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1 Introduction

Throughout the past years, decades and even centuries, historical linguists have examined many passed down manuscripts, they have formulated, accepted and rejected many hypotheses, they have compiled entire dictionaries and have reconstructed entire grammars, including the areas of morphology, phonology and syntax. Still, some subareas, such as element order, have not yet been thoroughly examined. Gerritsen (1984: 107), for instance, claims that research on element order change is neglected in historical linguistics. Her research on element order changes concerning the position of the verb in all the Old Germanic languages has been discussed in detail and has been profoundly criticised. It has often been considered as non-representative, as she only used one historical record per language, from which she deduced element orders of the different languages, assuming that these are representative for each of the languages’ dialects over the ages. Therefore, in order to create some clarity in this matter, I shall replicate her research partially, concentrating only on the verb second phenomenon, a term which Weerman (1989: 1) simply describes as “the verb that ends up in the second position of a clause”, in Old English and Old High German, in other records, viz. in texts by Wulfstan and by the unknown author of the Predigtsammlung B respectively. The use of more texts or the focus on more languages would lead me beyond the scope of this dissertation.

The original goal of this master dissertation was to find out whether Gerritsen (1984) did or did not over-generalise by means of a comparative analysis involving element order in Old High German and Old English homilies. In other words, I first wanted to investigate whether indeed High German has barely changed in terms of its use of inversion, i.e. “a reversal of the normal word order so that the a verb precedes the subject”
(Biber 2007: 457), and whether inversion in Old English really increased in frequency until 1001, after which inversion gradually disappeared. However, in burying myself in historical linguistics concerning Old English and Old High German element order, and in attempting to test the many—often vague—theories of researchers, such as Gerritsen (1984) amongst many others, the great amount of lacunas arrest the attention. As a result, the main goal of this dissertation is not only to research the occurrence of inversion in both languages, but it is also an attempt to bridge the gaps and to postulate corrections to inconsistencies. As research on element order in Old English differs from Old High German syntactic studies, it is impossible to compare the patterns SV and verb second, which are similar at first sight. Because research is incomplete in especially Old High German, it is interesting to reflect findings from one language to the other. Lacuna’s are found especially in relation to relative clauses, as for instance Old High German examination has not confirmed whether relative clauses are most likely to portray S...V(...) just as other subordinate clauses. Special attention will be paid to the effects of negation, for the description of the influence of negative particles on element order is almost completely absent. In Old English, for instance, three orders are proposed: neVS, SpronOneV and SNeV, whereas in Old High German, only the first and the last are proposed. I would like to find out whether Old English resembles Old High German with regard to the possibility to portray a pattern as SpronOneV. In short, I want to broaden this research by shifting the focus also on the hitherto ignored aspects of historical research on element order, as such not only including Gerritsen’s ideas on element order and inversion (1984: 108-118), but on negation as well.
Clearly, in this type of research, it is important to choose an appropriate methodology. First of all, the syntax of poetic language is often altered under the influence of textual elements as metre, rhyme, style, and the like, as a result of which homilies are more suitable for analysis than epic poems. It should also be taken into consideration that the written language will probably differ from the oral language spoken in those days. Again, homilies form useful data since they contain written language to be spoken out loud. Another limitation of this study involves the restricted number of resources: as in Gerritsen (1984), only one text per language will be used. Furthermore, this investigation shall only focus on verb second position in Old English and Old High German, which only covers part of Gerritsen’s research (1984), disallowing me to make general statements about her work. Nevertheless, the ultimate goal of the research is to accept, refine or refute Gerritsen’s (1984: 108-118) and other hypotheses concerning element order and negation in Old English and in Old High German.

The outline of this dissertation exists of three parts: the theoretical framework, the analysis of the chosen excerpts and, of course, the conclusion. In the first section, the notions Old English and Old high German will be explained. Next, in regarding research on Old English and Old High German element order, the freedom of element order, factors influencing element order, causes for linguistic change, the placement of the verb and element order, inversion and negation in Old English and old High German will be discussed in six subsections. The one but last section of the theoretical framework deals with the problems encountered in the research. Logically, the frame ends with a summary of all the element order theories.
The analysis comprises two major parts: the methodology and the actual analysis. In the methodology section, special attention will be paid to the choice of the texts. For the analysis, Secundum Lucam and Predigtsammlung B will be discussed separately. Both will undergo a general analysis, in which the clauses are subdivided into principal, subordinate and relative clauses. The general analysis of both texts will be followed by the analyses on inversion and negation. In the conclusion of the analyses, the verbal patterns of the fragments will be compared and the differences will be stressed and explained.

This dissertation ends with a comparative conclusion, in which the findings are linked to the theoretical framework.
2 Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework is the first major part of this dissertation and it precedes the analysis of my research. In order to conduct this investigation, it is important to obtain a thorough understanding of the field, so more specifically this means that first the notions Old English and Old High German will be explained. Second, different theories concerning Old English and Old High German element order will be elaborated upon. Here, the debate concerning the freedom of element order, the factors influencing element order, the causes for linguistic change, and the different angles at which the verbal position can be looked at, will be applied to Old English and Old High German specifically. Third, the problems that are expected to be encountered will be mentioned. Finally, hypotheses on the basis of the literature concerning the theoretical framework will be drawn.

2.2 The notions Old English and Old High German

2.2.1 Introduction

This section will elaborate on the traditional understanding of Old English and Old High German respectively. Both languages will first be situated in the genealogical dimension with respect to the Germanic languages, after which features regarding time, place and dialect will be explicated.

2.2.2 Old English

Old English is the notion used by modern historical researchers to refer to the oldest stage of the English language, belonging to the Ingvaeonic language family, which is a term taken from Tacitus’ tripartition of West-Germanic
into Ingvaeonic, Erminonic and Istvaeonic (in Lass 1994: 14). The 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century notion Anglo-Saxon is now used when referring to the culture and the people, whereas the term Old English is utilised to denote the language. The latter may be slightly misleading, for it gives the idea that English was a homogeneous language in its earliest stage. In fact, Old English cannot be well-delineated temporally, spatially or linguistically. In describing the early beginnings of Old English, Crystal (2003) relies on the testimony of the Anglo-Saxon Venerable Bede, who stated that

\begin{quote}
In the year of our Lord 449...the nations of the Angles, or Saxons, being invited by the aforesaid king, arrived in Britain with three long ships, and had a place assigned them to reside in by the same king, in the eastern part of the island, that they might thus appear to be fighting for their country, whilst their real intentions were to enslave it. (Venerable Bede in Crystal 2003: 6)
\end{quote}

The beginning of the Old English period took place when the Germanic invaders arrived about halfway the fifth century AD on the British isles. On the other hand, its transition to Middle English can be located in the beginning of the twelfth century, about half to one century after the Norman Conquest in 1066. All these boundaries, however, are not absolute. The Norman Conquest, for instance, though the date 1066 is regarded as the end of the Old English period, did not change Old English into Middle English overnight; it may only have accelerated a process which had been going on for many decades and which also had repercussions on the language. A confirming example is given by Crystal (2003: 30), who states that West Saxon texts were composed a century after the Norman Conquest of 1066. Lass (1994: 1) points out that runes dating from the seventh century are linguistically different from eleventh century classical Old English, clearly indicating it is impossible to exactly define the dates delimiting the Old English period. It is customary to talk about the period
between the middle of the fifth century and circa 1100 as the Old English period.
Old English in itself can be divided in several periods. Mossé (in Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 6-7) cuts across the traditional subdivision of Old English into an Early Old English period, to be situated between the early beginnings of the language and 900, and a Late Old English period, lasting from 900 until the shift to Middle English around 1100, by proposing four Old English periods in relation to important people of that time: one period preceding Alfred, one covering Alfred’s reign (i.e. from 871 until 899), and two periods after Alfred’s regime, i.e. a period of the authors Ælfric and Wulfstan and a period concerning the shift towards Middle English.

Apart from differences in time, there are also geographical-dialectal differences to be taken into account. Together with the three major Germanic tribes that settled on the British isles, three (or later on four) major dialectal variations of Old English (Quirk & Wrenn 1955, 4-5) can be distinguished. West Saxon is the dialect of the Saxons, in which most literary texts survived and which is to be found in the kingdom of Wessex. In the South-East of England, the South of Hampshire and on the isle of Wight, the language of the Jutes developed into Kentish. The Angles, living in the Midlands, the North-East of England and some parts of Scotland, spoke Anglian, a dialect which can be subdivided

![Figure 1 from Nielssen 1998: 76](image-url)
into Northumbrian and Mercian. These four dialects logically have linguistic differences so that in reality Old English cannot be considered as a homogeneous language.

2.2.3 Old High German

Old High German can be characterised as the oldest stage of the German language. Contrary to Old English, it is not an Ingvaeonic, but a confluence of partially Erminonic, i.e. Alemannic and Bavarian dialects, and partially Istvaeonic, i.e. Frankish languages. Erminonic and Istvaeonic are part of the tripartition of West Germanic made by Tacitus (in Lass 1994: 14). Just as Old English as not a straight-forward language with sharp demarcations, the Old High German boundaries concerning time, space and dialect are not absolute either. According to Geuenich (2000: 1144) Old High German came into being when the Old High German sound change starting in about 600 AD took place. Unfortunately, the earliest beginnings of the language are not available for research, as the oldest surviving glossary, the Abrogans, contains 3 manuscripts dating from about 800 (Sonderegger 2003: 68), which signifies there is a gap in our knowledge of 200 years. In investigating the syntactic field of Old High German, researchers depend on Isidor, the oldest manuscript displaying patterns of element order, dating from about 800 (Gerritsen 1984: 111). Even though it is important to keep in mind that languages never change overnight, the death of Notker in 1022 is frequently regarded as the symbolic end of Old High German. Sonderegger (in Geuenich 2000: 1145) illustrates the temporal heterogeneity of the language by dividing it into two: he distinguishes Early High German, lasting from 600 to 800, from Late High German, which started in 950 until the beginning of Early Middle German, which he puts in 1050-1070. Baesecke, von Polenz, and de Boor (all in Geuenich 2000: 1145) put forward an internal division of Old High German in relation to the
periods in which certain political leaders ruled. However, a segmentation into a period preceding Charlemagne’s reign, one in the course of his rule, one Carolingian and one Ottonian phase, has no bearing on the linguistic features of Old High German. Geographically, Tschirch (in Geuenich 2000: 1146) has drawn the attention to the fact that we are not competent to make statements concerning the Old High German dialects, for the rather small corpus available to us permits us only to research monastic dialects, and not entire regions.

![Diagram of Old High German dialects](Image)

Figure 2 from Sonderegger 2003: 78

Even though he is absolutely correct in his assertion, traditionally a dichotomy is proposed with Upper German on the one hand and Frankish on the other. The former is known as Oberdeutsch and includes the Bavarian, the Alemannic and presumably the Langobardian dialects. Bavarian was located in
contemporary Bavaria and Austria, i.e. in the southeast of present-day Germany as well as in the more southern areas. Alemannic, which is situated in the southwest, covers areas such as Switzerland, Alsace and the Southwest of Germany. Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about Langobardian. Frankish, on the other hand, is the dialect found in the North-West of the High German-speaking area, yet excluding the part north of the Benrather isogloss (Geuenich 2000: 1145), which separates the German dialects which underwent the Old High German sound change from those which have not undergone it.1

2.3 Research on Old English and Old High German element order

2.3.1 Introduction

Element order is a well-discussed topic in syntactic research and in order to investigate element order, it must first of all be made clear whether element order is free or not. In this light, the several factors influencing element order will be discussed exhaustively. Next, it is also important to understand linguistic change and its causes, i.e. linguistic drifts, communicative needs, reanalysis and non-linguistic factors. Though these are elaborated upon in studies on Old English, I believe that the majority of the mentioned causes can be applied to Old High German too. After providing a clear insight in the theories concerning the placement of the verb, i.e. the absolute position of the verb, the relative order of subject and verb, the position of the verb in relation to other clause elements and the theory of Gerritsen (1984), they will be applied to Old English and Old High German.

1 Personal communication with prof. dr. De Grauwe (10-03-2010)
2.3.2 Discussing the freedom of element order

There is great controversy over whether element order in Old English and in Old High German is free. Czichocki & Trempelmann (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 48) believe in the freedom of Old High German element order when regarding the placement of the verb in non-dependent clauses. They (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 39) assert that the position of the finite verb depends on communicative, and not grammatical stipulations. Braune ((1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 42-43) also deduces the same idea with regard to the freedom of Old High German element order from the same motivational grounds: the placement of the finite verb can be initial, medial or final in dependent as well as in non-dependent clauses. Sonderegger (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 43) agrees with Braune ((1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 42-43) with regard to the freedom of Old High German element order. Yet he adds that certain tendencies can be found: in non-dependent clauses the verb tends to be positioned in medial position, whereas in interrogative and imperative clauses, the verb in Old High German will more frequently be placed in initial position. 

Admoni (1990) adds a temporal dimension by focussing in his work on the evolution of element order starting with Indo European and ending with the modern languages. He states that element orders of early Indo-European languages were fairly fixed. These languages could evolve in two ways: either the element order became freer, as in Latin, or, on the contrary, they became more fixed, as for instance the English language. Today, these languages have reached an in between status: they are neither fully fixed, nor are they entirely free. He gives the example of German, in which the position of the verb is fixed and in which the position of other elements is free, i.e. their position depends on different factors. Researchers in Old English as well as in Old High German are rather careful when it comes to the fixation of element order, giving
rather vague statements, in which they cautiously reject the notion of an entirely free element order. Bosworth ((1826) in Kohonen 1978: 11), for instance, claims that Old English element order has a greater freedom than Latin or Greek, languages of which element order has been put on a par with Old English grammar for many centuries. Also Barrett ((1967) as cited in Davis 2006: 80) says that Old English element order is “reasonably firmly fixed in the main clause”. Quirk & Wrenn (1955: 87) concur, adding that the fixed patterns are largely similar to modern English element patterns. In other words, the idea that Old English or Old High German element order is completely free as well as the notion that element order is completely fixed are highly improbable. However, more research is needed to determine which elements are fixed in which situations. I believe that the obligatory elements, such as the subject and the verb are fixed, while the placement of elements, which do not add necessary information, as for instance adverbials, is more free. The truth is most likely to be found in between the two extremes.

2.3.3 Factors influencing element order

The first factor influencing element order involves grammatical rules which have had an influence on the arrangement of elements. According to Kohonen (1978: 40-41), the grammatical function is of primary importance: the elements mark syntactic functions such as object and predicate, co- or subordination of the clauses and type of sentence such as exclamative and interrogative. Even though this seems self-evident, researchers in the past have minimised the influence of grammar on element order. Meillet (in Admoni, 1990: 14, for instance, does not share the same opinion, by stating that the elements are non-dependent in Indo-European, meaning that element order cannot be altered by grammatical aspects, but that change is due to rhetorical
reasons only. Czichocki & Trempelmann (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 39) transfer Meillet’s idea to Old High German. Also Fries ((1943) in Kohonen 1978: 14) denies the importance of syntactic rules, claiming that element order in Old English was altered only for the purposes of style, stress, emphasis and the personal preferences of the author.

The second factor is the influence of the source language, as is proposed by Davis (2006: 98). Many Old High German and Old English texts are translations from Latin, which might have affected the target language lexically, phonologically, morphologically, orthographically and syntactically. Görlach (1999: 97) points out that the text-type can determine the degree in which the target text relies on the source text. Some texts, such as for instance interlinear glosses or sacred texts such as the Bible, will give preference to a verbatim reproduction of certain sentence structures. This has been a common and easy explanation for deviations of base structures in the past, yet now, researchers try to find other interpretations. I will not go in further detail, for the main reason why I chose to analyse the homilies by Wulfstan and by the author of Predigtsammlung B, is because the former are not translations, and the latter, despite the fact it is based on a Latin text, is not not a literal translation.

Thirdly, as Priebsch & Collinson (in Davis 2006: 102-103) point out, element order can also be affected by psychological factors, i.e. the state that related elements tend to be placed together, which conforms to Jespersen’s notion of cohesion ((1949) in Kohonen 1978: 13). By saying that the more important elements are placed later in the clause, they make a statement resembling the idea of theme-rheme, a notion coined by Firbas ((1964) in Bean 2001: 24), who explains the
functional sentence perspective of the Prague School Linguists. According to these functional linguists, known information is placed in the theme, the first section of the sentence, whereas unknown information should be located in the rheme, the end of the sentence. This is a reaction to Delbrück’s notion (in Davis 2006: 103) that important words are placed more towards the front of the utterance, but also to Jespersen’s idea of actuality ((1949) in Kohonen 1978: 13), which means that the order of words is conform to the stream of the speaker’s ideas. In the light of the idea of theme-rheme, McKnight’s notion ((1897) in Kohonen 1978: 12) of subjective element order should be mentioned. This signifies that the sentence elements are arranged in order of their familiarity with the speaker.

Fourth, many deviations from the basic element order are caused by stylistic considerations in poetry, but occasionally also in prose. These deviations are coined as “euphonical” by Smith ((1893) in Kohonen 1978: 12). Davis (2006: 97-98) adds that poetic features such as metre, stress and alliteration can also alter element order. Emphasis (Keller in Davis 2006: 102), for instance, often alters element order by fronting the direct or indirect object, resulting into unusual constructions especially in written texts (Kohonen 1978: 42). Rhythmic factors are described by Priebsch & Collinson (in Davis 2006: 103) and Jespersen ((1949) in Kohonen 1978: 13). Priebsch and Collinson (in Davis 2006: 103) provide the law of increment, which determines the “alternation of strong and weak syllables”. Exceptions to the rule are caused by stress, hesitation, contrast, and the parallel placement of dependent and non-dependent clauses. However, it is not clear to which extent rhythm can influence element orders. Barrett ((1967) in Kohonen 1978: 16), for example, compares rhythmic and narrative prose. He distinguished the element order patterns
in main clauses from those in dependent clauses. The former would principally contain SVOA or SvOV structures, whereas the latter would be characterised by SOV(v) patterns.

