Tóddilæ æsæþætan we lættat ut of wum eages, ðonne we for syndrecelæ agynæ, syndercelæ hæceswægan doð (Cura Past. 413, 27). In Middle English we have other factors which decisively contribute to the configuration of this pattern (see below).

Needless to say, the prepositional structures 'V P O præ' (with normal order) such as feoh æd ða de wið mi feohæd (Paris Ps. 34, 1), and æc aciidæ de

frinende after his friend (Orosius 166, 12), must not be confused with our pattern C. Nor must we confuse with our pattern C cases such as se heor þæt heofon (O. E. Chron. a. 1016, E., 151, 1). 27

(b) Other contextual aspects.

As with subcategorization, the other contextual aspects do not determine the configuration of pattern C either. At most they could only define pattern C negatively. There is no verifiable correlation between pattern C and the contexts Σ (8b) and Σ (8a) in we geven on heo heorte wr (Veap. Ps. 43, 10) and Gā geond ðæs wēgas... wyd hig þæt hig ginn in. p min hau st gefilléf (Luke 14, 22), for instance, though we should never lose sight of the possibility of additional factors. Cf. a context Σ (9a) with the string 'J' at the beginning of the sentence and with a long subject: On pæsum ælænde com æpp se Godes horæ Agustinus... his gefera (Bede 58, 1).

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

In the Middle period pattern C continues to be an essentially neutral pattern. The only difference is that this pattern is gaining ground all the time. Its extension to areas previously dominated by the patterns of the order P (i) V is fully documented in our data, but the majority of the subcategorisation points do not show any of the peculiarities which are proper to pattern A and to group-pattern B. Cf. the context Σ (1) which implies Σ (8a) (14) —see below (passive); Σ (8a) (9) —nullish nolde longe ridon... aeh ich helle wonden anon over awi... nede hou swi he sei wenden over (Ane. Riwle 119, 14). The sterven... ne neowes yesten adown no lyght (Boose L. I. M. 7, 1), for I zal takum a-vew fro ðe ðrymg (Kerne 155, 29); —Σ (8a) (10) —And therfore I... desired to potten forth in excusacion... (Boose L. I. Pr. 4, 39), I trove than seken... drym weaven mide... (ibid. L. II. Pr. 5, 11); Σ (8a) (11) —Seign John volde a dam hym conum in (Kerne 195, 27), Than Beverynes... the Rede Knight to stande up (Arthur 310, 9); —Σ (8a) (14) —Sithow, when his creatur was conum of be Mount... (Kempe 74, 33) ... your elders coneyd to han don awaye that dignifi for the pride of the conselors (Boose L. II. Pr. 6, 13)...

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

27 Cf. note 20.
venture of swiche conjunction may sterne som fair speare of soth! (Boece L. III, Pr. 12, 137). Nevertheless, we observe a very marked preponderance of sequences 'V P+J' as opposed to the order 'J+V P'. What undoubtedly contributes to the configuration of our pattern C in Middle English is the heading of the sentence not by a string 'J' but by a simple indefinite adverbial modifier with the post-position of a non-pronominal subject (post-position with respect to the phrasal unit should be understood). In contrast to And ye look well above / wither more nor mern / So goe youre weytys owte / exyn as He com In (Town. Plays XII, 172), the normal is that the pattern D be reserved for the structures with a (light) pronominal subject, and our pattern C for those containing a non-pronominal subject: *nu camed for a fele met.* bal hit him. *[Sword] hekhleche giȝ hauȝ ete wiðne hode, one loke[ne] cope. *wode iseon guage aencer (Anc. Riwele 24, 17), then com forth dame Lyconn arynyle yke a prynce, and there she made hym passyng good chere, and hit aayne (Arthur 331, 16). And than there lepe ouste many knyghtes ouste of their tentes and p[at]lywnes, and they within the castell lokct ovir the wallys and ouste at wyrdwynd (ibid. 321, 10). And than com in sir Palomydes ouste of the castell; and there encoutryd with hym sir Gauwayne (ibid. 346, 9).

