SKRIFTER

UDGIVNE AF

VIDENSKABS-SELSKABET

I CHRISTIANIA

1910

II. HISTORISK-FILOSOFISK KLASSE

CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

TO

EARLY ENGLISH SYNTAX

BY

Dr. **A. TRAMPE BØDTKER**

SECOND SERIES:

IV. PERSONAL PRONOUNS. V. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS
VI. RELATIVE PRONOUNS. VII. WHAT

Fremlagt i Fællesmødet den 11te Februar 1910.

The Relative Pronouns in Early English have been studied by E. A. Kock in his dissertation: *The English Relative Pronouns*, Lund 1897, and more especially by H. Grossmann: *Das angelsächsische Relativ*, Diss. Berlin 1906, and E. Anklam: *Das englische Relativ im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Diss. Berlin 1908. To the bibliography contained in these monographs should be added: L. R. Wilson, *Chaucer's Relative Constructions*, Studies in Philology, Phil. Club of the University of North Carolina 1906, and H. Engel, *Spenser's Relativsatz*, Diss. Berlin 1908.

J. E. Wülfing gives in his *Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen*, Pt. I, pp. 419—421, a survey of the publications on the omission of the Relative Pronoun in English. I mention Einenkel's articles in the *Anglia* XIII, pp. 348 ff., XIV, pp. 122 ff., and XXIX, pp. 121 ff. As regards the question in general it suffices to refer to B. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, III, pp. 381 ff., and to H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* IV. pp. 140 f. I have not yet had access to B. Delbrück, *Zu den germanischen Relativsätzen*, Abh. d. Kgl. Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. Hist.-Phil. Kl. 1909.

The Indefinite Pronouns have been treated exhaustively by Einenkel in the *Anglia*. I have added only a few remarks on *what*. So far as I know, nothing has been written of late on the early history of the other pronouns.

In the *Modern Language Review* IV, pp. 433 ff., Napier has demolished Heuser's theory of the early date of the *Ancren Riwle*. Napier states that »all the available evidence does not take the *Ancren Riwle* back further than the beginning of the thirteenth century«, and thus lays a solid basis for syntactical researches in that otherwise important work.

I have had the pleasure of seeing the First Series of these *Critical Contributions* reviewed by Wülfing in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1909, col. 2283, and by Einenkel in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 1909, pp 267—273.

Addenda to the chapters already dealt with will be embodied in some later Series. Some remarks on *a friend of mine* have been published recently in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 1910, pp. 56 ff.

IV. Personal Pronouns.

40. According to E. Windisch [1], French has borrowed from Celtic the use of the intensive phrase *c'est que*, as in *c'est à vous que je m'adresse*; and from French again A. Tobler derives [2] the use of corresponding phrases in many other languages. The French construction can, however, be traced back to Latin. *Vos estis* continues through *c'estes vos* in *c'est vous*, and similarly *vos estis qui* gives the modern *c'est vous qui*, as seen in Mat. X, 20 *non enim vos estis qui loquimini, sed Spiritus Patris vestri qui loquitur in vobis*. This runs in the OE. Gospels *ne synt ge na þe þær sprecað ac eowres fæder gast þe sprycð on eow* [3]. I further mention Orm. 8465 *þatt wass þe land off Galileo þatt himm wass bedenn sekenn*. In spite of French influence, this »umständlichere Ausdrucksweise« [4] is far from being so current in modern English as it is in Scandinavian, where the usual way of putting 'who comes?' is: *hvem er det som kommer?* = French *qui est-ce qui vient?*

41. Einenkel mentions in *Grundr.* § 173 *v* the OE. use of *hit* introducing a temporal statement, but »wo das Me. *comen* gebraucht, haben wie afrz. Einfluss, *quant ce vint le dymanche ...* > *whan hyt cam on the morn* > *it drew to þe night*«. An early instance occurs, however, in S. Chron. E 1087, p. 223, *sona swa hit com to þam Eastron, þa ferdon hi ⁊ hergodon*, etc. Later instances are: Orm 8917 *⁊ ʒedenn heore wezʒe forþ till þatt itt comm till efenn*, Cott. Vesp. Hom. p. 231 *þa hit þer to com þat se hlaford into þar halle come*, ib. p. 235 *wat hit com to þa time*. In late MidE. *it drew* is of frequent occurrence: Ipom. A 7056 *hit drew to the nyghte faste*, etc., compare Scand. *det drog ud paa natten*.

---

[1] *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* I, p. 402.

[2] *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik* I, p. 160. An account of the French construction is also given by P. Jochimsen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deiktischen Hervorhebung eines einzelnen Satzteiles, bezw. eines Satzes mittelst c'est (...) que (qui)*, Diss. Kiel 1907.

[3] Other examples are cited by L. Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 179.

[4] H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte IV*, p. 285.

42. »Die emphatische Wiederholung des Pron. am Schlusse des Satzes ist wahrscheinlich fremd, obgleich frz. *je le veux, moi!* bis jetzt nicht so früh belegt ist wie me. *But he can cherles daunten, he, ... > I wot not, I!*« (*Grundr.* § 173 *o*). *I wot not I* (corresponding to colloquial Scand. *jeg ved ikke jeg*) belongs, however, to the same category as Bede 473,12 (Smith) *hit is welig ðis Ealond* (see Wülfing, *Syntax* I, pp. 343 f.), Kent. Serm. (Misc. p. 27) *þet ne seide he nocht herodes*, Lamb. Hom. p. 27 *he þencheð þe deofel*, etc. The pronoun, like the noun, is added to define emphatically the atonic subject preceding the stressed verb [1].