Fifthly, the weight of elements is a generally acknowledged factor which can determine the position of the elements. However, there are several criteria upon which the determination of the weight rests. For instance, there are Smith’s rhetorical grounds ((1893) in Kohonen 1978: 12), by which he means “the relative weight and importance intended by the author” (Kohonen 1978: 12). Świeczkowski ((1962) in Kohonen 1978: 16) proposes that the weight of the elements is semantic, putting forward the notion of ‘semantic load’. The weight of elements can also be regarded from a merely grammatical point of view, assigning elements syntactic functions as subject and predicate. Reszkiewicz ((1966) in Kohonen 1978: 16) associates weight rather with size and complexity than with semantic meaning, stating that the weight increases towards the end of the clause. In other words, heavier elements are placed clause-finally, which conforms to Behaghel’s Law of Accumulating Elements (in Admoni 1990: 78), to which Meineke (2001: 323) reacts by stating that many exceptions are possible and that heavy elements can be placed within the brace of the sentence. On the other hand, Meineke (2001: 323) claims that light words can never be exbraciated. Clause structures deviating from this pattern are exceptional, and therefore considered as marked. Not only the semantic load, the size or the complexity can matter, also the number of syllables of an element could help determine its weight (Davis 2006: 52). Firbas ((1959) in Kohonen 1978: 22) proposes yet another criterion, i.e. “the number of syntactic distinctions”. This means that a verb is considered to be heavier when it can express number, mood, tense, voice and person, than a verb which can only express a few of the
previous. The theory itself is easy: the lighter an element, the more likely it is to be positioned towards the front of the clause, whereas Keller (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 40) claims that a heavy element, i.e. a qualified noun, will more probably be placed later in the clause. Moreover complements can be positioned pre- or post-verbally. The weight is, among others such as style, a decisive factor: light elements tend to be placed before and heavy elements after the verb. Fourquet ((1938) in Davis 2006: 96) claims that elements precede the verb, when they are light and are placed in subordinate clauses, or when they are heavy and “form a unity with the verb”. In contrast, elements follow the verb in main clauses when heavy or in subordinate clauses when light. Wackernagel’s Law (in Lass 1994: 226-227) states that the light second position of a non-dependent clause, which is the least stressed position in Indo European should be filled in by a light element, such as enclitics, but also by light verbs, such as copulae, causing verb second.

Now, many linguists have tried to categorise different word classes according to the principle. The original division between light and heavy was established by Todt and Ries ((1894; 1907) in Davis 2006: 76). According to Wackernagel (in Lass 1994: 226-227), light elements are unstressed elements, including enclitics, pronouns and light verbs such as copulas and tense/aspect auxiliaries. Kohonen (1978: 22) is fairly vague in his theory, for he states that in Old English, nouns and adjectives are heavier than the finite verb. He furthermore refers to Delbrück ((1911) in Kohonen 1978: 22), stressing the lightness of auxiliaries and ultimately offering an explanation for the verb second rule. Davis (2006: 59) proposes a tripartition: light elements are pronouns and one-word adverbials, elements with medium weight are unqualified nouns, i.e. nouns without adjectives preceding it, and adverbials containing 2 words. Last, heavy elements are
qualified nouns, i.e. they are preceded by adjectives, except when they are qualified "only by a demonstrative, or possessive pronoun or adjective" (Davis 2006: 59), they are of medium weight.

Finally, the type of clause (Jespersen (1949) in Kohonen 1978: 13) determines element order, as dependent and non-dependent, interrogative and declarative clauses present different element sequences.

This section has dealt with several factors affecting the basic element order. First of all, the language pattern can be affected by grammatical rules. Similar to the idea that a language can cause another language to change its entire grammatical system, a language, especially Latin, can also to a smaller extent affect the normal element order. Priebsch & Collinson (in Davis 2006: 102-103) assert that also psychological factors can influence the placement of the elements. This signifies that related elements must be placed together and also that known information must be uttered before unknown information. It also often occurs that poetic stylistic features, such as metre, rhyme, figures of speech, and the like, have an influence on element order. However, the narrative religious prose investigated here, will not be very liable to this. The weight of the elements have also been subject to this debate, for it is believed that light elements tend to be placed more towards the front, and heavier elements more towards the end of the clause. Last, the type of text, as well as the type of clause might influence the element order.
2.3.4 **Causes for linguistic change (in Old English)**

2.3.4.1 **Linguistic drifts**

The first factors influencing language change can be linked to Sapir’s Old English drifts ((1921) in Kohonen 1978: 22), of which the two most important ones are the loss of inflections and the fixation of element order. These two drifts are strongly entangled.

Pillsbury ((1967) in Kohonen 1978: 15) regards this entanglement as a shift from one syntactic system into another: the system in which inflections are used to refer to syntactic functions is replaced by a system which uses element order. West ((1973) in Kohonen 1978: 15), a structuralist who also deals with element order, claims that the shift explained by Pillsbury ((1967) in Kohonen 1978: 15) took place about 900, after which mostly SVO structures are found in surviving texts. Nonetheless, researchers today more or less agree with Mitchell (1985: 985), who states that the syntactic functions were made apparent by element order as well as by case endings.

However, as Kohonen (1978: 15) asserts, no general consensus among researchers as to which process was the cause of the other has been reached.

A first possibility can be found in Jespersen ((1922) in Davis 2007: 76), who maintains that element order fixation causes the weakening and disappearance of case endings, stating that the language would have gone through a phase of ambiguity and unintelligibility if the process progressed in the other direction. Logically, neither inflections nor element order would then indicate the syntactic functions taken by the clause elements. Similarly, Magers ((1943) in Kohonen 1978:
writes that element order was already of importance before inflectional levelling.

The ambiguity proposed by Jespersen ((1922) in Davis 2007: 76) is confirmed by Saitz ((1955) in Kohonen 1978: 14), who claims that lexis and context could not prevent ambiguities concerning the nominal subject and object, arising from the loss of inflection, to disappear. These ambiguities forced the Old English speaker not to rely on inflectional case endings only, but to take into account element order, lexical compatibility, suprasegmental properties such as intonation, and syntactic assistance of auxiliaries and prepositions as well. I nevertheless believe that the idea of unintelligibility can be neglected, for both element order and inflectional endings have a syntactic function.

Another possibility is posited by Carlton ((1970) in Kohonen 1978: 21), who thought that both the loss of inflections as well as the fixation of element order occurred at the same time, thus avoiding the idea of causality.

A third possibility is provided by Closs-Traugott ((1972) in Kohonen 1978: 21), who proposes a cyclical system, in which the inflections first weakened, causing element order to be more fixed, which resulted in a further levelling of inflections. A similar theory is proposed by Venneman ((1973) in Bean 2001: 49), who supposes that phonological change caused the decline of inflections, which would cause ambiguity, which was in its turn prevented by the fixation of element order. In a cyclical movement, sound change “degrades the positionally fixed independent function words of the language into a new morphology, which makes the word order rules redundant and leads to their loss” (Vennemann (1973) as cited in Bean 2001: 49). The grammatical rules concerning element order declines, and morphology flourishes again.

Fourthly, Keller (in Davis 2006: 101) also proposes that the loss of inflections precedes the syntactic fixation of element
order, yet, he does not believe these changes happened cyclically. He supposes that word accent shifted to the beginning of the word in Common Germanic times, as a consequence of which the case endings were less stressed, weakening the full suffix vowels and therefore affecting syntax and the transparency of syntactic functions.

The syntactic function itself of element order and of case endings has also been the subject of discussion. Fries ((1940) in Kohonen 1978: 14) claims that the grammatical function of clause elements is only made clear by inflections, which means that element order merely has a connotative function. Element order is a mere reflection of the order of ideas. Kohonen (1978: 15) himself asserts that element order had a grammatical function, i.e. to distinguish the subject from the object, a statement which he has derived from the idea that SVO became a frequent, unmarked pattern from about 900 AD onwards (West (1973) in Kohonen 1978: 15) and from Saitz’ idea ((1955) in Kohonen 1978: 15) that OS-structure was rather marked. Kohonen (1978: 15) adds that not only inflections, but also “lexical compatibility, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, and word order” have syntactic functions.

It is also important to mention that uninflected languages can depend on element order alone, whereas inflected languages cannot exclude element order. In other words, both types of languages, whether inflected or uninflected, have to rely on element order to a certain extent. However, deviations from the normal element order patterns occur more often in inflected languages (Sweet (1898) in Kohonen 1978: 12). As McKnight ((1897) in Bean 2001: 17) formulates: “Inflecting languages may have greater freedom to obey the dictates of subjective ordering”. Moreover, according to Mitchell (1985: 970), the loss of inflection did not cause
ambiguity, for the subject and the object in structures as OVS and OSV were clear due to the context.

2.3.4.2 Communicative needs

Second, communicative needs are proposed as an explanation for morpho-syntactic change. Kohonen (1978: 21) argues that Old English element order changed to avoid ambiguity caused by SOV patterns, in which the function of nominal subjects and objects were no longer distinguished by means of inflections, and to steer clear of complexity due to the placement of a high number of elements between the subject and the verb. This was resolved by changing syntactically into an SVO-structure, in which element order rather than inflectional endings clarifies the syntactic function of both subject and object by placing the former pre- and the latter post-verbally. Bean (2001) on the other hand, relates to McKnight ((1897) in Bean 2001: 29), who contends that the movement of the verb from final to second position is causally related to its loss in semantic meaning.

2.3.4.3 Reanalysis

For the third motive, Bean (2001) refers to Li & Thompson ((1974) in Bean 2001: 37-39), who maintain that the process of creating simple sentences out of complex ones is due to a change in morphology and lexis. By studying the return of an SVO structure into SOV in Chinese, they say that this process takes place by means of the replacement of phrasal verbs by structures consisting out of a prepositional phrase or case marker and a verb. They claim that this would mean that an SVOV structure would be replaced by an SOV structure, in which the object is preceded by a case marker. However, Bean (2001) critically remarks that Li & Thompson ((1974) in Bean 2001: 39) have incorrectly focussed on SVOV structures as their
point of departure, adding that also SVO and SVOVO would be structures needed to be included in their investigation. According to her, SVO patterns would not change, whereas SVOVO would be altered into SPPVO structures and SVOV into SPPV. In other words, when taking all the possible structures into account, verb final structure occurs only once. Lord ((1973) in Bean 2001: 39) claims that “reanalysis of serial verbs is not sufficient in and of itself to cause a shift from SVX to SXV order”. Bean (2001: 39) states that the thesis of Li & Thompson ((1974) in Bean 2001: 37-39), in which they claim that the finite verb of a periphrastic clause will be reanalysis by a preposition and a verb, is not the only way for a language to change its element order pattern.

Another example of reanalysis is provided by Vennemann ((1984) in Weerman 1989: 1), who proposes the concept of unisententiation by which he explains the rise of verb final and verb second as the norm in subordinate clauses and main clauses respectively. As already explained above, sentences in Indo European originally entailed an SOV structure. According to Vennemann ((1984) in Weerman 1989: 1), there was a process in which two sentences merged into one sentence with a main and a subordinate clause. In the former clause, the verb tended to be placed to the front, but as the first position was already taken for anaphoric purposes, the verb was placed in second position. By contrast, the verb was placed finally in the latter clause.

Another example is provided by Gerritsen (1984: 119), who relates the predominant use of a synthetical verb system in Old English with the rise of exbraciation. Stockwell (1977) in Gerritsen 1984: 119) proposes, apart from the frequent use of simple verbs, three other factors for causing Old English to exbricate, i.e. the “[e]xtrapolation of relative clauses, conjuncts and appositives”, the “[p]ostdeposition of adverbs and afterthoughts” and the “[r]ightward movement of sentential
objects and subjects”. However, Gerritsen (1984: 119-120) believes that the latter three are far less important. In other words, she asserts that the change in English and the Scandinavian language from embracing into exbraciating languages and the preservation of embraciation in German, Frisian and Dutch is caused by the degree in which these languages used simplex or complex verbs during the period of exbraciation. According to her, the synthetical verb system was then more frequent in Old English and the Old Scandinavian languages than in Old High German, Old Frisian and Old Dutch.

2.3.4.4 Non-linguistic factors

Last, Kohonen (1978: 22-24) introduces non-linguistic factors which might have influenced the change in Old English. The movement of the Anglo-Saxons to Britain resulted in the fact that all linguistic relations with the tribes which remained behind were broken. In contrast, contact with other languages, i.e. Old Norse and Norman-French, might have had an influence on the levelling of inflectional endings. Fennell ((2001) in Van Herreweghe 2008-2009: 64-65) agrees, yet he points out that the inflections were not entirely lost. In other words, pidgin languages must have existed in the tenth and eleventh century and in the eleventh, twelfth and even thirteenth century under the influence of Old Norse and Norman French respectively. However, as the inflectional system (partially) remained, Middle English cannot be regarded as a creole language. Furthermore, Labov ((1970; 1971) in Kohonen 1978: 23) stresses the fact that social, economic and geographical factors will render new insights in linguistic research and will offer rules for cases of free variation. Bever & Langedoen ((1971; 1972) in Kohonen 1978: 23) assert that “perceptual strategies and learnability” triggered linguistic change.
Causes for linguistic change proposed in the literature are the following: linguistic drifts, communicative needs, the reanalysis of complex verbs, and non-linguistic factors. The most important drifts are the fixation of element order and the loss of inflections. Both are intermingled closely, yet their causal relation is not yet clear. The period of syntactic change, which was caused by phonological changes, might have caused a stage of ambiguity according to some researchers. Second, Old English changed from SOV into SVO in order to avoid ambiguity and complexity. Another proposed, but already contradicted reason is that the periphrastic verbs might have been reanalysed as prepositions combined with a simple verb, changing the clause pattern from SVOV into SOV. Last, Kohonen (1978: 22-24) proposes that the absence or presence of contact with other languages and tribes have affected Old English syntax.

2.3.5 Theories on the placement of the verb

2.3.5.1 Introduction

This section deals with the theories regarding the placement of the verb, beginning with studies on the absolute position of the verb, continuing with studies concerning the relation between subject and verb, proceeding with a section concerning element order theories regarding the position of the verb in relation to other elements, and ending with the Gerritsen’s theory (1984).
2.3.5.2 **The absolute position of the verb in the clause**

There are different ways of investigating surface syntax with respect to verb placement. Most often, researchers focus on declarative principal clauses, yet some include other clause types into their analyses. Most easily, yet most primitively, a focus on the position of the finite verb, without taking other elements or factors into consideration, is a possibility. Verb placement is represented as V1, V2, V3, ... and verb final referring to initial, second, third, ... and final position of the finite verb respectively (Bean 2001: 98). The absolute verbal position has especially been used for examining Old High German by following researchers. Czichocki & Trempelmann (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 48) consider the placement of the finite verb in principal clauses as rather arbitrary. However, they also relate V1 to declarative and to conditional clauses in Old High German. Braune ((1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 45) states that all three positions (verb first, verb second as well as verb final) are normal element orders in Old High German, yet he poses that verb second is the order to be used in main clauses. However, Naumann (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 45) does not acknowledge verb second as a normal pattern. Instead he claims that verb first and verb final are used in non-dependent clauses, each used for different stylistic considerations. Many researchers (Diels, Priebsch & Collinson and Fourquet (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 47) concur with Naumann (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 45) that verb second is considered to be the normal pattern. Schrodt (2004: 197) also investigates verb first, verb second and verb final by comparing the Indo European and Common Germanic patterns with the element orders of the Germanic languages. In Indo European, V1 was only used for connection and emphasis, verb second was rare and was only enclitically used, while verb final was the normal, unmarked order in declarative sentences. Van Bree (1990: 208) agrees
with the latter, as he describes Indo European as an SOV language. Yet, Schrodt (2004: 197) points out that the final position of the finite verb was not absolute: other elements, which are not obligatory in the sentence, could be placed after the finite verb. When the Germanic languages developed, the element order patterns shifted. Final position was no longer the norm, but became a marker of subordinate clauses. Verb second was not a rarely used pattern anymore, but was the norm in main clauses in all Germanic languages. Ebert (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 49) maintains that verb second was the standard in principal clauses, yet he admits that exceptions can occur. Bernhardt & Davis (1997: 49) agree that the second position of the finite verb is the standard. Exceptions can indeed occur under special circumstances. Diels (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 47-48) acknowledges the importance of the weight of the introductory elements by subdividing clauses with verb second into two groups, one in which the first element is nominal and fully stressed, and one in which the initial element is a pronominal element.

Theories, in which only absolute verbal placement is taken into consideration, are unable to provide a correct and complete view on Old Germanic element order patterns, for they do not include the relative positions of the subject, the object(s) and the adverbial(s). Consequently, important linguistic features, such as inversion for instance, cannot be examined, because the relation between the finite verb and the subject is not taken into account. The idea that verb first would implicitly encompass inversion, is incorrect, since under certain circumstances, for instance in imperative clauses, the subject is not an obligatory element. Next, verb second does not necessarily mean that the clause portrays an SVO structure, for also OVS, i.e. inversion, can be found in V2 clauses. Another limitation of this approach is that no clear-cut consensus can be given. Some researchers also
include the conjunction, as for instance Kohonen ((1976) in Bean 2001: 206-209) distinguishes clauses introduced by *ond* or *ac* in Old English, others, such as Barrett (in Davis 2006: 80) do not acknowledge the importance of the conjunction, which affects the results concerning the position of the elements. In other words, researchers have not agreed whether the verb stands in first or in second position in the clauses such as for example clause 84, taken from the Wulfstan excerpt in this dissertation:

84. VO 7 weorpæp his gefystan eallum heora mihtum.

I believe the conjunction must be included in the clause structure, for, even though the coordinating conjunction 7 does not have a syntactic function, subordinating and coordinating conjunctions influence the element order. In my opinion, only the elements explicit in the clause should be taken into consideration. In other words, I believe that the finite verb *weorpæp* is placed in second position, not because one could imagine that the absent subject should precede the *weorpæp*, but because the conjunction 7 is placed initially.