Other contributory factors to pattern C in this period are the following: (1) absence of an object, (2) existence of a preceding object, (3) existence of a long object even though not preceding, (4) the passive. There is naturally no direct object with intransitive verbs. Cf. Fals and Favel forth with to digere, I and Mede in the myddis, and at the meyn eye (Piers II, 145), To yelde theo so reddy, I And lo of is grete mystra (Rose 2293), Io forth, greyn-horse! and ouste ouste, gyms! (Town. Plays II, 25). For, when *he ale was as fayr stondynge under berm as any man myght se, sodenly he bended wolde fallow down fer alle. *he ale was lost every bregynng after o fer (Kempe 9, 35). And then they frysted forth all at ony, of the bowercest knyghtes that ever brake (Arthur 214, 33). And to com offf and to bryf the talle, whan she com to knypp Arthur she was nobly resseyved (ibid. 341, 26). The existence of a preceding object is illustrated in cases like *he det his wepnen worped awel!* his haste been inwund (Anc. Riwele 107, 24). The whiche famyleres, certes, the real pover of kynges, in houes etal and in estat alated, ful ofte throweth adown (Boece L. III, Pr. 8, 44), and so Ulphes and Brastast other two smote downe (Arthur 21, 12), he iseth he uole de grime wrystlare of halle breid up on his haise (Anc. Riwele 125, 36). (See below in section (b) in connection with the relative clauses). The existence of a non-preceding long object may also determine a rapprochement 'V P', on being excluded from the phrasal unit proper, that is, the frame 'V (...) P': Hid up of hir hird hwch as he wolle, *wonde hire fiderward* (St. Katherine 156). And bringen forth bestes that bastardis ben holden (Piers VIII, 74), and as of it wolle the ches out thynge that to ben contrarie (Boece L. II, Pr. 6, 100), ... and saven that they scholde spoten adown the fillines of hir vices by the tormentes of peynes (Boece L. IV, Pr. 4, 277), ase wynne but gene evrey soych good as fer was (Kempe 8, 32), ... he put of his horse bredylly and his wedylly (Arthur 2425, 18). The passive does not only rule out the order 'P V' of the Old period, but also the order 'V / P' with an intervening object (D3 and D4). For this reason, the cases of pattern C which are due to the passive are numerous: *his bode gode wordes. det euerich ildel word bid der ibruth forð* (Anc. Riwele 64, 6), ... and doon your name for to be born forth? (Boece L. II, Pr. 7, 44), When it commys on assay / is keste doune wyde (Town. Plays XII, 172). As his name is now, it xal ben throughdown & pin schal ben regesed up (Kempe 156, 19), for all his oste was borne up by his handes (Arthur 77, 12). It must be borne in mind, that the passive does not rule out the order 'V / P'. Cf. bute giȝ de o fre holden hire! heo bid hekst some adown (Anc. Riwele 101, 28).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