43. Like French *comme cil qui*, Scand. *som den der* (*som en der*), etc., English *as he that* (*as one that*) is liable to take a causal shade. Einenkel (*Grundr.* § 173 *ψ*) quotes *as he that* only as late as Chaucer, and thinks that an earlier *as þe þat* is modelled on French. In reality, *he* and *þe*, as might naturally be expected, appear nearly at the same time: Vic. a. V. p. 119,25 *þus us aliesde ure aliesend and seððen aros of deaðe, alswo he ðe was soð lif*; a little later Anc. R. p. 388 *[he] scheawede hire his feire neb ase þe þet was of alle men ueirest to biholden* [2].

44. »Das von einer adverb. Bestimmung begleitete Pers. in demonstrat. Sinne ist dem Afrz. nachgebildet: *Chil de la cité vinrent contre lui, — chiaus de dedens et chiaus de dehors* Froiss > me. *thai of Scotland* Barb. > *Sche passed hem of Ypris . . .* Ch.« (*Grundr.* § 173 *ββ*). Early instances, besides Gothic parallels [3], are however given by Mätzner, *Gram.* III, p. 351: S. Chron. E 1129 (p. 260) *ða of Rome*, Laȝ. I p. 252 *heo of Rome*, etc., to which I add S. Chron. E 1140, p. 267, *hi of Normandi wenden alle fra þe king* [4], Trin. Hom. p. 115 *hie þe þer-inne weren þus andswerden . . . ⁊ þo wiðuten seiden . .*, Vic. a. V. p. 147,5 *swiðe niedfulle to ðan inede*. The interchange of the personal and the demonstrative pronouns needs no comment. The history of the personal pronoun in English as well as other Germanic languages offers abundant examples of its intimate connexion with the demonstrative. In similar

---

[1] See Falk og Torp, *Dansk-Norskens Syntax,* pp. 275 ff.; H. Wunderlich, *Der deutsche Satzbau* I, p. 231; Sweet *N. E. Gr.* II, p. 5 and p. 72; H. Paul, *Prinzipien* IV p. 127 (with references).

[2] A temporal shade is perceptible in Or. o. o. Louerde (O. E. Hom. I, p. 185) *Jhesu al feir aȝein hwam þe sunne nis boten a schadwe ase þeo þet leoseþ here liht.*

[3] See also Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik* IV [2] p. 464 and p. 528.

[4] S. Chron. D 915, p. 99 *þa gemytton hy of Hereforda ⁊ of Gleaweceastre* has nothing to do with the above construction as shown by A *þa gemetton þa men hie of Hereforda ⁊ of Gleaweceastre*, in which *of* doubtless belongs to *þa men*, and not *hie.*

phrases Scandinavian uses the personal pronoun: *de fra byen*, collo-quially *han, hun fra byen*. A kindred construction of the demonstrative pronoun will be dealt with in Section **46**.

45. »Das reflexive Verhältnis kann auch ausgedrückt werden mit Hilfe des Passivs, namentlich bei den Verben des Setzens, Legens etc. und zwar nach dem Muster des Afrz. . . . > me . *they were sette — I was leyde — he was clad* Ch., gelegentlich in Kreuzung mit Reflex. Pron.: *These riottours . . . Were sette hem in a tavern* id.« (*Grundr.* § 175 γ). Kellner (*Engl. Stud.* XVIII, p. 289) also takes *be* as an auxiliary to form the passive: *he was leyd.* sett: *they were mette*, and compares such OE. instances as Cædm. Gen. 120 *þā wæs gāst ofer holm boren*.

Wæs boren does not count as the passage simply renders Gen. I, 2 *et spiritus dei ferebatur super aquas*, in Ælfric's translation *godes gāst wæs geferod ofer wæteru*. *Meten* takes *be* after the analogy of intransi-tive verbs of motion, which in Chaucer are nearly always constructed with *be*. *Be clad* may be compared to the modern expression *be dressed*, Scand. *være klædt*, in which the participle has the function of an adjective.

In *be set* the old participles *seted* and *ᵹeten* have fallen together. The confusion began already in OE. (see Sievers *Ags. Gram.* § 406 a. 7), and went on increasing in MidE. Originally, *be set* does not con-tain *settan* but *sittan*, as shown by S. Chron. A, etc., 807, p. 90 *þa wurdon eac swiðe uneðelice áseten. Þreo ásæton on ða healfe þæs deopes ðe ða Deniscan scipu aseten wæron* (B *geseten waran*), Laᵹ. 18532 *þa heo weoren alle iseten* (Mätzner, *Gram.* II, p. 81), Havelok 2291 *he weren alle dun set*. A confusion with the passive was not, however, far off: Havelok 1722 *þanne [he] were set, and bord leyd, And þe beneysun was seyd.*

Another source of confusion was the ethic dative in OE. *him sittan* > Havelok 633 *he sat him up*. The dative, which might be mistaken for an accusative, was of course kept in the compound tenses: *these riottours . . . were sette hem*. French *s'être assis* brought in a third element.