Thus, this section presents a short summary of research on verb first, second, ..., final in Old High German. Though Braune ((1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 45) amongst others believe that all three orders are normal in Old High German non-dependent clauses, others believe that verbal positions can be perceived as neutral or marked, depending on the clause type they occur in. Ebert (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 49) and Bernhardt & Davis (1997: 49) both believe that verb second is not a marked position in Old High German non-dependent clauses. Schrodt (2004: 198) agrees, but adds a tripartition, in which verb first is regarded as a marked order, verb second as neutral in main clauses and verb final as normal in subordinate clauses in all the Germanic languages.
This way of examining is limited for it does not only neglect other clause elements, which omits the possibility of investigating linguistic phenomena such as inversion, but it also provides an incomplete and undetailed image of verb second, which can encompass orders as SVO as well as OVS. Moreover, no consensus has been reached when it comes to including clause elements such as conjunctions, hindering the comparison of different studies.

2.3.5.3 The relative order of subject and verb

Fortunately, the position of the verb relative to the subject has also been investigated. Whereas much research on Old High German element order has focussed on absolute element order, Old English syntactic studies have concentrated on the relative order of subject and verb. Many researchers, such as Campbell (in Mitchell 1985: 961) and Baker (2004: 112), propose three basic clause element order types for Old English: SV, i.e. the verb follows the subject immediately, S...V, i.e. the verb follows the verb, yet one or more clause elements are placed between the subject and the verb, and VS, which means that the verb precedes the subject. The three basic element orders are considered to be complementary in usage. According to Mitchell (1985: 963), SV is used in Old English non-dependent clauses, VS in main clauses when an adverb precedes, and S...V in main clauses after ond and in subordinate clauses. Smith’s view ((1893) in Bean 2001: 193) is very similar to Mitchell’s (1985: 963), yet he adds some nuances and details. To SV, or a “normal” order, he adds that the non-finite verb has to follow the finite verb and that its position (immediately after the finite verb, separated or even in final position) is arbitrary. To VS, or inverted element order, he adds that it has a unifying or emphasising function. S...V, or the “transposed” order, can, according to him, only
rarely occur in main clauses, e.g. when a pronominal object is placed pre-verbally for rhythmical considerations. Similar to Smith, Betten (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 42) states that SV is the normal pattern, and VS is marked. However, Scherer (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 42) disagrees, as for him, inversion is the normal element order.

An extra distinction is often added, i.e. S...V, in which the verb is in final position, is different from S...V... in which the verb is followed by a clause element. Why this element is placed after the verb, is not always clear. According to Robinson (1993: 165), it can be due to the element’s heavy weight. Also, the idea of afterthought is proposed (Hyman (1975) in Bean 2001: 41). Schrot’s notion on S...V and S...V... in Old High German (2004: 202) can be transposed to Old English as well. Although he recognises the distinction, he approaches both patterns as orders with final position, for he claims that it is hard to see the difference between a verb being placed in a sentence later than second position and a verb originally positioned finally, but with certain superfluous clause elements exbraciated. The distinction between SV and S...V also needs clarification (Mitchell 1985: 964): in the former, only adverbs and phrases can be placed between the subject and the verb, whereas in the latter, the separation of subject and verb is obligatory and is caused by the insertion of any other element.

This section has elaborated upon Old English research relying on the syntactic relation between subject and verb. Three major orders, i.e. SV, S...V and VS, as well as one minor order, i.e. S...V... (in opposition to S...V), can be discriminated. When inquiring the environment in which these patterns can occur, most researchers agree to Mitchell’s exposition (1985: 963), which tells that SV is the normal order in principal clauses, S...V in non-dependent clauses introduced by ond and in
subordinate clauses, and VS in main clauses in which the first element is an adverb. However, others, such as Smith ((1893) in Bean 2001: 193-194) believes that S...V can only rarely occur in non-dependent clauses. Similar to the previous section on the absolute order of Old High German elements, researchers have attempted to distinguish neutral and marked orders. However, no consensus has been reached.

2.3.5.4 The position of the verb in relation to other clause elements

The verb can be analysed not only in relation to the subject, but also in relation to other clause elements. Often, the placement of the object, direct or indirect, is investigated, resulting into element order types as SOV, SVO, OVS, and the like. In the same light, other clause elements such as the adverb and the complement can be included in element order research. Behaghel (1932: 88-123), for example, examines the relative position of the finite verb with regard to the participle(s) and the infinitive(s) in Old High German.

Also the type of the elements can be taken into account. Johanssen ((1968) in Bean 2001: 204-206), makes a distinction between the nominal (written by means of a capital) and pronominal (represented by a small letter) variants of the elements. He proposes patterns such as S Vo, sVO, SoV and sVo in Old English. Mitchell (1985) distinguishes the finite verb (v) from the non-finite verb forms (V) in periphrastic clauses. The periphrastic variant of SV is S vV, which he exemplifies with examples from Ælfric’ Homilies, for instance: “ÆCHom i. 28. 12 He hæfd gerymed rihtwisum mannum infær to his riche” (Mitchell 1985: 966). When the order is S...V(...), the finite verb follows the non-finite verb form, which is for instance indicated in Ælfric’ Homilies i. 14. 22 “hu heo hatan sceolde (Mitchell 1985: 967). When the periphrastic element
order is inverted, two different orders are possible: vSV and vVS, for which Mitchell (1985: 969) gives the following examples: “ÆCHom i. 92. 16 Sarai wæs his wif gehaten” and “ÆCHom i. 76. 16 Manna wæs gehaten se heofenlica mete”.

In other words, element order can be studied in greater or lesser detail. In this research, subject, finite verb, and object will be closely examined, not neglecting the importance of elements such as adverbials and conjunctions.

2.3.5.5 Gerritsen

Gerritsen (1984) studies the change in the use of embraciation and inversion in the Germanic languages, starting from the earliest surviving records up to their modern stages. She subdivides the languages in three groups: one without inversion or embraciation, one with only inversion and no embraciation, and one with both. The first group only encompasses English, the second all the Scandinavian languages, and the third German, Frisian and Dutch (Gerritsen 1984: 110). As already stated in the introduction, testing her entire investigation would be far beyond the scope of this dissertation. Therefore, I will concentrate on her findings on element order and inversion in Old English and in Old High German only.

For the former, she uses Stockwell’s interpretation (in Gerritsen 1984: 113) of Bean’s data of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1976 in Gerritsen 1984: 113), pointing out that for Early Old English inversion in declarative main clauses is rarely attested. However, the frequency of inversion increased up to 100% in the year 1001, after which it decreased steadily and it occurred more and more scarcely from the fourteenth century onwards until today. In other words, from the fourteenth century onwards, verb second order was entirely replaced by verb third order.
Because Gerritsen (1984: 110) believes that of all Old Germanic languages only Old English behaves differently, she pays less attention to the evolution in verb placement and inversion in declarative non-dependent clauses in Old High German, stating that in Isidor, the oldest surviving Old High German text dating from approximately 800, inversion was frequently employed. She concludes that verb second position became obligatory, as it still is in Modern High German. Gerritsen (1984: 114-118) then proposes different explanations for why inversion became obligatory in English, but not in German. First, stylistic factors could have had an influence in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Bean (in Gerritsen 1984: 114-115) claims that the use of inversion in sentences in which a clause element other than the subject is fronted, is due to the use of a vivid style in the Late Old English section of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Fourquet (in Gerritsen 1984: 115) ascribes it to Ælfred’s attempt to set up a literary tradition in the vernacular. Second, Gerritsen (1984: 115) proposes the linguistic explanations by Givón (in Gerritsen 1984: 115), Stockwell (in Gerritsen 1984: 115) and Venneman (in Gerritsen 1984: 115), that English has developed according to a natural drift, in which a language shifts from SOV over (X)SVO towards SVO. Last, the influence of the Scandinavian invasions and settlements of the end of the ninth and the tenth centuries and the impact of the Norman Conquest from 1066 until about 1200 are proposed as possible explanations.

Gerritsen’s study (1984) is restricted in various ways. First, it only concentrates on declarative main clauses. Other clauses, such as exclamative and several kinds of dependent clauses, are not taken into account, not making a detailed perception of the Germanic languages as a whole possible. My study will attempt to cover inversion in a more differentiated range of clauses. Moreover, Gerritsen (1984: 109) only focuses on the traditional Germanic languages by excluding the more
recent Germanic languages such as Yiddish and Afrikaans. I can only agree, when she motivates her choice by claiming that they “have only come into existence relatively recently and which have been strongly influenced by members of other language families” (Gerritsen, 1984: 109). Additionally, she focuses only on standardised forms of the languages, defending her choice by saying that, though more research is still needed, the different dialects do not differ from the standardised variants in terms of element order. As Gerritsen (1984: 128) admits, more research is still needed, as a result of which it is too soon to utter strong statements and as a result of which the comparison of different dialects with respect to element order would be even more valuable. Also, Gerritsen (1984: 111) only uses one text for each Germanic language (the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for Old English and Isidor for Old High German), which does not only limit the comparative analysis, but it can also yield false results, due to stylistic factors, such as emphasis, rhyme, metre, and the like. A comparison between more texts can get us a broader view, for different genres and styles can influence element order. Gerritsen (1984), on the other hand, does not think style has such an impact on element order, claiming that it is improbable that “a language that never embraces will suddenly start doing so in a certain style” (Gerritsen 1984: 110). I do agree, but, on the other hand, I wonder whether the influence of style is as weak on inversion as it is on embraciation.
2.3.6 Element order, inversion and negation in Old English

2.3.6.1 Introduction

The relative orders of subject and verb are most thoroughly discussed in Old English studies. Unfortunately, the object and the adverbials are not always taken into consideration. Though Old English is generally considered to be an SOV language (van Kemenade 1994: 135), other structures can also be found. In this section, the structures SV, VS, S...V(...) as well as negation will be explained.

2.3.6.2 SV

i General

In SV patterns, the finite verb does not always have to follow the subject immediately. On the contrary, pronoun objects as well as adverbs can be placed in between the finite verb and the subject (Mitchell & Robinson 2007: 63-64), which is supported by for instance clause 36:

36.SOV ac we hi habbađ syddan fylede swyđe 7 mid urum synnum þearly besmitene.

Here, the subject we is separated from the finite verb habbađ by the direct object hi.

ii Occurrence

The frequent occurrence of SV order in principal as well as in subordinate clauses can be ascribed to the fact that this order is also possible after the fronting of an adverbial, object or conjunction (Mitchell 1985: 964-965). Now, if a pronominal object is fronted, resulting in an OSV structure, Mitchell (1985: 965) declares that context, case or intonation would help avoid the occurrence of ambiguity between subject and object since the unmarked order is SVO.
SV is not restricted to declarative clauses; in interrogatives, and in certain yes/no questions with an introducing element (i.e. *hwæber* to be more precise), SV can also occur. In subordinate clauses, Quirk & Wrenn (1955: 94) describe the presence of an SV-structure in causal, resultative and nominal clauses, which they exemplify with the clauses *for þæm hiora cyning wæs gewundod on þæm gefeohhte, þat hīē gedydon on ānre wēstre ceastre*, and *hē sæde dat Nordmannan land wēre swēbe lang* respectively (Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 94).

2.3.6.3 **VS**

i **Function**

According to Schmidt (in Davis 2006: 78), inversion has not maintained the same function over the centuries and therefore occurs under different circumstances in Old English than in modern times. Snegireva ((1962) in Mitchell 1985: 978) asserts that inversion was used for emphasis, for it had a contrasting function with other orders. It was also used as a narrative technique, for it helped to link up sentences more easily or to introduce new information by shifting it to the end of the clause. The inverted element order could also mark the personal preference of the author (Quirk & Wrenn in Mitchell 1985: 976), or it could be the effect of stylistic considerations, such as for instance balance or the desire for chiasmus (Robinson in Mitchell 1985: 976).

ii **Frequency**

On the other hand, it might be possible that inversion was not that frequent. Gardner ((1971) in Bean 2001: 200-202) examined the A manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from the beginning until 902 and the Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan, written by Orosius, in order to obtain a clear understanding of Early Old English, and studied the A manuscript of the
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle dating from 903 until 1070 as well as the homilies of Ælfric and one Blickling Homily in order to obtain an insight into Late Old English. In studying the occurrence of prepositional phrases, she asserts that VSPP occurred less often in the later stages of Old English (29.6%) than in its early beginnings (40.5%). Unfortunately, she did not examine the phenomenon of inversion in general. She also failed at the same area as many have: she has not taken the several clause types into account, as a consequence of which her data cannot be used in more detailed research. Bean (2001: 100), too, claims that OVS was not frequently used, almost only occurring when the object is pronominal. In other words, no unambiguous conclusion can be drawn yet.

### iii Occurrence

#### a. Principal clauses

The appearance of inversion is most thoroughly discussed in non-dependent declarative clauses. Most researchers, as for instance Görlach (1999: 97), concur that the fronting of an adverb causes inversion in non-dependent clauses, but many have found that the influence of a topicalised adverb can differ, depending on the adverb itself. Mitchell (1985: 971-972), for instance, maintains that þær ‘there’, þanon ‘thence’ and þider ‘thither’ only tend to be followed by inversion, whereas after þa ‘then’ and þonne ‘then’, inversion may be considered as the norm. However, when the principal clause is negated, þa and þonne could, according to Mitchell (1985: 972), precede as well as follow the finite verb. An example of post-verbal placement of þonne can be found in the negated main clause 87 of the excerpt:

87.VSO Ne byrhþ se gesibba þonne gesibban þe ma þe þam fremdan

Brown ((1970) in Bean 2001: 199) adds that other adverbials, such as oft, forþæm, be þæm, þa, and the negative particle ne
are found with an inverted element order. Similar is van Kemenade’s statement (1994: 136) that inversion will occur in main clauses after *pa, ne, or a wh-question word. The structure adverb - verb can be explained by means of Campbell’s assertion (in Mitchell 1985: 974) that there is a tendency towards verb second in Old English, which means that inversion occurs when an adverb, or any element other than the subject is placed initially. Van Kemenade (1994: 135-136) on the other hand, does not seek an explication in the placement of the finite verb. She believes that inversion takes place when an element other than the subject or a wh-question word takes initial position of the main clause and when the subject is a noun. When the subject is pronominal, the inverted order of subject and verb did not occur in Old English. This is supported by clause 59, the only main clause of the excerpt with a fronted adverbial and with SV order, but in the meantime also the only clause with initial adverbial and a pronominal subject:

59.SV  Eac hit awrten is,

No consensus is found among researchers when it comes to this topic. Bean (2001: 236) for instance does not support Campbell’s idea (in Mitchell 1985: 974) that the occurrence of inversion due to the fronting of any element other than the subject is a tendency, for she did not find evidence for this assertion in her research on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In her opinion, here inversion is rather a feature of the narrative style of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle rather than proof for the establishment of the verb second rule. This is in accordance with Baker’s idea (2004: 114) that inversion is rather frequent in Old English, because *pa*-sentences are frequent in the Old English narrative tradition. However, Kohonen ((1976) in Bean 2001: 206 - 209), who has also studied Ælfric’s Homilies, ascertains that inversion occurs in 66% of the
instances when an element other than the subject is placed initially. On the other hand, only 1% of the clauses display an inverted element order when the clause is not introduced by an introductory element. More specifically, the frequency of occurrence of inversion is determined by the type of element introducing the clause. He states that the topicalisation of one word adverbials as well as of negative particle ne results into a high frequency of inversion, not depending on the length or givenness of the subject. However, when the introductory element is an object, a complement or an adverbial consisting of more than one word, inversion is less frequent and is, in contrast to the previous, determined by both length and givenness of the subject. Mitchell (1985: 973) also proposes AdvVOSO pattern, in which the first O is a pronominal object, and the second an apposition containing a clause with a pronoun.

Not only adverbs or adverbials can trigger inversion in the principal clause, also clauses introduced by and/ond, ac and other coordinating conjunctions are frequently found with VS-patterns (Mitchell 1985: 976-977). Moreover, Mitchell (1985: 974-975) refers to verb first patterns in clauses with a verb of saying, an impersonal verb with a nominal subject - similar to Modern English constructions introduced by it - and the Old English idioms is forði þonne and wæs da, now replaced by there was/ there is. Also when an object, i.e. a direct or indirect object, or a dative of interest, is fronted, VS will follow (Mitchell 1985: 969). According to Kohonen ((1976) in Bean 2001: 206-209), VS, has, though infrequently, also been attested in main clauses when neither of the above elements are placed before the verb in initial position. Van Kemenade (1994: 136) adds another factor for inversion: the weight of the subject. She asserts that heavy subjects tend to be placed more towards the end of the clause.
According to Mitchell (1985: 962), an inverted element order can be found in positive and negative yes/no questions as well as in questions introduced by a wh-question word. Mitchell & Robinson (2007: 64) add that the presence of a head word is of no importance to the inversion in positive interrogative main clauses. Several inverted element orders are proposed for interrogative clauses. Görlach (1999: 97), who studies the Late Old English stage, proposes a VSO as well as a VOS order. Quirk & Wrenn (1955: 93) on the other hand, indicate not only a VSO/C order, but also a topicalised order with O/CVS, which occurs when the head word, i.e. the interrogative introductory element, consists of a pronoun or an interrogative followed by a noun, for which they provide the example: "Hwilce fixas gefēhst dú?" (Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 93), for which they give the translation "What fishes do you catch?" (Quirk & Wrenn 1955, 93).

As already pointed out above, the imperative is placed in initial position in commands (Lass 1994: 221, Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 93). Verb first does not always entail inversion, for sometimes, the subject is omitted. Mitchell (1985: 962) clarifies this by stating that the subject is deleted when the imperative clause is positive, and that the subject is present when the clause is negative. Yet, he adds that in the latter, not only VS, but also SV can occur.