The context that concerns us here is $\Sigma - (\Sigma_r)$ (8). Evidently, in the subordinate clause there is less and less tendency towards the relegation of the verb to the end of the phrase and the subsequently typical (though not exclusive) configuration 'P V'. Cf. heo is biloced bi peo p unwarid jonpe put. *he put is hire veire emple, hire haste swore, hire bifi sier. hire hond giȝ hauȝ forð in his eishhode (Anc. Riwele 225, 12), A soyr gest, in gode fuy! / Thou herberdeast then in thy innbrokenn / The God of long wanne thou lett inn! (Rose 5106) — note in these two examples the precedence of an object — And durst at no time to say: Somehyn, er thou com aways (ibid. 2405). So goe youre weytys owte / exyn as He com In (Town. Plays XII, 173), For giȝ that thei myghten written away in other menere than ben purveyed, thanne we skolden thee be no stedfast prescience of thing to come (Boece L. V, Pr. 5, 19), And when Gryffout saw rescous he smote a knight on the tempillks, that hede and helme wente of to the ercke (Arthur 20, 1), and than he smote sir Gahalantyn in the helme, that his nose, eys and mouth braste owte on bloode (ibid. 263, 10), I pe messe hoon, pe prest haf typpe gode lokes siȝetȝe peo wes stondynke (Anc. Riwele 13, 33). In the following cases we can see a confluence of the contexts $\Sigma (1), \Sigma - (\Sigma_r)$ (14) and $\Sigma - (\Sigma_r)$ (8), that is, we have passive structures in subordinate clauses: *his bode gode wordes. det euerich ildel word bid der ibruth forð*, *ideles pouhtes det neren er ibrube (Anc. Riwele 64, 6), so that, after that the dernesese of deceweynge dezegrymes is downe away, than noe man knowe the schymynge of evry light (Boece L. II, Pr. 6, 100). For the matters of it is swich, that when o dout is determined and bet away, ther waxen other doutes without nombre (ibid. L. IV, Pr. 6, 10), *Doutyr, it is mor plesynge me to me but pu suffer despitys & scorwyny... than giȝ bid hekst some adown the...*
tymes on fe day every day in sevyn yer” (Kempe 131, 16), hurh schenluc, hurh sauwres pres bi de hoom alle de lea-ues schulen been tourvured, al fer ful Recovered him, wringed ut biworen al de wide wold de corwe were, hurh saue wore (Ance. Riwe 148, 20). And so they fell out at that tyne, that it was put of tyll Cundelmas (Arthur 15, 25), ase he reche seide, hervId god so ich de yf hi were ut of mine bosome i upperd, ut draven worde al min hope we are etolepen (Ance. Riwe 65, 30). But the soules of men moten rode be myre fre whan... and yet lasse fre when the ben gobrid topidre and comprehended in erhli membres (Boece L V, Pr. 2, 29).

There are, however, subordinate clauses which, in addition to illustrating the new order ‘V P’ as against ‘P V’, rule out the possibility of pattern D—V /P—, subgroups D3 and D4. I refer to the transitive relative clauses introduced by the direct object followed by the relative.12 There we have a preceding objeclive

The frust that bringh forth arm ye for mense woldes (Town. Plays X, 186), Thun lyme Perrian armed hyns and mounted upon hys horse, and rode more than a pace after the lady that the knycht layd away (Arthur 113, 36), ... at krokes worde, and abasions schene wite. Jet eac ofte ase eacseide him. me solde his euesunge doo her pet me ker of! nor two hundred sicles of sole-wor (Ance. Riwe 182, 1). ... the deambore wynde, bryngeth agyen in the first somer seasson the leene that the wynde that lyghtes Boreas keth rest awa in autumne (Boece L I, M, V, 22), That ar so long toryng / the foules that we / Cast out in the mornynge (Town. Plays III, 497). In a case like The yarde of a tree, that is baeld adown by myghty strengthe, boreneth rid the cop adown (Boece L III, M, II, 32) we obviously have a ‘passive+relative’ confluence; both the passive and the relative features contributute to the configuration of our pattern. It should be noted that the relative structures ‘O+relativate (−S)+V’ in which O is the direct object of V, which is obligatorily preceded by O, must not be confused with other relative structures such as be p swouch fulche speteth ut in eai on creare, me schulde draten his mud, nowt mid scherne wordes, auk mid herde fustes (Ance. Riwe 38, 29), which could have the object in a post-verbal position: speteth O ut instead of speteth at O. We might mention another type of relative which, although outside the scope of the above frame, nonetheless implies the precedence of the object which is preceded this time by the relative: at be it so that, certes, thilke writynges profeten ilde, the whiche writynges long and dirk eside doth awa, bothe hem and eth haer auctura (Boece L III. Pr. 7, 87).