Be [him] set probably acted on *be him laid*. The earliest instance I have met with is Kent. Serm. (Misc. p. 32) *and ure lord was i-leid him don to slepe ine þo ssipe er þane þis tempeste a-róós.*

V. Demonstrative Pronouns.

46. In his *Gram.* III, pp. 254 f. (cf. also p. 351) Mätzner treats of *that* referring back to a preceding noun and qualified by an adjunct, as in *he hathe the spere heed . . . but it is grettere than that at Paris*, Maund., *[this croune] was of jonkes of the see . . . for I have seen and beholden many tymes that of Paris and that of Costantynoble*, Maund. No earlier examples are quoted. Mätzner compares MidHG. *Die Gunthêres man unde ouch die Dietriches* [1], but does not find anything in OE. that comes nearer to this construction than Mark XII, 17 *agyfað þam casere þa ðing þe þæs caseres synd, and Gode þa ðe Godes synd* [2].

Kellner (*Hist. Outl.* p. 199) repeating Mätzner's examples, says that the use of *that* in connexion with the genitive is scarcely to be traced back to OE.

Einenkel (*Grundr.* § 179 ζ) adds only a French parallel.

These statements are rather bewildering; for it can be easily proved that the construction existed already in OE. We need not discuss an example like S. Chron. A 921, p. 101, *se here . . . worhton þæt geweorc æt Tæmeseforda, ꝛ hit budon ꝛ bytledon ꝛ forleton þæt oþer æt Huntandune*; it suffices to quote: Cart. Sax. II, p. 57—58 *sellað . . . ðet land æt Sempigaham . . . bruce . . . ðes landes æt Slioforda ꝛ . . . þes on Sempigaham*, Land. Chart. p. 361 *þet land æt bradan wætere. ꝛ þet æt Niwan túne*, ib. p. 365 *ic gean minum hlaforde þes landes æt lamburnan ꝛ þæs æt ceolsige ꝛ æt reandingan*, Diplom. Angl. p. 596 *ic gean Ælfgare minum suna þæs landes æt Hwipstede ꝛ þæs æt Wealtune*, S. Chron. C 912, p. 96 *þær ða burh getimbrede. ꝛ þæs ilcan geares þá æt Bricge*, and similarly in the annals for 913—915, S. Chron. E 1038, p. 161, *þa feng Eadsige biscop to þam arcebiscoprice ꝛ Grymcytel to ðam on Suð Sexum*, ib. 1094, p. 229, *se eorl . . . gewánn þone castel æt Argentses . . . ꝛ syððan þone æt Hulme*, ib. 1066, p. 198, *se cyng geaf . . . him þ abbotrice on Byrtune. ꝛ se of Couentre þ se eorl Leofric þe wæs his eam ǽr heafde macod. ꝛ se of Crulande. ꝛ se of Þorneie*, ib. 1086, p. 222, *se abbod of Baðon and þe of Perscoran*, ib. 1090, p. 225 *he begeat þone castel æt sancte Waleri ꝛ þa hæfenan. ꝛ swa he begeat þone æt Albemare*, ib. 1096, p. 232, *mid him se eorl of Flandran ꝛ se of Bunan*, ib. 1100, p. 235, *þ bisceoprice on Winceastre ꝛ þ on Searbyrig*, ib. 1108, p. 242, *wurdon syððon manege gewinn betwux þam cynge of France ꝛ þam of Englelande*, ib. 1120,

---

[1] See further Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik* IV [2], p. 528, and compare Section **44**.
[2] In Mat. XXII, 21 and Luke XX, 5 *ða þing ðe Godes synd*.

p. 249, *wurdon sehte seo cyng of Englelande ꝥ se of France . . . acor-dedan . . . Heanriges agene mæn . . . ꝥ se eorl of Flandran . ꝥ se of Pun-tiw.* Cf. also an instance from Liber Vitae, Winchester, in Section **50**.

In the same way Scandinavian uses the demonstrative pronoun to avoid the repetition of the noun: *huset i byen og det paa landet — et hus større end det i byen — værelserne ovenpaa og de nedenunder — dette bord og det der (borte).* The last two instances, in which the pro-noun is followed by an adverb, correspond to Mätzner's example: *the upper part of him the blow had slit as sure as that below.*

47. Most English dialects use *this here, that there* as demonstra-tive adjectives: *this here child, that there child.* The *N. E. D.* and Ein-enkel (*Grundr.* § 179 ϑ) derive this use from French: *ce livre-ci, ce livre-là.* To this Logeman rightly objects that the word-order is alto-gether different in the two languages; he suggests influence from Scand. *denne her mand[en]* [1]. I am inclined to believe that a parallel develop-ment took place in Scand. and English.