Only Mitchell (1985: 962) mentions the occurrence of VS in non-dependent wishes. If the optative is an irrealis, i.e. impossible, or potentialis, i.e. unrealised, but possible, it is accompanied by gif or þær and a past subjunctive. Then, inversion is rather infrequent. Quirk & Wrenn (1955: 93) add that VSO/C also occurs in commands, wishes and "in conditional clauses without subordinating conjunction" (Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 93).
b. **Subordinate clauses**

After an adverbial, inversion can occur not only in principal, but also in subordinate clauses. Mitchell (1985: 973) puts forward that ær, forbon (be), siddan, swa and þeah can be followed by an SV as well as a VS pattern. For siddan for instance, he gives examples from Ælfric’ homilies:

ÆCHom i. 72. 21 (§2669) and ÆCHom i. 460. 24 Se awyrigeda deofol, siddan he done frumsceapanan mann beswac, syddan he hæfde anweald on ungelyfedum mannum...but ÆCHom i. 304. 29 syddan se geleafa sprang geond ealne middangeard, siddan geswicon da wundra (Mitchell 1985: 973)

Brown ((1970) in Bean 2001: 199-200) asserts that inversion is used as alternation of the normal order, under the influence of an adverbial (especially þa). He adds that VSO/C is used “in dependent clauses to refer to the order of the second clause of a correlative construction (of the if ... then or when ... then type)”, independent of the order used in the previous clause.

2.3.6.4 S...V(...)

i **General**

Mitchell (1985: 964) distinguishes S...V from SV, pointing out that the difference between the two lies in the type of elements that can intervene. Here, a nominal object, direct as well as indirect, an adjective, a nominal complement or a nominal verb form can be placed between the subject and the verb. Yet, both clausal patterns can be found in principal as well as in dependent clauses, as a consequence of which both orders are used in the same sentence, causing “the syntactical significance it may once have had” (Mitchell 1985: 985) to be lost. As both orders occur in non-dependent as well as in dependent clauses, Mitchell & Robinson (2007: 64) conclude that this element order is not necessarily a sign of clause type. Moreover, also S...V... contains certain (often unnecessary) elements which can follow the finite verb. The
distinction between S...V and S...V... has been thoroughly discussed in German historical research, to which the former the notion *Endstellung* and the latter the term *Späterstellung* has been assigned. In the case of compound verbs, the finite verb occurs after the non-finite verb, creating patterns as S...Vv and S...Vv... (Mitchell 1985: 967-968). The function of *Späterstellung* or of the final position of the verb is not quite clear, for certain researchers, such as Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 976) believe that this position is emphatic, but this is contradicted by Mitchell (1985: 969), who states that the verb final position is a remnant of the old Germanic verbal system.

ii  Occurrence

a.  Principal clauses

Though S...V is seen as the element order most frequently used in subordinate clauses, it can also occur in principal clauses. Unfortunately, few researchers have looked into this in detail, and obviously, more research is needed. Mitchell (1985: 961-962) suggests that in these clauses, S...V may alternate with inversion, when an adverb, such as her, pa and bonne, or a prepositional phrase, e.g. be daem or after paem, are placed initially. According to Mitchell (1985: 962), these clauses are only ambiguous when written down or when the initial element is an ambiguous adverb or a conjunction. Mitchell (1985: 968) claims that S...V also occurs in clauses beginning with the conjunctions ond, ac and ne. Also in yes/no-questions with head word hwæþer, the verb can occur in final position.

b.  Subordinate clauses

Similar to the SV order, S...V can occur in both main and subordinate clauses. Quirk & Wrenn (1955: 94) state that this
order is the rule in relative as well as in concessive
clauses, but that it also often occurs in
temporal clauses (ār hē feorh seled ‘before he gives up his life’
[...]), in conditional clauses (gif wē dā stilness habbađ ‘if we have
peace’), in causal clauses (for dām hīē dār sittan ne mehton ‘because
they could not stay there’) and in noun clauses (hē geseah þat
Apollonius swā sārlīce sæt ond ealle þingc behēōld ond nān þingc ne āt
‘he saw that A. was sitting sorrowfully thus and looking at everything
and eating nothing’) (Quirk & Wrenn 1955: 94).

2.3.6.5 Negation

Not a lot of research has been conducted on negation, resulting
into a non-coherent view on the circumstances in which it
should appear. Mitchell (1985: 977) proposes three orders in
which the Old English negative particle ne can be found, i.e. neVS, SpronOneV and SneVO, for which he provides the examples
(amongst others) “ÆCHom ii. 350. 14 Nis þis wite seo hell þe du
wenst”, “Solil 16. 13 Ic hi ne lufige” and “ÆCHom ii. 110. 33
He ne andwyrde ðam wife ðæt fruman” (Mitchell 1987: 977). The
first element order, in which the negative particle is followed
by inversion, is supported by Baker (2004: 114) and Quirk &
Wrenn (1955: 92), who both state that ne causes the SVO/C
pattern in non-dependent clauses to change into VSO/C, and
Mitchell & Robinson (2007: 64), who believe that VS can be
found in positive as well as in negative main clauses. In the
same light, Mitchell (1985: 977) asserts that inversion is the
most common pattern following the negative particle. An
explanation is provided by Harbert (2007: 394), who believes
that the “negative particle seems to “attract” the verb,
causing it to appear farther to the left in sentential
struction than it would otherwise”.

On the other hand, Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 977) believes
that neVS is marked. According to him, SpronOneV is the normal
order. In all three orders, the negation immediately precedes
the verb.
2.3.6.6 Conclusion

The three proposed order SV, VS and S...V(...) can be found in certain circumstances.

First, SV can occur in declarative and interrogative main clauses as well as in subordinate clauses. The initial placement of object, adverbial or conjunction does not necessarily lead to the occurrence of inversion, resulting into an XSV pattern.

Second, inversion can also be found in non-dependent clauses after an adverbial. This cannot be considered as an absolute rule, for it might be the case that only certain adverbials cause inversion, while others trigger a normal SV order. Also after fronted objects or coordinating conjunction, VS can occur. Moreover, the subject can follow the impersonal finite verb or when it is a verb of saying. Also certain idiomatic expressions include an inverted element order. Inversion does not only occur in declarative main clauses, but also in interrogations, imperatives and wishes. In the first, different orders are proposed. In the second, it is mentioned that the command with verb first does not always include an explicit subject. The use of inverted element orders is not restricted to non-dependent clauses only: also dependent clauses can reflect a VS structure after certain conjunctions. Though this much debated topic is well represented in historical linguistic research, there is no certainty concerning the frequency of this phenomenon.

Third, S...V(...) can occur as an alternative to VS. It similarly occurs in principal as well as in subordinate clauses, after the topicalisation of certain adverbials, in certain yes-no questions and after the negative ne. This pattern can also be found in relative, in nominal clauses, as well as in clauses expressing concession, time, condition or cause.
2.3.7  Element order, inversion and negation in Old High German

2.3.7.1  Introduction

Unfortunately, Old High German has not been as thoroughly researched as Old English, as a consequence of which most studies have dealt with the absolute position of the verb, and not the relative. Most often, the position of the subject is not taken into consideration, disabling to inspect element order patterns such as inversion. In other words, only the use of verb first (and inversion), verb second and verb final positions will be discussed here. Of course, negation will also be elaborated upon.

2.3.7.2  Verb first and inversion

i  General

Here, initial verb position will be elaborated upon, starting with the remark that some researchers, such as Braune (1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 46) and Dal (1952: 180), assert that verb first can be either rein or gedeckt. In the former, nothing precedes the verb. In the latter, a weakly stressed element introducing the sentence precedes the verb, but is not regarded as a clause element, as a consequence of which the verb still occurs in verb first position. An example from Otfrid I, 7, 1 is provided by Braune: “tho sprah sancta Maria” (Braune 1894: 36 cited in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 46). So in both cases, the clauses are considered to be verb initial. Behaghel (1932: 30), on the other hand, disagrees and regards the latter structures as verb second. He also maintains that in sentences in which indirect speech is fronted, i.e. sentences of the type of for instance the Modern High German “Darf ich das Fenster öffnen?”, fragte das Mädchen, the main verb does not occur in verb first position, rather, the first
element is the entire question embedded in the sentence. Diels (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 48), though Bernhardt & Davis disagree, acknowledges four types of verb first: first, when a subordinate clause (which precedes the main clause) is immediately followed by the finite verb of the main clause; second, when the subject of the clause is omitted because it is the same as the preceding clause; third, when a non-emphasised element precedes the finite verb, an assertion identical to Braune’s; and fourth, one in which the finite verb is preceded by a negative adverb. The examples given are:

(Tatian 91, 6) [...] Tho her quam zi …, gisah her thie buochera (Diels 1906:114); (Tatian 4, 19) [...] Ther kneht vvuoah inti uuard gistrengisot geiste, … (Diels 1906:118); (Isidor 13, 21) [...] oh ist in dhesem dhrim heidem ein namo … (Diels 1906:128); (Tatian 25, 4) [...] ni quam ih zi losenne, uzouh zi fullenne (Diels 1906:126). (Diels 1906 as cited in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 48)

Second, it should be noted that the subject can be deleted, which often occurs in optative and imperative clauses, but also when the subject is a personal pronoun, as a consequence of which the verb shifts from second to first position, without producing inversion (Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 46). A critical note is added by Maurer (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 46-47), who doubts whether the pronominal subject is really omitted.

Third, Old High German syntactic research is not as well developed as Old English research, i.e. in Old High German research only the absolute position of the verb and not the relative position – with the exception of inversion – has been studied, as a consequence of which all findings concerning verb first and inversion are still preliminary.

ii Function

Inversion frequently occurs to connect sentences, to join up ideas or to link entire chapters of a narrative. In the latter, verb first (and consequently inversion) appears in the
first sentence of a new chapter of the narrative or when a new idea is introduced (Schrodt 2004: 199). Moreover inversion indicates change in the circumstances of the characters (Meineke 2001: 321). Behaghel (1932: 28) adds that verb first, and therefore also inversion, anticipate the fact that a larger part of the narrative follows, that the verb is more weakly stressed and shorter (cf. the Law of Accumulating Elements (in Behaghel 1932: 14)) and that the subject contains the new information and is therefore placed later on in the sentence. Apart from the clause type, also the conjunctions und and ouh can trigger the use of inversion.

iii Frequency

According to Gerritsen (1984: 111), little has changed in the use of inversion in Old High German. However, Behaghel (1932: 27 and 37), Ebert (1978: 38) and Meineke (2001: 321), although in their discussion of verb first and not verb second, claim that is not the case. Obviously, their findings are important, for verb first cannot be dissociated from verb second. Behaghel (1932: 27 and 37) states that verb first was not uncommon in Indo European and that the use of initial verbal position decreased in the Middle High German period. Ebert (1978: 38) makes a similar statement, asserting that the frequency of verb first in non-dependent clauses declined in the ninth and tenth centuries and inclined in the Early New High German period. Meineke (2001: 321) on the other hand, only states that verb first was only rarely used in Old High German declarative clauses.

iv Occurrence

Inversion can – rather exceptionally – occur in conjoined declarative clauses, i.e. when an element other than the subject or finite verb influences the structure, and in non-conjoined declarative clauses, i.e. when the subject is placed
post-verbally as a consequence of its weight, of stylistic considerations, of the influence of the initial placement of an object, a complement, an adverbial or a negative particle (Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 50-60). In commands, V(S) can also occur, though most often the subject is omitted, which puts extra stress on the finite verb according to Behaghel (1932: 39-42). He subdivides these sentences in two categories: sentences with an imperative (in second person), in which other nominal elements, though usually not more than one, can precede the verb (Behaghel 1932: 39-42 and Schrodt 2004: 200), or sentences with a past subjunctive (in the third person). According to Dal (1952: 179-180) and Behaghel (1932: 43) verb first (and therefore inversion) can occur in questions not introduced by an interrogative adverb or pronoun, as is for instance indicated in Notker I, 259, 13: “neware er danne na enes unsaligora?” (Behaghel 1932: 43). Schrodt (2004: 200) mentions the use of verb first, and therefore inversion, in yes-no questions. Ebert (1978: 37) adds to this that verb first can also occur in conditional sentences, whereas Dal (1952: 180) refers to the use of verb first in adhortative clauses, as well as in non-conjoined conditional questions, volitive clauses with a past subjunctive and hypothetical clauses referring to these volitive clauses.

Not only the clause type, but also certain words can trigger inversion. Behaghel (1932: 30-36) posits the use of inversion as a rule after the conjunction und, when it is used to emphasise the second clause as a continuation of the first. Amongst many examples, he provides a clause from Notker I, 17, 8 “begab mih tiu vinstri unde cham mir ougun lieht” (Behaghel 1932: 31). According to Schrodt (2004: 199), ouh tends to push the finite verb into initial position in declarative main clauses.
2.3.7.3 **Verb second**

**i General**

Caution is warranted when discussing research on verb second theories, given that the notion of verb second implicitly contains the idea that the subject precedes the finite verb. However, the subject can be placed pre- or post-verbally, not only enabling structures such as SVO and OVS, but also including clauses without subject. In other words, researching verb second is a rather vague study, in which important factors such as the relative order of subject and verb are not taken into consideration.

**ii Occurrence**

**a. Principal clauses**

According to Fourquet (in Meineke 2001: 321) verb second gradually became more frequent in the Old Germanic languages, which is more or less supported by Ebert (1978: 38), who asserts that verb second, a Germanic innovation of the sixth century, became the rule in declarative main clauses in the earliest stages of the Germanic languages. Schrodt (2004: 200) agrees, yet stresses the fact that verb second is only predominant in non-emphatic clauses. Also Admoni (1990: 71) declares that most sentences in Old High German have verb second order, but he stresses that this order is not absolute. He also states that the innovation of verb second is a result of the rise of the use of a pronominal subject, as a consequence of which the subject is less frequently placed after the verb because of rhythmic considerations. Lockwood (1968: 259) claims that the verb can immediately follow temporal and locative adverbs such as Old High German thô / dô and thâr / dâr respectively. The latter, which can still be found in the Modern English existential idiom there
is, was less frequent in Old High German and has been replaced by the pronoun es.

b. **Subordinate clauses**

Verb second also occurs in dependent sentences, with or without an introductory conjunction, most often when the subordinated clause has a conditional meaning and is embedded in a main clause with a verb of saying or of feeling (Schrodt 2004: 206), more specifically after the verb wanen ‘to believe’ and in indirect speech. Still, the verb can be placed later on in the sentence. In subordinate clauses without conjunction, of which Behaghel (1932: 46) gives the example “er glaubt, es sei Zeit”, verb second as well as verb final can occur. Wunder (2004: 206), who studies Otfrid, believes that verb second often occurs in subordinate clauses, of which the syntactical dependency is determined by the valency of the verb of the main clause.

2.3.7.4 **Verb final**

Although Admoni (1990: 71), followed by Meineke (2001: 321), claims that the final position of the verb is infrequent, it does occur in a variety of dependent and non-dependent clauses. Behaghel (1932: 11) for instance says that not only second, but also final position can be found in declarative principal clauses. McKnight (in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 43), who studies the placement of the verb in Isidor, a text from around 800 A.D., ascribes the use of verb final to the influence of Latin. On the contrary, Lockwood and Ellis (both in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 43-44) maintain that this element order was regarded as normal in prose and in verse in the period before Notker, who died in 1022, and this is confirmed by Fourquet (in Meineke 2001: 321), who asserts that verb final was normal in the beginning of all the Old Germanic languages. Admoni (1990: 71) also provides evidence to the
contrary in his study on Isidor, in which he finds the final position, even when the verb was found in a different position in the original Latin text which lies at the basis of the Isidor translation. In explaining verb final, Behaghel (1932: 12-13) refers to Wackernagel’s Law, which states that enclitics move to second position. This law means that an unstressed enclitic and a finite verb should both occur in second position, yet, when both are present, the less stressed enclitic precedes the finite verb, which is then pushed to third position. Fourquet (in Schrod 2004: 203) provides a similar explanation, stating that light elements, by which he means unstressed pronouns and adverbs, can precede the finite verb, an utterance to which Schrod (2004: 203) adds that this phenomenon is a remnant of Common Germanic times still present in Old High German. Many instances are given from Straßburger Eide, Isidor and Tatian, e.g.: Isidor 158: “ih inan infahu” (Schrod 2004: 203). Schrod (2004: 207) also remarks that verb final in dependent clauses does not apply to auxiliaries, for they are too light to be placed clause-finally. However, Behaghel (1932: 44) adds that rhythmical factors do not always need to be taken into consideration. Long elements, which would normally be placed outside the verbal brace, can also precede the verb, pushing the verb to final position in Old High German subordinate clauses. In other cases, though infrequent, short elements, and not the verb, are positioned at the very end of the clause. In short, three different explanations have been proposed: verb final can be a consequence of syntactic borrowing, it can be a relic of the Common Germanic language, or it can be due to rhythmical considerations. Another note refers to the distinction many researchers, such as Schrod (2004: 202) and Behaghel (1932: 14-15), make between Endstellung, which means that final placement is absolute and that unstressed elements, such as pronouns,
adverbs, adverbials as well as nominal verb forms precede the final verb, and *Späterstellung*, which entails that the verb occurs later in the clause, often in verb third, and that elements can still follow the verb. In periphrastic clauses, this also means that the nominal verb can follow, as Dal (1952: 182-183) claims that one or more infinitives, with or without zu, or the past participle can follow the finite verb. Wunder (in Schrodt 2004: 207) points out that the more elements a clause contains, the more likely it is that the finite verb will not be placed finally, out of which Schrodt (2004: 207) concludes that *Späterstellung* is characteristic for subordinate clauses. Schrodt (2004: 202), though he acknowledges the distinction between *Später- and Endstellung*, identifies both structures as *Späterstellungen*, for he finds it impossible to discriminate *Späterstellung* from a structure with final verbal position, in which certain elements are extrabaciated.

As already stated above, the finite verb could occur in final position in a main clause up until the time of Notker (Dal 1952: 181). This did not only occur in declarative clauses, but, according to Schrodt (2004: 204), it frequently occurred in clauses expressing a wish or an exclamation. He finds examples in Notker Psalter: "echert ich dir lichee NP 133.2, uuio uuunderlih din namo ist in allero uuerlte NP 29.3" (Schrodt 2004: 204).