We see the same order ‘VP’ in propositinal structures of category ‘b’ not only in ordinary clauses but also in (1) relative clauses: be appel p ich laken or is forbade me to etene, nowt forto bihol-den (Ance. Riwe 23, 16), he bove nu be frew wittes p ich habbe ispeken of (ibid. 45, 28), lune is he chaunberleve, his kunseler, his spesel p eth he ne mei gent helien wul (ibid. 187, 5); (2) infinit-

12 Note that this relative is optional in Modern English as against the relative of the intraactive structures: the workers that come out.

ive clauses (to all effects equivalent to the relative-ininfinntive structures except when between O and to we have either (a) ‘copula+predicate’ or (b) ‘for’ (+O -another object’): for swetter place / To plenye yve he may not fynde, / Although he sought on in-yyl Ynde (Rosc 622) as against (a) And for to passe the tyme this book shall be pleasant to rede in, but to gyve fyth and bylens that al is trewe that is conteyned herin, ye be at your lyberty (Arthur Preface cxv, 8), and as against (b) and, when thene was born, shë ordered bedding for owey Lady to lig in myth herl blyssed Sonne (Kempe 19, 18). Also his company which had putt fe foresayd creator fro her tybyl fat sche asilde no lenger etyn a menny hem ordered a schip for hem-self to saylyn in (ibid. 68, 19), And also pu hast thouf fat pu woldes, yff p haddist had good a-nay, a made many abbes for mye lote for religios men & women to dvellyn in (ibid. 203, 29); (3) ordinary passive clauses (a new development from Middle English onwards): Fild his legges al nakid & floed al so bi her fi. / fat sche was slyen bi (Arth. & Merlin 850). Lift vp thine eyenz into the high places and see where thou hast not bene lien with (Jeremiah 3, 2). Needless to say, the preposition structures of category ‘a’ also exhibit the order ‘VP’ in relative clauses introduced by the direct object (not when they are introduced y the object of the proposition), as well as in ordinary passive clauses. Let me mention, however, the order ‘VP’ in the passive-infinitive clauses of category ‘a’: ... & how over Lord yff hi contryncyn & compuncyyn myth gret plente of teorys, & how sche desiered to be housed every Sunday yff yf myth & sche had no presto to schryven in (Kempe 80, 33), & sche had no bide to lyn in ne no clothys to be cured wyth yff hi oys mensly. & fan was sche fat of vormyn & suffedyd gret poyyn Jeremey (ibid. 85, 37). Or, also a relative of the typo also ase are nat bereid wul also are bates bereid we oft to pinge let us last ever (Ance. Riwe 133, 13).

I shall finally add that this same order naturally appears in structures whose particles are a prepositional development of adverbs (during the Middle period): Pysst in perle, bat precios poce) On wyf yer half water com down fe echore (Pearl 299). But anne Geteleke, a good man of arnyse, for Chastelake the chylde he chongyd his mede, that the wete watir wents downe his chylys (Arthur 230, 21), fan sche preyst to our Lord fat hi husband myth leyn a yer & sche to be delivryd out slundayr yff it wer hyos pleasuns (Kempe 180, 17), etc.

GROUP—PATTERN D

(OR.)

(a) Subcategorial analysis.