Scand. *denne* and the adverb *her* or *der* now form a compound emphatic pronoun, which is consequently used also as a demon-strative adjective. It was pointed out above that the use of *that* in connexion with an adjunct has always been a current construction in English. In the course of time *that there* may have come to be felt as a compound pronoun like Scand. *denne der*; *this here* was formed after the analogy of *that there* [2]. The new compound can be compared to the primitive form of *this* itself and to the Romance compounds of *ecce + ille (iste).*

48. The juxtaposition of *this* and *that*, as in *you that way, — we this way* Shak., appeared, according to *Grundr.* § 179 η, in the 14th century in imitation of French *cil* and *cist.* The demonstrative frequently takes an indefinite character. In OE. other pronouns were used, *e. g.* Boet. 190,9 *ðonne lufaþ sum þæt, sum elles hwæt.* Though *this* and *that* already in OE. denoted what was nearer and what was farther off (see examples in Wülfing's Syntax I, § 256 and § 262), they do not seem to be used in juxtaposition like OHGerm. *noh thizi noh thaz* (Grimm,

---

[1] *Herrig's Archiv* 117, p. 45.

[2] In *this one reproach, any one name,* and the like, *one* stands in apposition to *this, any,* and is perhaps different from *one* used as a substitute for a noun. See examples in J. Ellinger, *Vermischte Beiträge zur Syntax der Neueren Englischen Sprache*, Wien 1909, p. 50

Deutsche Gram. IV ² p. 527). But the distinction between the two
pronouns was soon taken recourse to in Early MidE. Orm contrasts
not only *þiss* and *ʒonnd,* as stated by Mätzner, *Gram.* III. p. 251, but
also *þiss* and *þatt*: 19429 *whatt Abraham, whatt Moysæs, whatt tiss ⁊
tatt profete.*

VI. Relative Pronouns ¹.

49. The OE. clauses in which a relative pronoun is apparently
wanting, belong to two different categories, exemplified in:

1. S. Chron. A 906 *on þys geare gefor Ælfred, wæs æt Baðum
gerefa.*

2. Sol. 182,31 *[ic] fagnige þæs þu cwyst.*

To the construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ presented in the latter instance also
belong clauses containing *þonne,* as Oros. 2, 5, 8 *geortruwige Gode þæt
he us ne mæge gescyldan to beteran tidon þonne we nu on synd.* Simi-
larly *þu* stands for *þu þe* or *þe*: Elene 726 *fæder ure þu eart on heo-
fonum* ², which may also be explained as a case of parataxis.

In the OE. paratactical construction *gefor Ælfred, wæs æt Baðum
gerefa,* the subject of the second clause is to be supplied from some
noun, not necessarily the subject, in the first, and it is nearly always
followed by *hatan* or *wesan.* The parataxis imperceptibly changes into
a hypotaxis, *Ælfred* being felt as belonging to both clauses; but this
stage was scarcely attained in the OE. period. Among the examples
from early MidE. texts quoted by Anklam, *l. c.* p. 9, there is really only
one that marks a step forward: Anc. R. p. 408 *þus he spekeð to Moyses,
þet monne mest him luuede.* MidE. usage still continues in sentences
like *here is somebody wants to see you.*

Before discussing the absence of the pronoun in the object-relation,
as in *the man I saw,* it will be well to examine the earliest instances
met with.

Anklam, *l. c.* p. 8, quotes Gesetze d. Ags. p. 452 *gyf he ðonne eal wel
gefriðað he healdan sceal, ðonne bið he godes leanes ful wel wyrðe,* but
does not mention Liebermann's note on the passage: did the orignal
read —ðað þ̵? Ges. d. Ags. A 314 *habbe þonne ylcan dom se ðe þæt
fals worhte* is simply to be discarded.

---

¹ Full titles of books referred to are given p. 3.
² Both quotations given by Grossmann, *l. c.* p. 8 and p. 69.

I am equally diffident with regard to an instance I have found my-
self: S. Chron. F¹ 995, p. 128 *and sona of s . . . ealla þa wisuste menn
he awar gecneow* rendering *itaque præcepit congregari omnes quos scie-
bat prudentiores* (Plummer, *Appendix* B, p. 285). As many other small
words have been omitted in this MS., it is probable that *þe* or *þ* was
dropped inadvertently by the scribe; some lines below he left out *þ*:
*him tealdan þa swyðe ealde menn . ægðer ge gehadode ge læwede [þ] heora
yldran heom tealdan hu hit was gelagod: tunc seniores et prudentiores
narrauerunt ei, quod inde a suis patribus audissent.*

Anklam, *l. c.* p. 9, is perhaps right in considering Anc. R. p. 188
þertec al he þolede as due to a clerical error. The context shows
that *he þolede* is a subordinate clause. It coincides with the example
quoted from the Laws in so far as in both cases the pronoun is
wanting after *all.* Anklam further adduces Trin. Hom. p. 95 *ðet oðer
gostliche shrud ich embe spece : is mildhertnesse.* I have found in Pater
Noster, Lamb. Hom. p. 55:

> *halde we godes laȝe*
> *þet we habbeð of his saȝe .*
> *þa bodes he beodeð þer inne*
> *Bute weo hes halden : we doð sunne.*

Later MidE. instances, from Gen. and Ex., Brunne, etc. have been
collected by Einenkel².

Einenkel distinguishes between two types of relative clauses in
which the relative pronoun is wanting: The older and more northern
type is seen in *that swerd he wan of Sire Cesar By hym in grave they
leide hit thar* (Brunne). This construction in which the connecting link
is put first, is unknown in French. In the other type, which appears
some hundred years later and is independent of the first, the connecting
link is placed between both predicates, as in *he had a sone, men cald
Ector* (Brunne). Here French influence has been at work.