Verb final is most frequently found in dependent clauses, which is also a remnant of Common Germanic. However, according to Admoni (1990: 76), the finite verb, in opposition to other elements such as an object or subject, closes the clause and causes the clause to be a closed unit, as a consequence of which it is easier to recognize the clause in spoken language. Moreover, verb final signals subordinate clauses and as such contrasts with non-dependent clauses with verb second. Behaghel (1932: 14) adds another explanation, i.e. the law of
accumulating elements, which means that all elements which are weakly stressed - with the exclusion of the reflexive pronoun - are placed before the verb. Another explanation he gives, referring to Wackernagel (in Behaghel 1932: 12-13) is that the stress of the initial element is not strong enough in conditional subordinate clauses:

Mit dem Fehlen des einleitenden Volltons fehlte aber die Stütze für das Verbum, somit für seine Früherstellung (Behaghel 1932: 13)

Final position occurs in dependent clauses with and without an introductory word. The former was according to Dal (1952: 181) already predominant in Notker. Schrodt (2004: 207-208) states that they occur in conditional or concessive clauses without introductory word. Ebert (1978: 35) adds that verb final could also be found in relative clauses. Sometimes, verb final does not occur in clauses in which it is expected. Admoni (1990: 76) proposes different causes, such as the tendency of subject and verb to be placed together and the avoidance of ambiguity.

2.3.7.5 Negation

i Ni

With relation to Old High German, Dal (1952: 170-171) points out that two words were used to negate the sentence or clause. In Early Old High German, the particle ni and its phonologically weaker form ne were found, but in Late Old High German, ni was gradually replaced by nicht. Eventually, it was only used in combination with the verbs ruochen, wænen and wizzen, until it completely disappeared by the 14th century. Schrodt (2004: 199) points out that ne, similar to Old English, precedes the finite verb, with which it could proclitically merge. This is supported by the excerpt, as for instance clause 46 indicates:
Dal (1952: 170) adds that in Early Old High German this contraction could also occur between the negative particle ne on the one hand, and a pronoun or adverb on the other hand. However, there is a difference in scope between ne + verb and ne + pronoun/adverb. According to Harbert, (2007: 376-394) the former can be regarded as sentential negation, whereas the latter can be considered to be constituent negation. Behaghel (1932: 12) asserts that, because verb second, next to verb final, is a normal pattern in declarative main clauses, the negation is placed initially, pushing the subject after the verb, i.e. causing inversion, so that the verb stays in second position. This may be a remnant of Indo-European times, when the negative particle was still stressed. Exceptions are found in clauses conjoined by inti and imperative clauses, for which Behaghel (1932: 12) claims that the negative particle is placed between the subject and the verb, shifting the verb in third position. According to him, ne can stand initially only under the influence of Latin. In questions, Bernhardt & Davis (1997: 61) claim that negation did not affect element order.

ii **Nicht**

Behaghel (1932: 145-156) also elaborates upon the occurrence of the second negative particle, i.e. nicht, which is found in declarative, interrogative, as well as in imperative clauses. Non-dependent declarative clauses entail different element orders when regarding negation. In declarative clauses containing SV-patterns, nicht is placed after the finite verb, except when it refers to the nominal verb form in a periphrastic clause, in which case it is placed between the finite and the non-finite verb. When nicht refers to the finite verb in a VS-clause, it can either be found initially, finally, immediately after the pronominal subject, immediately
after the finite verb, or between ‘zwei Bestimmungen des Verbs’ (Behaghel 1932: 148), as for instance in:

Da nähme mancher nicht viel Geld

(Erzählungen 127 as cited in Behaghel 1932: 148)

If the negation relates to both finite and non-finite verb forms, it is, as in SV-sentences, placed in between. In dependent declarative clauses, **nicht** precedes the finite verb.

In questions without an interrogative head word, the negation **nicht** can stand after the subject when normal SV patterns occur, or between the finite verb and the subject in case of inversion. When the question is introduced by an interrogative particle, many element order patterns can occur dependent on the influence of other elements. Normally, the negation is placed in final position, of which deviations are only accepted when necessary adjectives or infinitives are included or when the subject is pronominal. These elements cause **nicht** to be placed in Späterstellung or immediately after the subject respectively.

In imperative clauses, the negation can be placed before or after the verb. Similarly to the particle **ne**, initial placement takes place only when the syntactical structures are affected by Latin. When the negation follows, the verb is normally placed in first position. The absence of the subject in this type of clauses emphasises the verb more strongly.
2.3.7.6 **Conclusion**

To summarise, it can be said that four verbal patterns, i.e. verb first and inversion, verb second and verb final, and the phenomenon of negation have been thoroughly examined. First, inversion takes place in declarative clauses only under certain circumstances: when the subject is heavy, when the style requires it, or when any constituent other than the subject is topicalised. In commands, the finite verb is often stressed by positioning it initially. However, the subject is not always present, as a consequence of which inversion is not obligatorily. Inversion can also occur in questions, and in conditional, and hortative, certain volitional and hypothetical clauses, of which more research and specification is needed. Moreover, there are extra-linguistic factors such as considerations of connection, narrative and emphasising features, which lead to the use of an inverted subject verb order.

Second, verb second most often occurs in declarative principal clauses, also after adverbs of time or place, but verb second can also be found in conjoined or non-conjoined subordinate clauses, especially when expressing a condition, or when it is depending on a main clause with a verb of saying or feeling, or in indirect speech.

Third, most researchers share the idea that verb final cannot be ascribed to the influence of Latin only, but that the final placement of the finite verb is a phenomenon found in all the Old Germanic languages, to which considerations of weight and rhythm are attached. Similar to research on Old English element order, a distinction between S...V and S...V..., here differentiated as *Endstellung* and *Späterstellung*, is made. With regard to their occurrence, it can be said that *Endstellung* as well as *Späterstellung* can be found in declarative, volitive, and exclamative main clauses, as well as in dependent clauses, in which verb final functions as a
their termination. Here, the Behaghel’s law of accumulating elements 1932: 14) is probably at work. Concerning the use of verb final in dependent or in relative clauses, no univocal nor extensive conclusions are drawn.

Fourth, with regard to negation, it seems that ne can be placed initially, immediately before the finite verb, as well as between the subject and the verb in SV-clauses. Nicht, a younger negative element still used today, is extensively examined by Behaghel (1932: 145-156), who believes that it follows the finite verb in declarative SV-principal clauses. In declarative main clauses with an inverted element order, the position of nicht seems almost arbitrary: it can be placed initially, finally, after the pronominal subject or after the finite verb, or between “zwei Bestimmungen des Verbs” (Behaghel 1932: 148). When this clause is periphrasic, nicht will follow the finite verb, yet still precede the nominal verb form. Less complex is the placement of nicht in subordinate declarative clauses, in which it always precedes the finite verb. In interrogatives without an introductory question word, not depending whether they portray an SV or VS order, nicht is placed between the subject and the verb. When there is a question word, nicht is most likely to be placed finally. In imperatives, the negation can precede, but it can also follow the finite verb.

2.4 Problems in research

By writing on element order patterns in Old English and Old High German, this study has encountered many problems and limitations. First of all, although much has been written in the course of the past centuries on both languages, researchers have focussed on phonology and morphology, rather than on syntax, as a result of which research with regard to element order is still in its infancy. For Old High German, for instance, no general survey has been given yet. Also,
researchers often tend to generalise too much, trying to find one underlying element order pattern, or they only discriminate main from subordinate clauses, still neglecting distinguishing aspects such as declarative or interrogative clauses, or even excluding the contrast between relative and other dependent clauses.

Second, the rather small size of the corpus is (in Old High German even more than in Old English) problematic. Not enough texts have survived in order to provide us with a correct and detailed understanding of the languages in every dialect at every moment in history. Moreover, translations are the most common surviving text-type, which entails that influences of the original language may have found their way into the target language used in these texts. These translations are most frequently biblical, and since the Bible was considered a holy text, the surviving texts are even more likely to be altered under the influence of the original language. Greule (2000: 1207-1208) adds another difficulty: the modern editions have changed the original text by adding punctuation.

Unfortunately, I am not able to rely on the original texts either.

Also the influence of poetry and prose must be taken into consideration. Poetry is distinguished from prose, because it contains several factors, such as rhyme, metre, alliteration, and the like, which can influence element order, as a consequence of which poetic work is often excluded from syntactical research. However, not all researchers agree on this topic. Admoni (1990: 11-12), for instance, attempts to uphold the use of poetry in his analysis concerning syntax,
for, in his opinion, when the clauses are not artificial or ungrammatical, poetic sources are an advantage. They display clause constructions, which are syntactically possible in the language, but which are not used in prose. This contrasts sharply with Ebert (in Admoni 1990: 11), who rather underlines the impracticability of poetry, claiming that poetry promotes the use of archaic and abnormal clause constructions. He is followed by Robinson (1993: 163), who states that poetry has the “propensity to violate grammatical rules”. Gerritsen (1984: 110) can be found in between the two extreme opinions. On the one hand, she recognises that poetic style has a certain influence, yet, on the other hand, she minimises the problem by claiming that the influence is not that strong: it will not trigger embracement in languages which are normally exbraciating. However, she does not include statements on inversion in this matter. Barrett ((1967) in Kohonen 1978: 16), despite the fact that he did not distinguish prose from poetry, stayed within the genre of prose, still bearing the rhythmical aspect in mind. More specifically, he investigated the distinction between rhythmic and narrative prose, concluding that the former, due to the effects of rhythm, inverts more often in non-dependent clauses with head words. However, when the head was not present, inversion was less frequent (in Davis 2006: 79-81). In the first clause type the function of inversion is either to connect the clauses or to adjust the structure to the rhythm. In the second sentence type, without a head word, inversion is used in order to emphasise. Davis (2006: 79), however, states that Barrett does not take the influence of conjunctions causing inversion, such as Old English ond, ac and ne, into consideration. Additionally, rhythmic prose brings about a more frequent placement of the unemphatic verb modifier between the verb and the subject, and, when the verb is a predicate, objects are also often positioned between them. In other words, the rhythm
causes a light element to fall between two heavy ones. Even though those researchers who defend the inclusion of poetry in syntactic research as well as those who are against it have decent arguments, both sides do not take into consideration what Van Bree does remark (1990: 227-228): he states that the discrepancy between poetry and spoken language can vary from period to period.

In short, it can be said that the size and diversity of syntactic research as well as of the available corpus complicates the analysis of Old English and especially on Old High German element order. Also the influence of poetic elements can influence the results of syntactic research.

2.5 Conclusion

The literature has shown that the position of the verb cannot only be examined absolutely, but it can also be looked at relatively to other clause elements. This results into the positions verb first, verb second and verb final, which are predominantly used in Old High German syntactic research and into the orders SV, VS and S...V(...), which are mainly utilised in Old English element order examination. Moreover, the background reading lacks a fully detailed representation of studies on the influence of negation in both languages. When reading on verb first and inversion, Gerritsen (1984: 113) has claimed that inverted element order rose in the Old English period until it reached a use of 100% in 1001, after which its frequency decreased until about 1400, when inversion was barely used. As Secundum Lucam was written only a few decades afterwards, the frequency of inversion is expected to be very high. Following the generalised and rather abstract logic that if the frequency in English decreased from 100% to 0% in four centuries, it can be deduced that the use of inversion should decrease with 25% per century, or, with 2.5%
per decade. Of course, the decline can impossibly have happened at a steady speed, yet, I consider it plausible to expect a frequency of inversion of more than 90% in the Wulfstan excerpt. If not, I can say that Gerritsen’s hypothesis regarding the use of inversion in Old English is incorrect. A lead to affirmation of my expectation can be found in Kohonen (1976) in Bean 2001: 206 – 209), who has stated that only 66% of the clauses portray an inverted order when they are introduced by an element other than the subject. Also Bean (2001: 236) has taken an edge of Gerritsen’s statement. She has also examined the Anglo Saxon Chronicle and ascribes the frequent use of inversion to the recurring use of ba, which is typical for the contemporary narrative style.

With regard to the use of inversion Old High German, Gerritsen (1984: 110) has stated that it was already frequent and that it became obligatory. As she is fairly vague in her conception of frequent and as she does not mention whether she regards the use of inversion as the consequence of a fronted element, of the weight of the subject or of stylistic issues, inversion requires a closer look in this study.

The literature on the remaining orders as well as on negation have shown many lacuna’s and inconsistencies in past research. Verb second used in Old High German studies, for instance, cannot be compared with SV, used in Old English examinations, as SV also encompasses XSV, in which the verb is placed in third, and not in second, position. Therefore, I must investigate verb second in Old English and SV in Old High German. Additionally, I have to check the reliability of the literature by testing their statements on SV in Old English and verb second in Old High German.

What is more, is that S...V(...), which in both languages is considered as typical for subordinate clauses, is regarded as common for relative clauses in Old English. However, the
background reading has not indicated whether this is also the case in Old High German.

Old English research has proposed three orders when negation occurs: neVS, SpronOneV and SneV. Old High German research only suggests two orders including the negative particle ne: neVS and SneV. Now it is possible that Old High German researchers have not recognised SpronOneV order, but it can also be that this order is simply not possible in Old High German.
3 Analysis of Secundum Lucam and Predigtsammlung B

3.1 Introduction

In this section, the methodology, with special attention drawn for the text choice, and the analyses will be described. Both texts are analysed separately, starting with a general analysis, in which the number of non-dependent, dependent and relative clauses is looked at. Special attention is paid to the initial elements: objects, subjects, adverbials and conjunctions can influence the entire element order. When taking a closer look at the sentences, not only the principal, subordinate and relative clauses are examined, but also inversion and negation are researched separately. In previous section, in which for every verbal position (i.e. SV, VS, S...V(…) in Old English and verb first and inversion, verb second and verb final in Old High German) all possible clause types, in which these positions can occur, are provided. In contrast to this, the analysis starts from three possible clause types, for which the verbal patterns found in the excerpts are given. I have done this in order to provide a better understanding of these verbal patterns in both Old English and Old High German.

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Choice of texts

3.2.1.1 Introduction

In the light of the original idea to test Gerritsen’s conclusions on inversion in Old English and Old High German (1984), two texts other than the ones she used, i.e. the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Isidor, were chosen here. In this dissertation, the Homilies of Wulfstan and those of the anonymous author of Predigtsammlung B, are used for analysis.
Both texts are written in the same genre, i.e. religious prose, for this facilitates comparison and this particular style is, because the texts are written down with the purpose of reading them out loud, most closely related to the natural, oral variant of Old English and Old High German respectively.

3.2.1.2 Secundum Lucam

Secundum Lucam is an eschatological sermon, in which the author Wulfstan, who also called himself Lupus (Bethurum 1957: 24), related the contemporary sorrow with sin committed (Bethurum 1957: 30). Eighteen manuscripts encompassing his work have survived, and this particular homily can be found in manuscripts A (or Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 421), C (or Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 201 (S18)) and E (or Bodleian, Hatton 113) (Bethurum 1957: 1-24).

Wulfstan, whose date of birth is unknown and who died the 28th of May 1023, was a Benedictine homilist writing and preaching in the late West-Saxon dialect. For bibliographical information, I rely on Bethurum (1957: 54-68) who in his turn bases himself mainly on the Book of Ely, or the Historia Eliensis, the only medieval manuscript dealing with Wulfstan’s life. Therefore, information about his life may therefore not be regarded as absolutely true. Wulfstan was a metropolitan engaging in political, religious and literate purposes: he was not only known at the courts of both Ethelred and Cnut as a friend, lawmaker and advisor, he, as Bishop of London, was also a canonist and homilist. His homiletic work can be subdivided into four areas according to theme: those dealing with eschatological matters, those treating Christian belief in general, those discussing the functions of the archiepiscopacy and those concerning the evil days. Moreover, Wulfstan, who might have been a scribe for king Ethelred, was known for his eloquent, oratorical skills. He was, just as Augustine, familiar with Cicero’s oratorical style, which
encompasses different styles for different purposes: either to teach, to gratify or to move. The homilies were not only to be read, but also to be heard, as a consequence of which Wulfstan emphasised features and figures of speech to clarify, to enforce, to teach and to move. Although his style was syntactically similar to that of his contemporaries, he was known for his use of intentional repetitions, intensifying words, figures of speech, such as the use of irony and tautology, and stylistic systems such as alliteration, assonance, rhyme, and sentence and word parallelisms. Though his homilies are still considered as prosaic works, and not as poetry, Wulfstan clearly took care of the rhythmical balance of the phrases, which, according to McIntosh (in Whitelock 1963: 19), confines the number of possible syntactic structures. Whitelock (1963: 18) adds that Wulfstan included pairs of words, phrases such as *gime se þe wille, swa hi betst mihton, us selfum to pearfe, gecnawe se þe cunne, swa hit þincan mæg, swa swa man scolde* as well as smaller word groups and individual tags such as *mid ealle, georne, to wide, ealles to swybe, ealles to gelome, oft 7 gelome, elles, nyde, mit rihte* in order to suit the sentence stresses of his original as well as revisions which do not fit his rhythm.

3.2.1.3 Predigtsammlung B

Predigtsammlung B is one of three eleventh century collections of Bavarian sermons. Little is known about the authors, but according to von Steinmeyer (in McLintock 1978: 306), collection A is composed by a different author than collections B and C, which would partially explain the linguistic differences found between the collections. Though two different hands are ascribed to the Old High German sermons, they were written at the same monastery, which is confirmed by the fact that all three manuscripts were present in Wessobrunn in around 1500.
The fragment used for this dissertation is a sample taken from the first and the second sermons of the B collection, dealing with the dispatching of the seventy disciples and the labourers at the vineyard.

Even though Ehrismann (1932: 347) states that the Latin homiletic work “In Evangelia” of Gregory the Great lies at the basis of the B collection, the Latin influence can be minimised. He adds that sermons 1, 2 and 4 are shorter versions of the “In Evangelia”, but as such they are no literal translations. This is confirmed by von Steinmeyer’s edition (1963), for he provides the Latin original where it is available. The fact that no Latin can be found for the fragments studied here (taken from von Steinmeyer 1963: 168-170), is evidence that the texts were not exactly copied into Old High German. Moreover, McLintock (1978), after comparing fragments of the collections with the Latin original, concludes that the homilies are a very free translation, although they sometimes rely on the Latin original, in which some parts are Old High German elaborations which do not go back to the original. McLintock (1978) discusses the style of the collections, stressing that the colloquial Old High German texts are more emphatic than the rather plain original.