As I have already pointed out, this group-pattern is characterized, like the previous pattern, by its marked absence in Old English when V is a finite form. The evidence of our corpus pertaining to that period does not
exhibit it in the contexts: Σ (1), Σ-(Σε), Σ-(Σε)- (10), Σ-(Σε)- (11), Σ-(Σε)- (12), Σ-(Σε)- (13), Σ-(Σε)- (14), Σ-(Σε)- (15), all of which, except no. 13 are perfectly well established in Middle English. We have, however, a well-defined restriction already in the Old period when in the normal order (S+V+...) there exists a pronoun object. Should such an order be required, the pronoun object must occupy an intervening position between V and P, its post-position with respect to the particle being avoided. This is the context Σ (2) with O_pron. This object can be (a) non-reflexive and (b) reflexive: (a) Se cyngu do wellece ne mibile orserfian his dohac toors, on arde sce his hip up and hode to wards... (Apollonius 34, 20), (b) On after pon he hine geared midlic mediciple, da aofe hine up, organe wegg gan (Bede 320, 8). Of course the non-pronominal objects may also assume an intervening position: cf., warp inne anfle ut, nym inne westan fæc, hæt nu p ge-opena fen ist anfle wegg on him (Math. 17, 27) as against Se forset ut dat watter, se his hægan sammene on ungumnu woldum last tofwanan (Cura Past. 279, 13). What is not normal is the order "V P O_pron." It is quite a different thing when we have two objects, one non-pronominal and the other pronoun (normally a dative of interest) in which case we can indeed have at least one order O_pron. (...) V O_pron. P:... et p hæm mon eohy pa handa of, pa pet hæfdom (Orosius 169, 4).

We have another context which, while not defining group-pattern D, at least contributes in some measure to its configuration. I refer to the context Σ (6b). The adverb pæ, above all, frequently introduces the subgroup D1, that is, structures with inverted order: pa eoden hig ut p hig gesacan p dar gesecen wæs (Lute 8, 36), pa eow ut se dag fæg (ibid. 9, 12), pa eode his fader ut, organe hine bidden (ibid. 15, 28), Da code petres ut, bitelic ussew (ibid. 22, 63), pa se foræ stemm for hæm, pa fæ for o pur, æf se for burg ut Hwætan dene (O. E. Chron. a. 921, A. 183, 5), pa ohn he befrem, slak up on an treow. siccorum p he hine geear (Lute 19, 4). Da geofden fæt uuenæf pa gesacan, pa leode mon for summe blinde mon of Ongeoleane (O. E. Chron. a. 100, 2), pa teh heors odw forð fæppa bore, suive midlicale, na seolde to readean (ibid. 438, 23), pa teh heor forð ose ongereigistges, sa amatt micelnes, ly- thes unaoheredlic hordeane (ibid. 438, 32), Da Ceadwalla se cynging mid hæ in heast colond for, pa flugon pa eodne hefut ut ofm colonde, weron geleade in pa nehekryi, se is leopet Ethol lord (ibid. 306, 8), pa eoden hie ut to omnem meman, ut on easte heare be e micolde, pa ohn ut p gefædum, pa Cristan heafdon sege (O. E. Chron. a. 894, A. 87, 23), pa seodon heo ehte on eom ihilde at Brædan Rælice (ibid. 918, A. 98, 31), pa foran pa men ut eorene pa fer binnan weorpan (ibid. 921, A. 101, 20), Da eoden pa beowuc ut pa weoges (Math. 22, 10). The same happens with other adverbs such as domne, eor, etc.: Durem ygd Dæn ec sceawnan da ethldigian wif, domne hecse memes mid forlaat his ðegna libyngu, & sorgað ymd oðerra monna wisan... (Cura Past. 416, 19), Wh þ þon ðecan geat, þes gæt ge on ysweld geot on
ordinary structures of category 'a', resemble our group-pattern D. The ordinary relative and infinitive structures, that is, non-passive, introduced by the object of the preposition (category 'b' and the pseudo-adverbial transformation of category 'a') show, however, an order 'P (\theta) V', as we have seen when discussing pattern A and group-pattern B. In Middle English, nonetheless, the pseudo-adverbial transformation of category 'a' is relevant to the configuration of the order 'V / P' (see below).

(ME.)

(a) Subcategorial extension.