As shown by Gen. and Ex. 2167 *nu, bi ðe feið ic og to king pha-
raon, sule ge nogt alle eðen gon*, a front-position may easily change into a
mid-position; *ðe feið* belongs just as well to the preposition *bi* as to the
following *og.* It is scarcely safe to urge the difference of the two types,
either as regards locality or an earlier appearance of the one.

I do not think the problem can be solved according to one for-
mula. In French the pronoun is rarely omitted unless the principal

---

¹ From about A. D. 1100, see Plummer, *Pt.* II, p. XXXVI and p. XLIV.
² See *Angl.* XIII, pp. 348 ff., XIV, pp. 122 ff., XXIX, pp. 121 ff.

sentence contains a negation, nor does the early appearance of the front-position favour the theory of French influence. Jespersen holds the viking settlements responsible for the loss of the pronoun [1]. But to this Einenkel objects that the relative is never omitted by Orm, who how-ever a few times leaves out the conjunction *that* (see Series I, p. 48). I think foreign influence met with a congenial tendency in the language itself.

Gefor Ælfred wæs gerefa had developed into a construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, perhaps towards the end of the twelfth century. A similar but independent process may have taken place in *the man I saw*.

The *þ*-words in OE. and still more the bold OHGerman clauses show that a construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ agrees very well with full case-endings. On the other hand it cannot be denied that the loss of the OE. inflexions offered new facilities to the language. A noun placed at the head or in the middle of two clauses could more easily be felt as belonging to both.

A primitive structure such as *the man you saw — the man is my brother* could scarcely develop on its own accord *the man you saw [he] is my brother*. The word-order would be too unusual. The same argu-ment applies to *I ate the apple — [the apple] John gave me*. But the word-order established in relative clauses might lead to a compromise resulting in *the man you saw . . . , the apple John gave me*. It is of course impossible to decide how far Scandinavian or French influence was concerned in this development.

50. Another feature which English and Scandinavian have in com-mon, is the place of the preposition after the verb in a relative clause, as in Orm 3470 ff.

> *Acc fra þatt Kalldewisshe land,*
> *Þatt teȝȝ þa comenn offe,*
> *Wass mikell weȝȝe till þatt land*
> *Þatt Crist wass borenn inne.*

Jespersen [1] and Onions [2] think that the English word-order is due to Scandinavian. A few OE. instances have, however, been found by Grossmann, *l. c.* p. 16, in the Metres of Boethius and Ælfric's Grammar.

I have met with an instance in Liber Vitae, New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester, ed. de Gray Birch, p. 161 *þæt is . . . of ðam stáne*

---

[1] *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 82.
[2] *An Advanced English Syntax*, London 1905, p. 104.

þe séo rod stod on uppan ðe ure dryhten onðrowode ⁊ of þære binnan ðe ure dryhten onlæg [1], and another in S. Chron. F 992, p. 126 *an of þam þa se cyng hæfde mæst truwe to.*

This shifting of word-order is not restricted to relative clauses. The question does not, in fact, belong to the Syntax of the Pronoun, but to the Syntax of the Verb. The same shift takes place just as well with an infinitive: S. Chron. E 1140, p. 266 *me lihtede candles to æten bi* [2]. There is on the whole a tendency to assume the normal word-order of the principal clauses: S. Chron. E 1140, p. 267 *þat he alle his castles sculde íiuen up . . . Sume he iaf up . . . til hi aiauen up here castles.* This tendency, which will be studied in some subsequent chapter, is also seen in such subordinate clauses in which the preposition is placed after the noun ('semi-compounds'), as S. Chron. A 918, p. 98 *se cyng hæfde funden þæt him mon sæt wiþ on suþhealfe Sæfern múþan,* ib. 921, p. 102 *oþ þam burgwarum com mara fultum tó,* Holy Rood 5,34 *þær wolde anbidiʒen oð dauid him come to* (compare S. Chron. 921, p. 101 *oþ him mara fultum tó com*).

51. E. A. Kock, *l. c.* p. 67, and Anklam, *l. c.* p. 57, give only a few late OE. instances of *hwā swā,* etc. for *swā hwā swā.* I add from my own collections: S. Chron. E 675, p. 37 *⁊ hwa swa hit tobreceð þa wurðe he amansumed,* Liebermann in Herrig's Archiv 111, p. 283, *hua swa braves ðisses, braue Crist hine þisses liues hele* (Northumbrian documents 1099—1128), Diplom. Angl. p. 369 *⁊ hwa se þas ælmesse holdlice healde, healde hine God . . . ⁊ hwa swa hio awende sieo he awænded fram Gode,* ib. 567 *and wo so þis quides bereuen wylle bereue hym God heueriche,* ib. 593 *and wo so þis awende God awende his ansene from him.*

The second *swā* is rarely omitted (see E. A. Kock, *l. c.* p. 66, p. 71). Here are some instances: Angl. Sax. Min. (*Anglia* XI, p. 119) *geedniwa ⁊ geniwa arfæstusta fæder swa hwæt on dæde, swa hwæt on worde swa hwæt on þære spæce mid deoflicum facne ys gewemmed,* rendering *renova . . . quicquid actione quicquid verbo quicquid ipsa locutione diabolica fraude violatum est.* S. Chron. F 994, p. 128 *þ mæste yfel worhton þe æfre æni here mihte on eallon ðingan swa hwar hi ferdon,* compare ib.