3.2.2 Methodology

First, the first 100 clauses of both Secundum Lucam and Predigtsammlung B were subdivided into non-dependent, dependent and relative clauses, indicated in the appendix by the colours red, green and blue respectively. In a second stage, a distinction is made in the first two clause types on the basis of presence of a conjunction: both clause types can be conjoined or non-conjoined. Conjoined main clauses can be introduced by and/ond or by bonne in Old English and by une in Old High German. In non-conjoined clauses, it is of importance to separate those clauses beginning with the
subject, and those, in which the introductory element is fronted, be it a verb, an object, an adverbial or even a preposition. Old English subordinate clauses can only be introduced by a conjunction, but it can be absent in certain dependent clauses in Old High German. All conjoined subordinate clauses are placed separately in order to investigate the possible influence of the conjunction on the element order. As relative clauses are a special type of subordinate clauses, attention is drawn to the function of the first element, i.e. the relative particle, which can take the function of the subject, the object or even an adverbial. Furthermore, clauses with inversion and with negation are placed separately, for it is not only important to look at their frequency of occurrence, but it is also interesting to find out what can trigger inversion or which influence these phenomena may have on element order.

As the finite verb is the basis of this analysis, it is placed in bold in the appendix, so that its position can more easily be found. Moreover, the patterns portrayed by the elements subject, object and verb are mentioned next to the clause in the appendix. Also translations are added to facilitate the analysis.
3.3 **Analysis**

3.3.1 **Secundum Lucam**

3.3.1.1 **General analysis**

![Graph 1](image)

As graphs 1 to 4 indicate, 43 clauses in the excerpt of Wulfstan’s *Secundum Lucam* are non-dependent clauses, of which 22 are non-conjoined, and of which 21 are introduced by a conjunction.

![Graph 2](image)

The initial element in the non-conjoined clauses is the subject in 17 instances, whereas 5 clauses begin with any element other than the subject. Of the conjoined principal clauses, 19 are introduced by *and*/7 and 2 by *ponne/donne*. Different conjunctions can introduce the 49 subordinate clauses: 12 by *and*/7, 7 by *ponne/donne*, 10 clauses are
introduced by *pæt*. Other conjunctions are *ac, fordam be, pæs de, pam swylce, ealswa, swa swa, ne, ær dam* and *swylce* found in the 20 remaining dependent clauses.

The remaining 8 clauses are relative, of which in 6 clauses, the relative particle functions as the subject, whereas in only in clauses 41 and 47, the relative particle takes the meaning of the object.
i **Principal clauses**

17 non-conjoined main clauses begin with the subject, resulting into verb second in all but 2 instances, i.e. clauses 53 and 56. The number may be misleading, for many almost idiomatic clauses are repeated. *He cwæd*, found in clauses 29 and 32, is very similar to the construction *hit cwæd* in clauses 75 and 80, but also to *þæt bid* of clause 13. The structure *þæt is* is found in clauses 69, 76 and 81, and extended by the prepositional element *on Englisc* in clauses 30, 50 and 89. In 1 instance, in clause 67, the verb form is periphrastic, as a consequence of which the finite verb is followed by the participle *gecweden*.

67.SV  
*Hit is gecweden*

2 verb forms can also be found in clause 1, yet here, 2 finite verbs are displayed, both taking second position:

1.SV  
*Dis godspel segd 7 swutelad*

In 2 clauses, i.e. clauses 53 and 56, the pronominal object *us* is placed pre-verbally, yet still after the subject, as a consequence of which verb third takes place. These analogical clauses have exbraciated the preposition, whereas the element to which the preposition relates, is still placed within the brace:

53.SV  
*Seo heofone us wind wid*

56.SV  
*Seo eorde us wind wid*

These structures seem odd at first sight, but nonetheless, they is not grammatically erroneous, for the preposition can be placed at the end of the prepositional phrase, especially when the complement is a pronoun. This is supported by the prepositional phrase *heom betweonan* in clause 33. What is more, is that it was not impossible in Old English times to divide an element by means of the verb. In these 2 clauses, the prepositional phrase is split up by the finite verb *wind*. 
Even though these clauses are grammatically incorrect, clause 51 proves that verb third has occurred in these clauses as a consequence of stylistic considerations, such as alliteration and parallelism. In non-emphasised declarative main clauses, I believe that prepositional phrases and other adverbials must follow the finite verb in order to place the verb in second position:

51. SV  
\[ \text{eal woruld winned swyde for synnum ongean } \text{þa oferhogan} \]

6 clauses are non-conjoined non-dependent clauses and do not begin with the subject. The first element is an adverb in clauses 6, 31, 59, 87 and 99, and an adjective in clause 35:

35. VS  
\[ \text{clæne wæs þeos eorđe on hyre frumsceafte,} \]

With the exception of clause 59, all clauses reveal a verb second and therefore inversion, as a consequence of which (even light) object and adverbials must be placed after the finite verb, as also clause 35 indicates. Clause 59, however, begins with an adverb, yet holds an SV structure:

59. SV  
\[ \text{Eac hit awritten is,} \]

In trying to provide an explanation for this seemingly exceptional order, I have to rely on van Kemenade (1994: 135-136), who asserts that inversion after a fronted adverbial does not occur when the subject is pronominal.

Two kinds of conjunctions can introduce the principal clause: \(7/\text{and} \) and \( \text{bonne} \). 19 clauses begin with \(7/\text{and} \), of which 12 have the normal and 7 the inverted order, contrasting with Davis' idea (2006: 132) that SV in conjoined declarative clauses may be considered as a rule in Old English. It does not seem clear when which order occurs, for both normal as inverted patterns can appear under similar circumstances.

Clauses 26, 37, 63, 74, 79, 94 and 100 have an SV pattern in which the subject immediately follows the conjunction. Here,
the object(s) can precede, yet also follow the verb, as clauses 26 and 37 respectively indicate.

26.SOV  7 ælþeodige men 7 utancumene swyðe us swencad,
37.SVO  And ure misdæda eac wregead us gelome,

No considerations of weight are at work here, for both clauses display the same light pronominal object us. Also both clauses have a one word adverb, placed pre-verbally in clause 26, post-verbally in clause 37. The reason why clause 26 has verb final and clause 37 Späterstellung, is not clear. Also, special attention should be drawn to clauses 74 and 79 in this category, for here, an entire clause is placed between the subject and the verb.

74a.S  And mona,
75.SV   hit cwed,
74b.V   adeorcad;
79a.S  And steorran,
80.SV   hit cwed,
79b.V   hreosad ufene of heofonum;

Clauses 75 and 80 interrupt the clauses 74 and 79 respectively immediately after the subject. These clauses can be left out, not affecting the order of the clauses in which they are embedded.

It appears that the tendency for verb second is not at work in declarative clauses introduced by the coordinating conjunction 7/and. The need to place the subject before the finite verb seems greater than the tendency to place the finite verb in second position.

Clauses 5, 7, 9, 16 and 17 also portray an SV order, but here, an adverbial is placed between the conjunction and the subject. On the other hand, clauses 8, 10, 19, 25, 48, 85, 93 and 100 are also main clauses in which 7/and is immediately followed by (an) adverbial(s), but they display an inverted element order. Perhaps it is possible that certain adverbials
trigger inversion, whereas others do not. Even though this is
already indicated by Mitchell (1985: 961-962) and Brown
((1970) in Bean 2001: 199), more research is required. Maybe
all adverbials tend to cause inversion, but in a different
degree. It might be possible that tendency to display VS after
certain adverbials is weaker than the tendency (if there
already is one) to portray the normal SV order after the
conjunction 7/and in declarative main clauses. This would mean
that an adverb such as đærto less strongly requires an
inverted element order than for instance the locative adverb
dær:

7 and 16.SV  7 đærto hit nealæcd nu swyde georne.
100.VS  7 đær is ece gryre;

However, 2 clauses are found with the adverb dy: 1 with SV and
1 with VS order:

8.VS  And dy is fela yfela 7 mistlicra gelimpa wide mid
mannum,
17.SV  And dy hit is on worulde a swa leng swa wyrs,

These clauses lead to a third possibility: not only the
conjunction 7/and or the adverbial can influence the element
order, but also the weight of the subject: the nominal subject
fela yfela 7 mistlicra gelimpa of clause 8 is heavier than the
pronominal subject hit of clause 17, as a consequence of which the
former is more likely to follow the finite verb than the latter.
This explanation is in my opinion the most plausible, since all
conjoined non-dependent SV clauses in which 7/ond is immediately
followed by at least 1 adverbial entail a light subject: clauses 7,
9, 16 and 17 all encompass the pronominal subject hit, clause 5 has
the one word nominal subject flod.

5.SV  And witodlice ealswa flod com hwilum ær for synnum,

On the other hand, all clauses portraying 7/and-adverbial(s)-
verb-subject order have a heavy subject consisting of a
nominal phrase, as for instance clause 10, in which the
subject *mare wracu 7 gedrecednes* has been split up by clause 11.

10a.VS And gył weorped mare,
11.SV þæs de bec secgad,
10b.S wracu 7 gedrecednes

Of all these conjoined main clauses in which the adverbial immediately follows the conjunction, only clause 25 entails an object.

25.OVS And dy us deriađ 7 dearle dyrfad fela ungelimpa,

The pronominal object precedes the 2 coordinate verb phrases, which share the exbraciated subject. Since this is the only example with an object, I am not able to draw conclusion concerning the position of the object in this particular clause type.

The main clauses cannot only be introduced by *and/7*, but also by *ponne*, of which 2 examples, i.e. clauses 72 and 95, can be found in the fragment.
Clause 72 is part of the correlative construction *ponne...ponne* ‘when...then’:

70.SVO þonne God nele cyđan on Antecristes timan his mægen ne his mihta
72.V donne bid gelic
73.S þam swylce sunne sy apystrad.

Clause 73 functions as subject of clause 72, resulting into inversion.

95.V(S) Donne mæg gecnawan
96.SVO se þe ær nolde sodes gelyfan

Also in clause 95, the subject is the entire following clause, as a consequence of which one can say there is inversion. This supports Mitchell (1985: 971), according to who *ponne* must be followed by an inverted order.
Subordinate clauses

The majority of the dependent clauses are introduced by the conjunctions and/7, bonne or þæt, leading to structures with verb second, Späterstellung as well as verb final.

Starting with the clauses introduced by and/7, clause 84 arrests attention, for it is the only subordinate clause introduced by and/7, which portrays verb second. The clauses preceding this clause, are needed to provide a plausible explanation for this phenomenon.

Clause 84 is the last of 3 subordinate clauses, which share the same subject, explicit only in the first clause. I believe the verb of clause 84 is transposed immediately behind the conjunction in order to demonstrate its relation with the previous clauses. In my opinion, the finite verb weorþaþ is placed in second position, even though it can be argued that it takes third position, for the subject is elided and one can imagine the subject to precede the finite verb. However, because the subject is not explicitly there, I regard the conjunction as first, and the finite verb as second position. It reminds us of the structure of clause 33, in which 3 verbal phrases are connected.

Here, the first 2 finite verbs are preceded by an adverbial, causing the verbs to be placed at the end of the phrase. However, the third finite verb precedes the adverbials, as a consequence of which it is placed immediately after the conjunction. Yet, it is also possible that the last verb precedes the adverbial because the length of the prepositional
phrases leads to their final placement. As such, clause 62 can be explained in a similar way:

62. SV 7 steorran hreosad for manna synnum;

The finite verb *hreosad* occurs in third position, because only the conjunction *7* and the subject *steorran* precede. The prepositional phrase *for manna synnum* follows the finite verb because of considerations of weight.

Clauses 21 and 24 however, need an explanation related to their context. Clause 21 has copied the entire structure of clause 20, exbraciating the heavy nominal object, perhaps for considerations of emphasis. However, clause 24 has a reversed order, for the adverb phrase, in which the first element is the adverb *to*, and the object are now placed in pre- and post-verbal position respectively.

20. SVO þæt we to wace hyrad urum Drihtne,

21. SVO 7 þæt we to ortreowe syndan Godes mihta 7 his mildheortnessa,

24. SOV 7 eac betweenan us sylfum rihte getrywda healdad to wace for gode 7 for worulde.

On the other hand, clauses 15, 22, 55, 58, 61, 83 and 88, which are other dependent clauses introduced by *7/and*, have positioned the finite verb at the absolute end of the clause. Remarkably, only in clauses 22, 61 and 88 the subject is explicitly present in the clause. The verb of the clauses with an absent subject refer to a subject present in a preceding clause.

A clear tendency towards *Späterstellung* or verb final placement can be observed in all but 1 subordinate clause introduced by *7/and*. In other words, all these instances portray an S...V(...) order, excluding the occurrence of inversion.
The subordinate clauses introduced by *þonne* also display several patterns. Similar to those introduced by *7/and*, one clause occurs with verb second, which is caused by the correlation with clause 70:

70.SVO  þonne God nele cyðan on Antecristes timan his mægen ne
        his mihta
72.V     þonne bið gelic
73.SV    þam swylce sunne sy aþystrad.

*þonne...þonne*, meaning when...then, is a correlative pair, of which the subordinate clause can occur with inversion according to Brown (1970 in Bean 2001: 199), which is the case, for clause 73 functions as the subject of clause 72. More common are the occurrences of *Späterstellung* and verb final. The 3 clauses with verb final, i.e. clauses 14, 23 and 64, only consist of a conjunction, a subject and a verb in the order mentioned. The orders with *Späterstellung*, i.e. clauses 12, 54 and 57, are slightly longer. Clause 12 exbraciates the prepositional phrase, a phenomenon which has been explained previously. In explaining clauses 54 and 57 however, the entire textual context must be taken into consideration. As already mentioned in the section concerning the non-dependent clauses, stylistic considerations may be at work here.

53.SOV    Seo heofone us wind wid
54.SOVO  þonne heo us sended styrnlice stormas
55.OV     7 orf 7 æceras swyde amyrred.
56.SOV    Seo eorde us wind wid
57.SVO    þonne heo forwyrned eordlices wæstmas
58.OV     7 us unweoda to fela asended.

The first 3 clauses show structures very similar to the latter 3. As a lot of thought has been spent to this part specifically, I believe the exbraciation of the objects in clauses 54 and 57, which also rhyme, is not only to be ascribed to the weight of the object or to the length of the clause, but also to preferences of the author.
In other words, short subordinate clauses, existing only out of the conjunction þonne, a subject and a verb, will reveal a verb final pattern, but when more elements are included, Späterstellung is more likely to occur in order to maintain the SV structure. However, as orders of clauses 54 and 57 are the result of stylistic considerations, these conclusions cannot be considered as absolute.

Another highly frequent conjunction is þæt, present in 10 clauses. Also here, verb second rather has the status of being exceptional, for it occurs only once in clause 28. This clause functions as the direct object of the previous clause, clarifying what Christ has said.

27.SV ealswa Crist on his godspelle swutollice sæde
28.V þæt scolde geweordan.

As seen before, the non-finite verb tends to be placed at the end of the subordinate clause, as a consequence of which the finite verb is placed in second position.

7 out of 10 clauses occur with Späterstellung: clauses 2, 60, 65 and 90 display the finite verb in third position, whereas clauses 20, 82 and 97 placed it later in the clause, yet not at the absolute end. These clauses can be reduced to the structure conjunction - subject - (adverbial(s)) - finite verb - non-finite verb. After the verb phrase, the object as well as other adverbials can follow.

Of the 2 clauses with verb final, 1 clause has verb third, a clause very similar to clause 60.
Consequently, it may be accepted that if more elements had been present in clause 68, they would have been placed after the finite verb. Also for the placement of the finite verb in final position a plausible elucidation can be provided.

I believe that the negative particle has influenced the element order, which is almost completely similar to the SpronOneV order proposed by Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 977), and which will be elaborated upon below.

In other words, I think that clauses introduced by þæt include Späterstellung and that verb second and verb final are more exceptional. No inversion occurs in either of these clauses. As to which elements can be extraciated, no clarity can be found, for both objects and adverbials can be positioned at the very end of the þæt-clause. In clause 20 for example, the object urum Drihtne occurs after the finite verb hyrad:

Also adverbials, as for instance the prepositional phrase ær worulde ende in clause 60 is extraciated.

It seems that the function of objects and adverbials is of no importance with regard to their placement in the clause, which contrasts to Modern Dutch\(^2\), in which it is impossible to extraciate the object, as for instance:

* Dat hij haar op de trein gegeven heeft een bal

On the other hand, a prepositional phrase can occur pre- as well as post-verbally:

---

\(^2\) Examples from prof. dr. Van Herreweghe(16-07-2010)
In other words, Old English þæt-clauses do not distinguish the necessary “kern”, i.e. subject, objects, complements, from the not obligatory “sateliet”, i.e. the adverbials. This distinction is important in Modern Dutch grammar, but perhaps an extra distinction must be made between noun, adjective and adverb phrases on the one hand, and prepositional phrases on the other. An answer can be found in clause 65:

65. SV þæt hit bid gelic

In this clause, the finite verb bid is followed by the adjective gelic, which is counterevidence to the previous assertion. It appears that Old English syntax is even more complex and more parameters must be used. Or, it is also possible that Old English and Modern Dutch are syntactically not alike.

20 clauses have not been discussed yet, and are introduced by 9 different conjunctions, which results into the fact that not enough clauses are included in the fragment to draw sound conclusions. Clauses 18, 36, 38, 46 and 73 also have Späterstellung, and they are introduced by ac, fordham þe, þæs de and þam swylce. Though 3 clauses have verb third, no clear patterns can be observed. 15 other clauses, which are in general shorter than those with Späterstellung, have verb final.

In other words, subordinate clauses are most commonly found with Späterstellung or verb final. The difference here seems to lie in the length of the clause rather than into the influence of the conjunction itself.
Relative clauses

6 relative clauses are introduced by the subject, and they all, without exception, display a verb third order. The first element is logically the subject, but the nature of the second element can nevertheless vary.

4. SOV  þe us eallum wyrd gemæne.
52. SOV  þe Gode nellad hyran.

Clauses 4 and 52 encompass a pre-verbal object (in opposition to the heavier post-verbal objects in clauses 96 and 98), whereas the remaining 4 clauses 34, 86, 96 and 98 placed an adverbial before the finite verb:

34. SV  þe to wide wyrd mid mannum on eordan.
86. SV  þe æfre ær ware
96. SVO se þe ær nole sodes gelyfan
98. SVO þam (ponne) þe ær geearnod node hell wite.