Parallel to the extension of pattern C in Middle English, the evidence of the data of our corpus fully supports the extension of pattern D in the same contexts. As in Old English, we have a defining restriction of group-pattern D in context \( \Sigma (2) \) with \( \text{O}_{\text{pre}} \), both when this pronoun object is reflexive and when it is not. This is the subgroup D4: (non-reflexive) understandeth he god wolde a su- me wise scheveun ham to men i bisse worlde bi worlíche pise \( \ldots \) worldliche wunnen, and scheveuden ham wold as ðone hit were a schadeus (Anc. Riwle 198, 3), (reflexive) \( \text{sun} \) get, ne mahte ha na mere; \( \text{h} \) dide hire adun suide, \( \ldots \) ford, witen fereacre, \( \ldots \) over fereacres (St. Katherine 2027), and so put his horse to pasture and sette hymself downe at the gate (Arthur 423, 19). As in the Old Period, we also have non-pronominal objects in an intervening position: 

\[ \text{hieron hit so bivalde} \ldots \text{et is mee neble} \ldots \text{brassernde} \ldots \text{cestes} \ldots \text{byd} \ldots \text{adun hiden heli} \ldots \text{schuld} \ldots \text{de water} \ldots \text{seri} \ldots \text{so de walle} \ldots \text{Anc. Riwle 199, 29} \]

But, whereas in Old English we can have a pronominal string \( \text{I} \) (see above: \( \text{O}_{\text{pre}} \ldots \text{O} \), in Middle English T is only constituted by non-pronominal objects, as against the group I\( \ldots \)-typical of the pronominal objects: 

\[ \text{vor hoo so is alker of] sukere \ldots \text{et him schal sommen} \ldots \text{gelt bruch up his kastel} \ldots \text{to his wi fercwines} \ldots \text{he is sume to blomen} \ldots \text{Anc. Riwle 104, 3} \]

As can be seen, from the point of view of the object, this reminds us of pattern C, subpattern D1: 

\[ \text{She, cruel Fortune, casteth adown kynges that whilom weren ygnard} \ldots \text{and seke, desere wage, enhance make the humble chere of hym that is discomfyt} \ldots \text{Boece L II, M. I. 7} \]

So that, if there is a pronominal object, such an object determines the subgroup D4, the determination of the subpattern being effected by the non-pronominal object. Note that when we have two objects, one within the frame 'V P' and another outside such a frame (subgroups D3 or D4 other than with \( \alpha \) or \( \gamma \)), the object outside the frame is normally a direct object specifierific of the one inside the frame (which is normally a pronominal object and also direct) or else a direct object in connection with an indirect object which is inside the frame (possibly pronominal). A specifierific object may follow the pronominal object if it specifies, or else it may constitute the base for an anaphoric pronoun to refer back to. So we have cases like: hot him at betterliche. ðe fule har dogge. \( \ldots \) ðe pere to him! to periche mid ða holf ðe ston (Anc. Riwle 130, 28), 'A', sayde the kyng, 'syn ye knowe of youre evil adventure, payne for hit, and put hit awa by yowre cranzite, that my roune shall wi (Arthur 125, 20), So they encountered, and sir Launcelot bare hym downe horse and man so that his sholdre wente oute of joynite (ibid. 262, 34) or like ðy nylles blak ðif ðam mainst sce (ibid. 1928), or else like: 

\[ \ldots \text{et pus to commer} \ldots \text{my husband} \ldots \text{for to it is ða ror made} \ldots \text{and} \ldots \text{þow shall have neuer ðe lesse grace, for I will þow bring me forthe} \ldots \text{Kempe 48, 30} \]

A case like 

\[ \ldots \text{et pus of ðat oust ðat} \ldots \text{hym Trywyelle, provost of the kyngis house, bothe of the wronges that he hadde byganne to doon, and eke perfected} \ldots \text{Boece L I, Fr. 4, 58} \]

is truly exceptional. Note that we have a co-ordination of two phrasal structures.