---

[1] *séo rod* is the reading of the MS. (*Stowe MS. 944, Brit. Mus.,* f. 58), but it is misprinted *se oród* in de Gray Birch's edition. Dr. Warner has kindly informed me that the passage in question is written in a late eleventh century hand.

[2] Quoted by Onions, *l. c.* p. 105.

995, p. 130 *het hi faran loc whar hi woldon*, S. Chron. E, etc. 1009, p. 139 *hi ferdon loc hu hi woldon* (C omits *hu*), etc.

An early instance of *hwilc* from S. Chron. E will be found in the following Section.

52. Anklam, *l. c.* pp. 59 f., rightly observes that *ðe* in Vic. a. V. sometimes interchanges with *se* from OE. *swā* after a noun preceded by *hwilch*, *e. g.* 113,18 *hwilche dai ðe* and 51,23 *hwilche daiʒe se*. Anklam supposes that *ðe*, which also occurs in *þar ðe* and *hwar ðe*, is due to a mistake on the part of the scribe. The scribe knowing that the OE. relative pronoun *se* had been replaced by *þe*, wrongly put *þe* for *se* = OE. *swā*. To this I object that the scribe very well knew how to use *swa* in 71,34 *hwilche kennes swa hit bie*, and that the construction occurs much earlier: S. Chron. E 675, p. 36 *[Ic wille . . .] ⁊ hwilc abbot þe beþ þær coren of þe munecan ꝥ he beo gebletsad . . . Ic wille . . . ꝥ whilc man swa*[1] *haued behaten to faren to Rome, and he ne muge hit forðian, ouðer for untrumnisse . . . ouðer for hwilces cinnes oðer neod he ne muge þær cumon, beo he of Englelande ouðer of hwilc oðer igland beo he, cume to ꝥ mynstre on Medeshamstede.*

We set aside *hwilces* (*cinnes*, etc.) that belongs to the preceding Section, and compare only *hwilc abbot þe* and *whilc man swa*. The omission of the first correlative in *swa hwilc* + noun *swa* impaired the feeling of correlation. The subordinate clause was then connected with the noun, and the introductory word *swa* replaced by the relative pronoun *þe* accordingly.

53. If, in the above connexion, *who* (*which*) is substituted for *which* + noun, *that* may still be kept: Laʒ. B 5207 *and þeos four kinges hii leide to þan grunde bote wo þat þar fleh* (the A-text reads *whulc riche mon þer at-fleh*), Woh. o. u. Lau. (OE. Hom. p. 275) *þenne aʒaines kinde Gað hwa þat swuche kinsemon ne luueð* (cf. some lines below *þenne hwa se þe ne luues, he is mon unwreastest*). This early use of *that* after an indefinite relative may account for the later insertion of *that* after any relative pronoun: *the hye God on whom that we bileve*, Chauc. The development was supported by a similar insertion of *that* after an interrogative pronoun: Woh. o. u. Lau. (OE. Hom. I, p. 283) *A hu þat ha nu driuen irnene neiles þurh þine feire hondes in to hard rode* (here *hu*

---

[1] *whilc man swa* renders *quicumque* in the spurious charter on which this Peterborough insertion is based (Cart. Sax. No. 48).

þat in reality introduces an dependent question or exclamation); Have-lok 2211 *[Ye witen wel] how þat he ... bitauhte hise children þre.* For a similar use of *at* and relative particles in ONorse and later in Scandinavian, see Falk og Torp, *Dansk-norskens Syntax*, pp. 232 f., p. 241, p. 247. How far Scand. usage and influence from French *que* are concerned in this development, is scarcely possible to decide. The insertion of *that* after pronouns runs parallel to the use of *that* after conjunctions, see Series I, p. 45.

54. Very early *ever* was attached to *who that, which that*, etc. *Ever* originally belonged to the verb or the whole sentence, but was gradually attracted by the pronoun. In many cases it is impossible to tell where its real place was meant to be: S. Chron. E 1048, p. 174 *het se cyning bannan út here, ægðer ge be suðan Temese ge be norðan eall þ æfre betst wæs*, Mor. O. 130, Lamb. H. p. 167 *a hwilke time se eure mon of þinchþ his mid-dede*, Orm 18757 *forr all þatt æfre Crist sellf shop all iss itt god wiþþ alle*, ib. 5074 *z all þatt æfre iss god inn me ... all birrþ þe lufenn itt inn me*, Vic. a. V. 67,5 *luue ðine nexte al swa ðe seluen, hwat manne swo he æure bie. Ne bie he næure swa swiðe forʒelt, æure he is ðin nexte*, ib. 37,31 *hwat swo æure of him betide*, Lamb. Hom. 47 *hwa efre þenne ilokie wel þene sunne dei ... beo heo dal neominde of heofene riches blisse*, Sawles Warde, OEH. I, p. 265 *openeð for hwer se eauer þe gast wule*, Ur. of ure Lou., OEH. I, p. 185 *hwa se euer haueð longe wone of gastliche elne*, ib. p. 187 *hwa se euer wule habbe lot wiþ þe ...*, Gen. Ex. 270 *wisdom ðe made ilc ðing of nogt quuat-so-euere on heuone or her is wrogt.* It is not at all necessary to recur to French *qui que onques* (cf. *Grundr.* § 172 γ).