The adverbial in clause 34 is a prepositional phrase, whereas clauses 86, 96 and 98 placed an adverb between the subject and the verb. I believe verb third may be considered as a rule, as a consequence of which an element, preferably a light one, must precede the finite verb, which would explain the placement of ær in clauses 96 and 98. However, clauses 4, 34 and 52 need a different explanation. I think that the object in clauses 4 and 52 are less constrained to be placed before the verb than the predicative adjective or the non-finite verb respectively. Apart from the subject and the verb, which are already placed in first and third position, clause 34 consists of 2 adverbials and a complement:

34. SV  þe to wide wyrd mid mannum on eordan.

The prepositional phrases *mid mannum* and *on eordan* are semantically more strongly related and are placed outside the verbal brace, the complement to *wide*, on the other hand, is placed before the finite verb in order to create a verb third structure. This opposes to Davis’ proposal (2006: 134) of a
RelS O/I V O I/C structure, in which the complement must be placed finally.

In clauses 41 and 47, the relative particle does not function as the subject, but as the object. Just as the previously discussed relative clauses, the verb is placed in third position. As here, the object is placed initially, the subject follows in second position, creating OSV structures. Here, my findings correspond with those of Davis (2006: 134), for he proposes the orders RelO S I V I/C and RelI S O V O/C:

41. OSV  þæt þæt we scoldan,
47. OSV  þæt we sceoldan on godes est gelæstan.

According to him, the object must be positioned pre-verbally when light in weight, and post-verbally when heavy.

Why the subject and not another element have to be placed in second position, might be because the subject is an obligatory element, while others, such as an object and an adverbial, are not necessary to construct a clause. The use of the latter would therefore lead to inconsistencies.

All relative clauses portray a verb third pattern, in which the subject always precedes the verb, either because it has merged with the relative particle or because it must fill in the second position when the object is placed initially.

3.3.1.2 Inversion

The order of subject and finite verb is inverted in 13 clauses in the excerpt. This low percentage of 12% supports Gardner’s ((1971) in Bean 2001: 200-202) idea that inversion was not frequently used in Late Old English. Apparently, inversion mainly occurs in principal clauses, no single subordinate clause portrays inversion. 5 non-conjoined main clauses, i.e. clauses 6, 31, 35, 87 and 99, revealing an inverted element order, are those clauses in which an element other than the
verb is topicalised. Most often, these elements are adverbs, and in one occasion (clause 35) an adjective. 1 exception is clause 59, in which, though the adverb eac is topicalised, an SV pattern emerges. Perhaps the tendency to place the finite verb in second position causes the subject, along with other objects and adverbials which are not placed initially, to follow the finite verb. In 4 instances, the subject immediately follows the verb, as a consequence of which the object and adverbial are placed at the end of the clause. The only exception is clause 6:

6.VS swa cymd eac for synnum fyr ofer mancynn,

Here, the subject fyr is separated from the finite verb cymd by eac and for synnum. The fact that the subject does not immediately follow the finite verb may be ascribed to the influence of eac.

Inversion seems to appear most frequently in principal clauses conjoined by means of and/7. In all instances, and/7 is immediately followed by one or more adverbials and in clauses 8, 10, 19, 48, 85 and 93, the adverbial(s) is/are immediately followed by the finite verb. Only one exception is made in clause 25, when the object is placed pre-verbally, yet still after the adverbial.

25.OVS And dy us deriad 7 dearle dyrfad fela ungelimpa,

This clause is the only inverted structure in which an object is revealed. Many (7 out of 19, i.e. clauses 8, 10, 19, 25, 48, 85 and 93) of the non-dependent clauses introduced by the conjunction and/7 have inversion, of which Mitchell (1985: 976) states that the cause is the conjunction and/7 itself. I find this a rather poor explanation, for the other 12 clauses indicate an SV pattern. Instead of neVS, I believe that the length of the subject is a decisive factor. According to Mitchell (1985:
969-972), the topicalisation of an object or of certain adverbials, such as \textit{pa} and \textit{ponne} will be followed by an inverted element order.

However, 2 main clauses are introduced by \textit{ponne}, i.e. clauses 72 and 95, and both entail inversion, which already has an exceptional status, for the subjects are the following clauses:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 72.V \quad \text{donna bid gelic}
  \item 73.SV \quad \text{þam swylce sunne sy abystrad.}
  \item 95.V(S) \quad \text{Đonne mæg gecnawan}
  \item 96.SVO \quad \text{se þe ær rolde sodes gelyfan}
\end{itemize}

Also 7 subordinate clauses, i.e. clauses 12, 14, 23, 54, 57, 64 and 72, begin with \textit{ponne}, yet none are found with an inverted order of subject and finite verb.

According to Campbell (in Mitchell 1985: 974), inversion follows a fronted adverbial for the sake of the verb second. However, in these instances, the conjunction can be found in first position, the adverbial(s) in second and the verb in third. Now, as Braune ((1894) in Bernhardt & Davis 1997: 46) has indicated by his explanation on \textit{gedeckte} verb first, some researchers believe that the initial conjunction is not part of the clause, which would mean that the adverbial takes first and the finite verb second position. Moreover, clause 25 placed the object before the finite verb, resulting into a verb third structure. However, it is also possible that Campbell (in Mitchell 1985: 974) is incorrect and that Bean (2001: 236) is right when stating that inversion is more of a narrative feature of Old English prose.
3.3.1.3 Negation

Only 7 clauses are negated, in which 3 possible structures are expected, i.e. neVS, SpronOneV and SneVO, as described by Mitchell (1985: 977). Though the former should be the most common pattern according to Mitchell (1985: 977), it only occurs once in clause 87, which at first sight supports Bacquet’s idea (in Mitchell 1985: 977) that inversion after negation is rather marked:

87. VSO Ne byrhdl se gesibba þonne gesibban þe ma þe þam fremdan

On the other hand, clause 87 is the only negated principal clause, as a consequence of which it may be possible that neVS is the normal order in non-dependent clauses. After all, some researchers regard ne as an adverbial, after which inversion was a highly common phenomenon. Special notice should be paid to the placement of the conjunction þonne after the finite verb and the subject. Mitchell (1985: 972) states that þonne, as well as þa, can follow as well as precede the finite verb in negated main clauses. Instead, Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 977) proposed SpronOneV to be the normal order, which is a pattern not present in the excerpt. On the other hand, it should be noted that clause 77 holds a pattern close to Bacquet’s proposed normal order (in Mitchell 1985: 977):

77. SOneV þæt Godes halgan ðægne tacna þonne ne wyrcað

Here, when not taking the introducing conjunction þæt into consideration, the elements are positioned in the order proposed by Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 977), except that the object is nominal and not pronominal. Clauses 91 and 92 resemble the same pattern, in that they placed the finite verb in final position, the negation ne immediately preceding it:
Clause 91 is the only instance in which the negative *ne* has fused with the finite verb. Both clauses have an elided subject and no object. Clause 92 has a double negation, for the clause itself begins with the conjunction *ne*, a negative particle, which seems to have been omitted by the researchers mentioned above. Apart from clause 92, clauses 40, 42 and 44 are also introduced by a negative conjunction. Clauses 42 and 44, indicate an S...V structure:

42.SOV ne we teodunga syllad
44.SOV ne we ælmessan dælad

This contrasts with clause 40, a clause with an elided subject, but still an object preceding the finite verb in final position, and with clause 92, a clause with neither subject nor object, and with only 2 adverbs, *eft* and *ne*, preceding the final finite verb:

40.OV ne gode gelæstan
92.V ne eft ne geweorped.

It is impossible to confirm or contradict the theories of Bacquet (in Mitchell 1985: 977) and Mitchell (1985: 977), not only because of the confinement of this dissertation, but also because both have failed to distinguish different clause types. Again, more research is needed in this domain.
3.3.2 Predigtsammlung B

3.3.2.1 General analysis

Graph 5

Graphs 5 to 8 show that the excerpt taken from Predigtsammlung B comprises 42 non-dependent clauses, of which a majority of 39 are non-conjoined.

Graph 6

Of these 39, 22 are initiated by the subject, 16 by an adverbial and 1 by a finite verb. 3 other clauses are conjoined by means of **unte**. 33 clauses are subordinate. In contrast to Old English, a subordinate clause does not necessarily have to be introduced by a conjunction in Old High German, as 5 dependent clauses are non-conjoined. Despite this possibility, most clauses are conjoined, 11 times by **daz** in clauses 2, 13, 21, 25, 34, 35, 38, 57, 60, 73 and 77; 3 times by **do** in clauses 19, 49 and 74; 4 times by **so** in clauses 30,
54, 55 and 56; 2 times by *uuante* in clauses 43 and 100; and once by *unte*, *dare*, *suntir*, *suenne*, *oder*, *also*, *aua* and *suie* in clauses 22, 4, 10, 16, 31, 65, 88 and 98 respectively.

![Graph 7](image)

Of the 100 clauses of the excerpt, 25 clauses are relative, in which 11 times, the relative particle is merged with the subject. In 7 relative clauses, the relative particle functions as the object of the clause, and the remaining 7 clauses are introduced by an adverbial relative particle.

![Graph 8](image)
i  Principal clauses

Similar to the Old English analysis, in Old High German several patterns can also be found with regard to clause type. All principal clauses begin with the subject, so that SVO structure with the verb in second position may be considered as a rule in Predigtsammlung B, which is confirmed by the S V I/C O order proposed by Davis (2006: 144). The objects as well as the adverbials, irrespective of their weight, function or class, always follow the finite verb: the short pronominal indirect object uns in clause 1, as well as the longer nominal direct object die ziueei kibo dere minne in clause 5b are placed after the subject and the finite verb.

The verb is always placed in verb second position when the clause is introduced by 1 or more adverbials, pushing the subject after the finite verb and creating inversion in all instances but 1, clause 70, in which the subject is implicit in the subjunctive finite verb and no inversion can occur:

70.V  Nu sehen,

Despite Davis’ assertion (2006: 144-145) that SV can occur in clauses with initial adverbial when the subject is pronominal, no proof can be found in this excerpt. In clause 75, for instance, the pronominal subject er is placed after the finite verb uuart.

75.VS  do uuart er dannen kistozzen in daz ellentuom disere uuenicheite.

Perhaps the Old English tendency to place the verb in second position described by Campbell (in Mitchell 1985: 974) is valid for Old High German too. The direct or indirect object can only be placed post-verbally, or else the verb would not be positioned in second position. Clauses 9, 91, 97 and 99
show that the weight of the object determines whether the object is placed before or after the subject: clause 9 positioned the light and pronominal object between the subject and the finite verb, whereas clauses 91, 97 and 99 placed the rather long and heavy objects in final position.

Non-dependent clauses cannot only be introduced by an adverbial, but also by the conjunction **unte**. Extra prudence is in order, for clauses introduced by **unte** can also be subordinate, depending on the type of clause it is related to. In this excerpt, 4 clauses are introduced by **unte**, of which 3 are principal clauses and 1 dependent. The verbal position in the principal clauses is not consistent: clauses 18 and 53 show verb second, whereas in clause 45, the finite verb is placed in **Späterstellung**. The former 2 are closely linked with the preceding clause, for they rely upon the pronominal subject of the previous clauses 17 and 52, which causes ellipsis of the pronominal subject er, here indicated with [Ø].

17.VS dare nah chumet er
18.VO **unte** Ø pisizzet siu mit sinemo lièhte.

52.SV Er gab in den kiuualt prediginnis
53.VO **unte** Ø hiez siu haben die miteuuari des lampis,

In these cases, the finite verb is placed immediately after the conjunction **unte**, taking verb second position, in order to stress the relation with the preceding clause. Clearly, the element order of the clauses 17 and 52 are of no relevance for the clauses 18 and 53 respectively, as clause 17 placed the subject in final position as a consequence of the inversion triggered by the adverbials **dare** and **nah**, and as clause 52 starts with the pronominal subject er.

The subject of clause 45, on the other hand, differs from the subject of clause 44, resulting in a rather unexpected element order of the former:
The subject in clause 45, *der liut*, can be found in fourth position, being preceded by the conjunction, the adverb *doh* and the direct object *iz*. The subject is followed by the non-finite infinitive *wurchen*, which is placed in final position, and the subjunctive finite verb *uuelle* in *Späterstellung*. None of the other non-dependent clauses discussed show a similar pattern. However, when comparing this clause with the subordinate clause 22:

22.OV  unte dero snītare luzil uuari.

it may be possible to state that the later position of the finite verb in clause 45 is a marker of subordinate clauses. Another explanation is the possibility that Old High German might have also been subject to a tendency to place the finite and non-finite verb forms together, a phenomenon described by van Kemenade (1994: 136) with regard to Old English. Also special notice should be paid to the placement of the object before the subject, due to the weight of the arguments.

To return to the comparison of clause 44 and 45, in which the object follows the subject in clause 44, yet precedes it in clause 45, it is of no coincidence that in the former clause, the subject *er* is pronominal, whereas the object, *daz reth*, is nominal. In clause 45 on the other hand, the subject is heavier than the object due to its nominal nature, as a consequence of which the subject is postponed after the object.

All 4 instances, including the subordinate clause, show no signs of inversion, which contrasts with Behaghel’s belief (1932: 30-36) that inversion occurs regularly after *und*. Many reasons can be reported for this distinction: it may be possible that my findings are not representative or that the text is taken from a period later than the one of the
manuscripts Behaghel (1932) based himself on, but I find it rather unlikely that all 4 of these clauses present no indication of a characteristic which is generalised to the entire Old High German period, to which also Predigtsammlung B belongs.

Clause 24 is the second principal clause, which does not have the verb in second position, yet in contrast to clause 56, it is not placed in verb third of even verb final position, but in initial position:

24. VO pittit den almahtigen got,

The mood of the verb provides a quick explanation, as imperative clauses (Behaghel 1932: 144) tend to leave out the subject, resulting in this case in a mere VO construction in which the verb is more emphasised.

In short, it can be noticed that all but 3 principal clauses, i.e. clauses 45, 91 and 97, have verb second, which indicates that Ebert’s assertion on the regular use of verb second in Old High German (1978: 38) is correct. Clauses 15, 46, 50 and 70 have verb final position, yet they have verb second and verb final at the same time. In 3 instances, the clause consists of the subject and the verb only, in one case, the initial adverbial is followed by a subjunctive verbal form with an elided subject. This means that the final position of the finite verb is not characteristic of Late Old High German, which corresponds with the ideas of Lockwood and Ellis (both in Bernhardt and Davis 1997: 43-44) that verb final was only used until Notker’s period.
ii  Subordinate clauses

Of the 37 subordinate clauses, 5 are not introduced by a conjunction. In these clause types, though dependent, no *Späterstellung* or verb final occurs: 4 clauses, i.e. clauses 8, 41, 44 and 78, have verb first position, and 1 clause, i.e. clause 47, has verb second. The former can be subdivided into 2 subcategories: clause 8 is opposed to clauses 41, 44 and 78. Clause 8 has the same subject as clause 7, as a consequence of which the subject *die* is elided:

7. SV  
die niemir irfullet nimagen uuerdén,
8. V  
Ø niuuari iêdoh zi minniste unter ziuuain.

The ellipsis of the subject in such cases is not uncommon, resulting into the movement of the finite verb into first position. Here it is interesting to wonder whether the finite verb shifts from second to first position, following the idea that the absence of the subject causes a drag chain in which every element is positioned 1 place earlier in the sentence, or whether the finite verb moves from final placement into first. The latter assertion signifies that the verb, which tends to be placed towards the end of the subordinate clause, is repositioned in initial position in order to underline the relation between clause 7 and 8. Clauses 41, 44 and 78 on the other hand encompass inversion with the subject, placed in second position. In attempting to explain clause 41, its context should be looked into:

41. VSO  
taret iz ettesuenne demo hirte,
42. SVO  
iz taret aue iêntie demo quartire,

Conspicuously, clauses 41 and 42 are very similar, in that they do not only have the same subject *iz*, but also because in both clauses the finite verb is immediately followed by 1 or more adverbials. Both clauses also end with an indirect object, which both consist of an article, which has the same form, and a noun in the dative. Though many resemblances, the
relative order of the subject and the object differs, for which the cause should not only be sought in the notion of stylistic considerations, but also in the meaning of the clause type. Clauses 41 and 42 are non-conjoined coordinated conditional concessive clauses, comparable with the Dutch proverb *baat het niet, het schaadt ook niet*. Though there are no examples of this clause type found in the Wulfstan excerpt, this clause type also existed in Old English.\(^3\) Moreover, clause 41 is weaker than clause 42, for *ettesuenne*, which could in Modern High German be translated as *irgendwenn*, is weaker than *iêntie*, meaning *immer* in Modern German. Also *hirte*, referring to a shepherd, is smaller than a whole group of shepherds, the *quartire*.\(^4\) All previous enumerated similarities are not a mere series of coincidences: the original author must have been conversant with figures of speech such as chiasmus. Clause 44 can be regarded in the same light as clause 41, for also this clause must be analysed in relation to its context and also here, the conditional and concessive aspect of the clause cannot be neglected.

\[\begin{align*}
43a. & \text{ uuante} \\
44. VS & \text{ nimac der bredigare nieth sprechen,} \\
43b. SVO & \text{ er chan iêdoh daz reth wurchen,}
\end{align*}\]

This complex structure, in which clause 44 is embedded in clause 43 immediately after the conjunction *uuante*, places the negated verb in initial position. Moreover, I believe that the initial placement did not only occur under the influence of the conditional aspect of the clause, but also to stress the negation. By fronting the finite verb, the negative particle *ni*, which is proclitically attached to the verb, is placed in initial position. The negation is repeated by means of the word *nieth*, stressing its importance.

The last clause with initial verbal placement is clause 78.