Context \( \Sigma (8b) \) is also relevant in Middle English. The indefinite adverbs of the type feome, so, nu, þus, more... þen, etc., frequently introduce the inverted order: vor gis ði eht ðam feome cigde ðeo anoninit. mesre þeo dev ðo also. þeo is betre þen ich am ã, notre betere þen ich wol (Anc. Riwle 22, 24), so duden ibes freond. þe wrenen i cumen to wronen, seten stilte alle seorinnen (ibid. 51, 21), Nu aði ze hav ðe rulve ze onere schulen holden (ibid. 2, 6), þæs codu stode ðe wæren, makede we to wæl last, ... com þe ðed þer efer! p al monken ruwell (ibid. 23, 8), More beðe ðe gode jet hæð ði chum be ði tempelt! þen beð he wæfe (ibid. 78, 52), ñ. Hence the fact that in such circumstances the phrasal structures should crystallize into subgroup D1. Cf. the following cases: ðiu ñ is sumer frystes ðe... þe ðe nealwes ðo fortu fühen hit ut, and hoon his båvings ne gei-neð nowe. þeome bringes he up sum loder word, oðer sum o ðer mûndtæne (Anc. Riwle 8, 28), þen ne were hi up ðer fayre freunde, I ðyr eynuge ðe þyl ðat ze guone (Pearl 77), Thonat solt Sleoste up, and seynide hynm faste (Piers V, 221), þan wente fyrth with wyue Lodey ð by wyth Þeop... (Kempe 18, 33), þan went pei forth to Elizbeth, Seynit John Baptysta moder (ibid. 18, 36), So drog þey fyrth with wyht glefat (Pearl 1115), Now yede þis meny thought awa (Rowe 2535), 'Now go ye forth', sayde ðe Torre, 'and God spea ye and me!' (Arthur 109, 34), Syphtyn ged echs forth to Leycestyr, & a good man also. Thomas Marchale of whome is wrynyn befor (Kempe 111, 3). In these illustrations we doubtless note a preponderance of light pronominal subjects between V and P. This intervening position, which originates our subgroup D2, can be assumed by all kinds of adverbs. In the following two cases we have, in addition, an indirect inverted order with a subject which is post-posed to

\( ** \) horse and man is equivalent to an adverbial expression.

\( *** \) Inversion is of course not exclusive to the circumstances mentioned. It also occurs with the negative particle ne, as well as in cases of simple co-ordination (cf. the penultimate example given: \( \ldots \) com þe ðed þer efer...), or in cases of mere precedence of the object: ðie maðda ðe lefðe rulve ðe rulde ð ridæ ð smada ðe heorte ðe xoinus of sumne (Anc. Riwle 2, 16).
the phrasal structure: But goth now rather awaye, ye morrowdaine, whichs that ben swete til it be at the laste (Boece L I, Pr 1, 67). Come nowe forth, therefore, the sweason of sweetes returhein (ibid. L II, Pr 1, 40). (In our corpus we can see structures of subgroup D2 with the following adverbs between V and P: *úðlicco, anon, sone, alogeteder, (ali)*, (not) so, well, yonder, (foul), (fast), ever, (clene), feor suð, tuach). Although this immediate modification of P is quite common, we also have every kind of adverb in other circumstances, that is, neither introducing an inverted order nor in an intervening position, but simply pre-posed or post-posed (whether immediately or not) to the phrasal structure. Cf. the normal order introduced by indefinite adverbs like: Than she lette the drawrygge downe (Arthur 353, 31).

(b) Other contextual aspects.

We must also examine here context Σ (6b). In Middle English we still have the particle as which, as I have pointed out, may introduce the inverted order, according to the same model I have illustrated with the adverbs *jomme*, so, etc., in the preceding section (a): Ne scene non of thet treo bet heo ne beo *stende* (Anc. Rwle 78, 22). As in the Old period, given a structure of the type *V P* and the immediate precedence of the particle ne with regard to V, the frequent existence of the inverted order will be easily understood. This accounts for the configuration of subgroup D1 in discontinuous structures. Nevertheless, negation by means of ne tends to be reinforced in Middle English through a second particle (nought - not) in post-verbal position. For this reason we often encounter mixed patterns of the type *be herne of f o caste, beo hir huse purles, ne abouthe heo nowe wi thorough* (Anc. Rwle 28, 36) -D1-D2-. *Vor ase wi twelve holden sei pinnen ou hoope... beo-ge hir nowe wi modedinde madne, ne mid gemonide bordes* (ibid. 35, 3) -D1-D2-D2-. -D4. The post-verbal negation with *not* is the one that eventually establishes itself on its own as the normal procedure with every class of verb until the 17th century crystallization of the use of *do + ne* before *V*.