55. *For hwon* referring to a whole clause occurs already early in the twelfth century (see examples Anklam, *l. c.* p. 63). *For why* referring to a preceding idea, and corresponding to *quam ob rem, qua re*, may be seen in Orm's concluding remarks 12690 *forrwhi wass þatt tatt Sannt Johan amang þe leode sezzde off Crist tatt he ne cneow himm nohht.* Compare Ælfric's translation, Gram. 231,10, of the interrogative pronouns in Latin: *quare : for hwí, quam ob rem : for hwí oðše for ði.*

The reason *(for) why*, which Einenkel (*Grundr.* § 172 o) derives from French, corresponds to Germ. *die Ursache warum*, Danish *grunden hvorfor, aarsagen hvi* [1], and may have developed through a blending of

---

[1] Falk og Torp, *Dansk-norskens Syntax*, p. 233.

I tell you why . . . and *I tell you the reason for which . . . .,* compare
Orm 2421 *nu wile I shæwenn ȝuw forrwhi ȝho ȝaff swillc sware
onnȝæness,* and ib. 9729 *ȝét wass operrwhatt forrwhi þeȝȝ wærenn
Drihhtin laþe.*

56. I join to the documents an early, though not very conclusive,
instance of *whose* as a relative pronoun: Eadw. Cant. Hymns 15,40
[Crist sye þeolade . . .] ⁊ to whæs tocuman alle menn sculen arisan = *ad
cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere habent.* (*ðe hwilc* in the next
verse has no importance). Some other early forms of the interrogative
pronoun used as a relative occur in Wint. Vers. Reg. Ben. *e. g.* 19,27
saule to gyemenne, for hwam hu sceal ȝewistale upaȝifen, ib. 35,30 *urne
drihte be hwam þe apostel þus cweð* (A-S. Vers. *be him,* Interl. Vers.
be ðam), ib. 47,24 *on þan ȝebedehuse þurh hwylcere ȝyemelyste hit ȝelamp*
(*per cuius,* A-S. Verl. *þe hit,* Interl. Vers. *þæs . . . þe hit*), ib. 27,4 *þa
stowwenn hwar we ealle þos þing maȝe sycerlice wyrcæn.*

Anklam, *l. c.* pp. 61 f., cites some interesting but not quite certain
examples which seem to indicate that the interrogative pronoun began
to be used as a relative already about the middle of the eleventh
century. In Wulfstan 129,9 *ac bið æt gode anum gelang eal hwæt we
gefaran scylon* the meaning of *hwæt* is rather 'how' or perhaps 'where',
compare S. Chron. E 1052, p. 177 *þa eorlas ne mihton gewitan hwet
Godwine eorl gefaren hæfde.* Wulfstan's *hwæt* does not refer to *eal* as
its antecedent, but introduces a noun clause in apposition to the subject
of the preceding sentence. *Hwæt* is accordingly an interrogative pro-
noun used as a general or indefinite relative; and *eal,* to which the
hwæt-clause stands in an appositive relation, may be omitted. The use
of *hwæt* before *gefaran* is somewhat like that of French *ce que* in *je
ne sais pas ce qu'il est devenu.*

57. A. Tobler treats in *Vermischte Beiträge* I, p. 203 f. of French
phrases formed by a noun and a relative clause only: *Massacre que
nous avons oublié!* Such exclamatory sentences belong to vivid familiar
speech, and may, I think, be formed spontaneously in any language,
though instances are rare in print. An example like On Oreis. o. o. Lou.,
(OE. Hom. p. 187) *min heoueneliche leche þet makedest us of þi seolf
se mihti medicine, iblesced beo þu euer* shows an intermediate stage,
a principal clause being tagged on. But no verb appears in Woh. o. u. Lau.
(OE. Hom. p. 283) *A þat luuelike bodi þat henges swa rewli swa blodi
and swa kalde.*

VII. What.

58. In his dissertation on temporal clauses, W. Böhme explains *al what*, meaning '*until*', as a further development of the OE. conjunction *þæt* [1].

Böhme first observes that the use of *þæt* in the temporal sense '*until*' began in consecutive clauses, as seen in the substitution of *þæt* for *oþ* in *swā lange þæt:* S. Chron. E 1052, p. 177 *swa lange þ seo scipfyrd eall belaf*. The ultimate stage *until* appears early, *e. g.* S. Chron. E 1076. p. 213, *þa Bryttas hine heoldon þ se cyng com of Francland* [2].

So far there are no difficulties. The S. Chron. and Charters offer abundant proofs that the sense *until* was firmly established in late OE. The same change from a consecutive to a temporal clause is seen in French *tant que : je vais traîner une mourante vie tant que par ta poursuite elle me soit ravie*, Corn. (*Dict. Gén.*), and in early Danish: *rob nu thijn kettere saa lenge tw reffner* 'cry now you heretic so long [that *i. e.* till] you burst' (Falk og Torp, *Dansk-norskens Syntax*, p. 229).