It should be noted that post-verbal *not* on its own without pre-verbal *ne*, determines in normal order the existence of subgroup D2. Cf. *'Nay', its God give me blisses! Wrong wendith not so away, or I tyele more* (Piers IV, 91), where we also have a second intervening modifier. To some extent a parallel situation and development can be observed in direct interrogative structures (context Σ (7)) with or without an introductory interrogative adverb: the norm is the inverted order in a configuration D1 until the...

---

22 Cf. the propositional redundancy, at times with the occurrence of a second proposition totally different, in relative structures introduced by the proposition followed by the relative: *in what order... half bound by* to (Audelay Poems, p. 5). This redundancy can also be seen with identical or different particles in structures *VP*, whether of category *a* in the passive or of category *b* in the active: (a) from whom any of the said Goddes... were take fro (Rymer, Foeda XI, 275), in the which... was honged onde (Mandel 8, 8), (b) to witch pene I have spoke to (Bury Wills 27, 8).

24 The structures of the type & ful falyng beog age hisse temporaeg of be Desigle of thynge fat oto beo was neuor gylly in (Kempe 32, 30) are of course very different. Evidently, gylly is in part of a *be-adjunct* structure which can be discontinued, as in the present case, by the intervening presence of an adverb like *neuir*. Cf. also the type *make much of*: So anon within a whyle the kynges and the queene and all the court understood that his was sir Tresnyghte that smote downe sir Palomyke, and than was he more made of, more than he was before (Arthur 359, 9). It is obvious that this structure could not be handled as fill the glass with water, for example.
such folk was arisen. as me seide up his bende (Robert of Gloucester 362), After 
he messedes hoon. he procet sacred per wrysted al des world, per beod al his 
sbodi. per in sincerelne lane biceclapped our kefsmen (Anç Riwle 14, 31).

**TABLE OF CONTEXT-PATTERN CORRELATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A</td>
<td>1. A, (C), /C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. D (upon the base SVO)                | 2. (C) preceding object or non-preceding 
                                          | long object, D (upon the base SVO)       |
| 3. (G)                                  | 3. (C)                                  |
| 4. (G)                                  | 4. (G)                                  |
| 5a. (C)                                 | 5a. (G)                                 |
| 6a. (G)                                 | 6a. (G)                                 |
| 6b. B, D (upon the base VP)             | 6b. B, D (upon the base VP)             |
| 7. (D) (direct questions, whether non-   | 7. (D) (direct questions, whether non-  |
| negative or negative)                   | negative or negative)                   |
| 8. A                                    | 8. A, (C) (relative clauses)            |
| 10. A, B (in the case of an infinitive,  | 10. A, B (in the case of an infinitive,   |
| /C)                                     | /C)                                     |
| 11. A, B (in the case of an infinitive)  | 11. A, B (in the case of an infinitive,   |
|                                          | /C)                                     |
| 12. A                                   | 12. A                                   |
| 13. A                                   | 13. A                                   |
| 15. A (in the case of a finite form),   | 15. A (in the case of a finite form),   |
| B (in the case of an infinitive         | B (in the case of an infinitive         |
| complementing a noun or in the case of   | complementing a noun or in the case of   |
| a final infinitive)                     | a final infinitive)                     |

**TEXT REFERENCES**


Alfric. Homilies—Thorpe, B. 1844 - 46. The homilies of the Anglo-Saxon church; the first

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

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