The question is next how to combine *þæt* with *al what*. Böhme calls attention to S. Chron. F 1013, p. 144 (Thorpe p. 271) *and se cing sona him sylf ferde æfter ⁊ wæs þar begeondan eal ð Swegen wearð dead*, and continues: »*eal þæt* verhält sich zu *þæt*, wie *eal swa* zu *swa*; man vgl. übrigens dazu eine andere Stelle aus S. C. (F s. 143) ⁊ *þær wunode eal to his lifes ende*. Das Interrogativ an Stelle des Demonstrativs hat nichts Auffälliges an sich«. Böhme states that *al what* in the transition period occurs only in three passages in Vic. and V. and in one passage in Kent. Serm. 27,8 *al-wat hi kam over þo huse*, and concludes that *al what* is peculiar to the South-East of England. The conjunction is still used in Aȝenbite (*al-huet* and *al-huet þet*).

These statements are not quite exact. In his excellent study Böhme has overlooked some important passages that point in another direction. *Al* has only an intensive force, as shown by Cott. Vesp. Hom. p. 235 *þer efter arerde god þus lage ... and si ȝeleste sume wile ... swa lange(?) þat si alswa swið abread and adiliȝede þurh unhersamnesse wat hit com to þa time þe god sende þe halie witiȝe*. This passage is also quoted by Einenkel, who supposes an imitation of French *que* (*Anglia* XXVII p. 142).

---

[1] *Die Temporalsätze in der Übergangszeit vom Angelsächsischen zum Altenglischen* Diss. Leipzig 1903, pp. 51 ff.

[2] Cf. already Oros. 161,31 *hie þeah swa ondrædendlice gebidon þæt se ege ofergangen wæs*, Wülfing, *Syntax* II, p. 120. Sometimes a final shade blends with the temporal *e. g.* Per. Didax. 21,24 *wlece hyt eall togadere þæt hyt wlæc beo*.

Secondly, *what* is also used in connexion with an adverb: Kent. Serm.
(Misc. p. 30) *þu hest i-hialde þet betste wyn wath nu*, corresponding to
John II. 10 *tu autem servasti bonum vinum usque adhuc* [1]. Thirdly, *what*
occurs in the sense 'as long as': Lamb. Hom. p. 11 *Muchel is us
þenne neod leoue breðren wet we on þisse middelerd liuien sod scrift*
'great need have we then, dear brethren, as long as we live on this
earth, of true shrift'.

The last passage of Section **56** showed that *hwæt* in late OE. had
acquired a vaguer sense. How far the interrogative-relative pronoun *hwæt*
may have developed on its own accord in a temporal direction I do not
dare to say. The history of *what* and *that* is still obscure in many
respects. The primary sense was perhaps 'the time that', 'while', which
before an ingressive verb was turned into 'until': *wet we liuien; wat hit
com*. But as *wath nu* appears nearly at the same time, there is reason
to believe that *what* has somehow or other been exposed to the influ-
ence of French *que*, the more so as this particular use of *what* seems
to be restricted to the southern dialects.

59. In the Trin. Hom. (*al*) *so what so* occurs several times in the
sense 'as soon as', e. g. 125 *alse wat se þat holi meide mid worde
grette þe holie spuse, þo warð soð þat þe engel hadde er bi þis child seid*
(see Böhme *l. c.* p. 38). In Lamb. Hom. only one instance has been
found. Böhme is perhaps right in explaining *so what so* as formed by
the adjective *hwæt* 'quick' on the analogy of *swa hraðe swa*, though
there may also have been some confusion or vague connexion with the
pronoun *what*.

60. *Ney wat* in Rob. Glouc. may be due to French *presque* (see
Einenkel in *Anglia* XXVII, p. 142), but there is an older expression
which is not so easily accounted for: Lamb. Hom. 137 *and þesne lehter
habbeð mest hwet alle men*, rendering *et hoc animi morbo laborat fere
omnis homo*; similarly in the corresponding passage Trin. Hom. 157 *and
þis custume haueð mestwat alle men* [2].

61. Mätzner (*Gram.* III, p. 377) compares the correlative adverbial
what ... what with French *que ... que*, but mentions at the same time

---

[1] In the West-Saxon Version *ðu geheolde þ gode win oð þis*, in the Northumbrian
Glosses ... *uið to ðises vel uið nu vel uið ðageana*, Orm. 14066 ... *till nu*.

[2] I take *hwet* to be the OE. exclamatory *hwæt* in Cott. Vesp. Hom. p. 231 *þa sende se
king his ærndraches ... to zeladie þis folc hwet bute icome súm cófer sum láter sum
frend sum fend*.

the analogy of *sum ... sum*. Sweet *N. E. Gr.* 2122 also explains *what* as the OE. indefinite pronoun. Einenkel (*Anglia* XXVII, p. 143) has found an early instance in Cott. Vesp. Hom. 237 *wat frend wat fa*, to which I add Lamb. Hom. 145 *alle we beoð in monifald wawe inne þisse wreche liue hwat for ure eldere werkes, hwat for ure aȝene gultes*; the corresponding passage in Trin. Hom. 203 has only *for ure eldrene giltes and ec for ure agene sinnen*. A correlated (*some-*)*what ...* (*some-*)*what* could easily take the adverbial meaning *partim ... partim*, whether influenced or not by French *que ... que*.