\(^3\) Personal communication with prof. dr. Van Herreweghe (16-07-2010)
\(^4\) Personal communication with prof. dr. De Grauwe (18-05-2010)
The subjunctive finite verb uirruochelon indicates the conditional aspect of the clause, which I believe to be the factor for inversion. This structure supports Schrodt’s idea (2004: 207-208) that verb first can occur in subordinate conditional clauses without introductory word. Apart from the 3 clauses mentioned, verb first can only be found once in clause 24, a principal imperative clause discussed previously. According to Behaghel (1932: 27 and 37), verb first was not infrequent in Indo-European times, but its occurrence decreased in the Middle High period. This could be a plausible explanation for the small number of verb first clauses, for changes did not happen overnight, and Late Old High German was already in a state of transition to Middle High German. Meineke (2001: 321) does not agree and states that verb first was rather infrequently used in Old High German declarative clauses. This hypothesis can also not be contradicted by my findings.

In contrast to the previous clauses, clause 47 is non-conjoined, yet beginning with the subject.

47. SV  iz niiuerde imo kichundit

This is the only clause in which verb second takes place and no inversion can be found.

In general, the statements concerning dependent clauses without introductory word cannot be generalised under any circumstances, because the small number of 5 clauses of this type restrain me from doing so. Also, I did not find any background information on this topic, as a result of which the demand for more research flares up again.

The 5 non-conjoined subordinate structures are only a minority, for the 31 other are conjoined. 11 clauses are introduced by the universal conjunction daz. The common verbal
structures are Späterstellung, present in clauses 2, 13, 25, 34, 38, 60, 73 and 77, and final position, which is represented by clauses 21, 35 and 57. In the former type, the subject immediately follows the conjunction in all the examples. In clauses 25, 34, 73 and 77, the subject is immediately followed by the finite verb. The exbraciated elements are never light in weight and all differ in type: clause 25 exbraciates the direct object and a prepositional phrase,

25.SVO  daz er senti die uuerhmanne in sinen aren.

Whereas clause 34 places 2 adverbials at the very end of the clause:

34.SV  daz der predigare firstummet: ettisuenne durh sin selbis unreth,

The clauses 73 and 77 both exbraciate the predicate:

73.SV  daz er uuari õoberi des paradysi;
77.SV  daz uuir sin õobare dere gotis e:

Also in the other Späterstellungen, clauses 2, 13, 38, and 60, several kinds of elements, such as the object, be it direct or indirect, and prepositional phrases, are exbraciated. Opposed to the first 4 clauses, here elements other than the conjunction and the subject precede the verb. In clause 2, the prepositional phrase and the indirect object precede the verb iruueliti:

2.SOVO  daz unser herro Ihesus Christus zuo den heiligen bóton
imo iruueliti sibinzic unta ziuueni iungerun,

Strikingly, the heavy prepositional phrase precedes the verb and the light pronominal indirect object. The embraciation of imo can easily be explained by Fourquet’s assumption (in Schrodt 2004: 203) that light elements, such as unstressed pronouns, tend to be placed within the verbal brace. On the other hand, the prepositional phrase zuo den heiligen bóton as
a heavy element would be more likely to be exbraciated, as is also supported by the clauses 13 and 38, in which in alla die stete and ze firnemenne are also placed at the end of the clause. In the latter 2 clauses, the subject is immediately followed by the object or predicate respectively. Also short adverbials, including negatives, and adjectives can be placed between the subject and the verb. The last clause, clause 60,  exbraciates the indirect object, which is a second grade dative object, dependent on an adjective (Duden Grammatik 6. 1998: 694 [§1400/2]) and places the adjective kelih within the verbal clause for considerations of weight.

3 other clauses introduced by daz, clauses 21, 35 and 57, display an absolute verb final position.

21.OV daz der arin michel uuare
35.SOV daz er die nieth vuurchen niuule,
57.SOV daz si denno den tarent,

Similar to the other clauses with daz discussed above, the subject can be found in second position. Clause 21 is the only exception, for here, the object der arin michel, a partitive genitive, immediately follows the conjunction daz. In this kind of clause, the subject is elided, now known to us as constructions with an impersonal pronoun as in the Modern English expression there are, or as in Modern High German es gibt. In all the clauses, the objects and the adverbials are short in length and light in weight, as a consequence of which they are placed pre-verbally. Only clause 57 has an extra reason not to exbraciate: the adverb denno and den alliterate. To some extent, rhythmical reasons can therefore alter the placement of the elements in religious prose. However, I do not believe it could create grammatically incorrect constructions.
A subordinate clause could also be introduced by a local or temporal conjunction, in this text represented by *dare* and *do* respectively. Lockwood (1968: 259) asserts that under the influence of these conjunctions, verb second can occur. Nevertheless, no proof can be found in this excerpt: only one clause is introduced with *dare*, a connector with a locative connotation, in which the verb is placed at the absolute end of the clause. Of the 3 clauses with the temporal conjunction *do*, clauses 19 and 49 encompass verb final. Clause 74 placed the verb in third position, a seemingly exceptional structure which seems affected by its context:

73.SV  daz er uuari ûoberi des paradysi;
74.SVO  do er do firbrah daz gotis kebot,

As discussed above, the verb third position in *daz*-clauses was not uncommon. Presumably, clause 73 has had an influence on clause 74, resulting into the parallel structures conjunction-subject-verb-rest and therefore into the exbraciation of the direct object *daz gotis kebot*.

Similarly, no verb second, but only *Späterstellung* or verb final can be found in the other subordinate clauses introduced by *unte, uuante, suntir, suenne, oder, also, aua or suie*. An explanation for this is easily found, for the verb is most often preceded by the conjunction and the subject, as a consequence of which the verb can only be placed as early as the third position. I believe that certain clauses, despite the notion that the verb is positioned later than verb second, are not just representations of *Späterstellung*, in which the verb, which should have been verb final, is followed by an exbraciated element. Examples are clause 43, introduced by *uuante*, clause 10, introduced by *suntir*, clause 65, introduced by *also*, and clause 88, introduced by *aua*. If the conjunction were omitted, these clauses would represent the structure of a
non-dependent clause. Especially clauses 43 and 10 need extra attention, for 2 verb forms can be found within the clause:

43a. uuante
43b. SVO er chan iêdoh daz reth wurchen,
10. SVO suntir er scol si irfullen an einemo anderemo.

Similarities between the clauses are easily found: both clauses are subordinate, are introduced by a conjunction, have a modal finite verb and consist of the same elements. However, in clause 43, the infinitive is placed in absolutely final position, embracing the object and the adverbial, whereas clause 10 exbraciates the adverbial. An explanation can be provided by the idea that an einemo anderemo is longer and is therefore exbraciated, but when comparing with clause 100, which is also introduced by the conjunction uuante, it seems that weight is not always a legitimate explanation, for here, the heavy prepositional phrase is positioned within the verbal brace. Perhaps, the conjunction uuante concerns with that an obligatory final placement of the verb, i.e. the finite verb in simple clauses or the infinitive in periphrastic clauses.

All other clauses, i.e. those introduced by so, unte, suenne, oder and suie can be found with Späterstellung, which is caused by the exbraciation of one or more prepositional phrases in all instances except in clause 31, or verb final. Clause 31 reveals an OVO structure, which can be explained by means of its context:

30. SOV so iz gote liche
31. OVO oder Ø imo selbemo nuzze si oder dero diheinigemo,
32. OSOV demo er iz spenten scol.’

Clause 31 has elided the subject iz, for it shares the same pronominal subject as the preceding clause 30. Special here, is that part of the indirect object is placed at the end of the clause, for which I can think of four reasons. First, it might be possible that the object is broken up for the sake of
clarity. Perhaps the transparency between clause 30 and 31, especially their relation on the basis of a common subject, would not be explicit. Second, rhetorical considerations of stress and emphasis could be at work. These purposes have not been investigated thoroughly yet, and exbraciation could either place extra stress on or, on the contrary, remove the stress from the element, which could signify that a stronger emphasis is put on *imo selbemo* or *dero diheinigemo*. Third, another stylistic aspect must be taken into consideration, for now, the clause is more balanced when the finite verb is placed in the middle and 2 elements beginning with *oder* are spread over the entire clause. A fourth reason could be that exbraciation occurs because of the tendency to place the antecedent as near as possible to the relative particle referring to it. In this case, demo of clause 32 refers to *dero diheinigemo*.

To summarise, verb second only exceptionally occurs in subordinate clauses, and verb first in clauses without a conjunction and *Späterstellung* or verb final in conjoined clauses may be considered as a rule. However, some clauses prove that *Späterstellung* cannot be equated with verb third. Certain conjunctions seem to trigger verb third rather than *Späterstellung*. However, not enough examples are provided in order to be able to draw permanent conclusions.

***Relative clauses***

Relative clauses, irrespective of the syntactic function (subject, object or adverbial) of the relative particle, show an SV structure, except for clauses 69 and 95. However, when it comes to the absolute position of the finite verb, no clear patterns are found. When the relative particle functions as the subject of the clause, verb second, found in clauses 27, 63, 94 and 96, verb final, which occurs in clauses 11, 29, 80
and 87, as well as exbraciation (or Späterstellung), seen in clauses 7, 61 and 82 occur. In the clauses with final verbal position, all object(s) and/or adverbial(s) are placed within the verbal brace. Nevertheless, the fact that objects and adverbs can precede is not an absolute rule: when the verb occupies second position, they are logically placed after the verb. In the clauses with Späterstellung, and the objects and adverbials can, seemingly without any reason, either precede or follow the verb:

7.SV die niemir irfullet nimagen uuerdén,
61.SVO der des morgenis fruo in sinan uuinkarten samenoti die uuerhiuti.
82.SVO der dir aua vuurchet daz gotis reth,

The verb phrase in clause 7 is preceded by the negative adverb niemir. Interesting is the placement of the finite verb, for it is, in contrast to the expectation that the finite verb would be placed at the end of the verbal phrase, positioned between the participle irfullet and the infinitive uuerdén. In clauses 61 and 82, the verb is preceded by 1 or more adverbials respectively, yet the object is exbraciated, which could be attributed to consideration of emphasis.

When the relative particle has merged with the object, the subject immediately follows, taking second position and pushing the verb more towards the end of the clause. The absolute final placement of the finite verb can be found in clauses 32, 36, 58 and 64. Clauses 3, 36 and 58, on the other hand, exbraciate 1 or more prepositional phrases, despite the fact that clearly other adverbials and objects can precede the verb, as for instance in clause 89, in which 1 prepositional phrase precedes and 1 prepositional phrase follows the finite verb ladite:
This particular clause can be explained by the idea that the relation of the prepositional phrase *zi demo euuigen liebe* is more firmly attached to the finite verb *ladite*.

Similar patterns can be found in clauses in which the relative particle is preceded by a preposition, as a consequence of which it functions as an adverbial. Clauses 14, 40, 71 and 93 reveal absolute final position, whereas in clauses 69, 86 and 95, certain elements are positioned out of the verbal brace. Clause 86, for instance, has exbraciated the object as well as the adverbial, which also occurred in the previous type of relative clauses:

However, the other 2 clauses are exceptional, for they have exbraciated the subject, which leads to inversion. In clause 69, the weight of the subject is an important factor for the use of inversion. In explaining the exbraciation of clause 95, the subsequent clause should also be included:

The relative particle of clause 96 refers to the subject of clause 95, as a result of which the subject of clause 95 is exbraciated. In this way, the relation between the antecedent *dui heiliga christinheit* and the particle *dui dir* is made clear (Duden Grammatik. 1998: 820 [$1400]).

In short, it can be said that relative clauses in Old High German most often encompass an SV structure, as inversion seems to occur only under exceptional circumstances. Verb second only occurs when the relative particle is the subject.
at the same time, and even then, only in a few clauses, the subject is immediately followed by the verb. Almost half of the relative clauses have verb final position, i.e. 12 out of 25, the difference with the number of clauses with Späterstellung is rather small, for it occurs in 9 out of 25 relative clauses.

3.3.2.2 Inversion

Though inversion has been discussed per clause, I believe it is important to take a closer look at it. It was not uncommon, as 20% of the clauses knew inversion. Most commonly, inversion occurs in principal clauses introduced by an adverbial. As discussed above, all 14 instances lead to the assumption that in these circumstances, the appearance of inversion is regular. The use of inversion in subordinate and relative clauses is less frequent, for in the former, only 4 instances, of which 3 non-conjoined and 1 introduced by uuante, are found, and in the latter merely 2. The subordinate clause 37 and the relative clauses 69 and 95 have an inverted element order for the same reason as the main clauses: the clause is introduced by one or more adverbials.

Inversion in relative clause 69 cannot only be explained by the influence of the fronted adverbial, but also by Reszkiewicz ((1966) in Kohonen 1978: 16), who claims that heavier elements are placed towards the end of the clause. The long enumeration is subject to Behaghel’s Law of Accumulating Elements (1932: 14), which states that longer and heavier elements are placed later in the clause.
As already is mentioned previously, inversion also inevitably takes place in clause 95, because the antecedent is placed finally to enable a relation with the following relative clause.

In the remaining 2 subordinate non-conjoined clauses, 41 and 78, verb first triggers the appearance of inversion for reasons of style in the clause 41 and in clause 78 because of its conditional nature. For the non-conjoined clause

`43.VS nimac der bredigare nieth sprechen`,

the explanation lies in its conditional nature and in the absence of a conjunction, as a consequence of which the finite verb is placed initially.

In other words, inversion does happen under certain regular circumstances in the excerpt from Predigtsammlung B. It does not only occur as a rule in main clauses with one or more fronted adverbials, but it is also found when the subject is heavy, or for reasons of style and stress. Bernhardt and Davis’ (1997: 52-53) idea that inversion can also come into being as a consequence of the topicalisation of objects and negative particles cannot be confirmed. Again, it is important to indicate that the limited scope of this dissertation does not allow for making generalisations of any kind.

### 3.3.2.3 Negation

After an analysis focussing on the structure of certain clause types, special attention should be paid to the influence of negation on syntactical structures. In the Predigtsammlung B excerpt, 14 out of 100 clauses are negated. 6 of them, clauses 9, 12, 46, 67, 84 and 99, are non-dependent clauses. Another 6, i.e. clauses 8, 35, 38, 43, 47 and 54, are dependent, and 2,
clauses 7 and 11, are relative. The different structures found in the excerpt are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ni-V</th>
<th>niemir</th>
<th>8, 46, 47, 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni-V</td>
<td>nieman</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni-V</td>
<td>nieth</td>
<td>11, 35, 38, 43, 54, 84, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>niemir</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All clauses but one, clause 12, are negated at least by means of a negative particle which has fused with the finite verb. Clauses 8, 46, 47 and 67 encompass only a single negation, which is a remnant of older times. In the light of Indo-European, when ne was still an independent particle, Behaghel (1932: 12) suggests that ne pushes the verb in verb third position when the negative particle is placed immediately before the finite verb and immediately after the subject. However, in this text, ne only appears proclitically, which indicates that the author might have experienced the negative particle as part of the finite verb. In my opinion, negator ne has lost its stress and independence it once had in the Late Old High German period, as a consequence of which it has fused with the finite verb. For this reason, the verb in clauses such as clause 9 must be considered as verb second:

9.VSO     In imo selbemo nimac si nieman irfullen,

In this logic, ni has not caused the inverted order, but the topicalised adverbial in imo selbemo.

The same remark should be made that here, ne has lost its function as an independent element. The negation is only once placed, at the beginning of clause 8 proclitically with the verb:
I believe this clause is not the result of the influence of Latin on Late Old High German, but rather the result of an elided subject, which would be placed initially, if present, and this also occurs in the subordinate clause 31:

31. OVO oder Ø imo selbemo nuzze si oder dero diheinigemo,

Harbert (2007: 396) describes the weakening of the fusion of ne-V. This is supported by the majority of the clauses in which a double negation can be found. Ne-V had to be enforced by means of a second negator, which resulted into fusion of ni-iemir, ni-ieman and ni-ieth, respectively meaning ‘not ever’, ‘not anyone’ and ‘not thing’. At first, double negation was used to emphasise, but later on, it became a obligatory phenomenon. In third stage, ne-V became superfluous and gradually disappeared and the negation will be expressed by nieth alone.

Double negation with ni-V and nieth occurs 7 times in the excerpt, of which once in relative clause 11, 4 times, i.e. in clauses 35, 38, 43 and 54, in a subordinate clause and twice in a non-dependent clauses, i.e., in clauses 84 and 99. In the relative and subordinate clauses, niéth precedes the finite verb, supporting Behaghel’s notion (1932: 152) that nicht precedes the finite verb in dependent declarative clauses, except in non-conjoined conditional clause 44:

44. VS nimac der bredigare nieth sprechen,

This clause-type, to which also clause 8 belongs, displays initial placement of the finite verb.

Just as the negative adverb nieth, niemir takes the position before the finite verb in relative clause 7:

---

5 This can still be found in certain Dutch dialects, as for instance ’k en doe da nie, in which en originates from ne (metathesis)
In the 2 declarative main clauses, i.e. 84 and 99, the finite verb with a proclitic negative is positioned in second position. The difference in placement of nieth can be explained by Behaghel (1932: 145-146).

It is normal for niéth to immediately follow the finite verb in a declarative non-dependent clause with SV-pattern. Clause 99 on the other hand does not encompass SV-order:

When nicht refers to the finite verb of a non-periphrastic non-dependent clause with an inverted order of subject and verb, it can either be found immediately after the finite verb, immediately after the pronominal subject or between “zwei Bestimmungen des Verbs” for which Behaghel (1932: 148) gives the example from the Erzählungen 127: “da nähme mancher nicht viel Geld” (Behaghel 1932: 148), initially or finally. Clause 9, with the negative adverb nieman, can be explained similarly:

Just as Behaghel (1932: 148) has posited for nieth, nieman can be placed immediately after the pronominal subject in VS clauses.

Bernhardt & Davis (1997: 61) assert that negation did not influence the element order in questions, but they do not provide similar comments on declarative, exclamative or imperative clauses. I believe that the negative enclitic does not have an influence on the use of inversion, whatever the type of clause it may occur in. Verb first occurs only once
(in clause 8), as a consequence of the omission of the subject. 5 times the negated finite verb can be found in non-dependent declarative clauses in verb second, which is regarded as the normal position. Verb second is also found in subordinate clause 47. SVO was not uncommon in non-conjoined declarative clauses. 5 clauses, of which 2 are relative and three are subordinate, encompass Späterstellung or verb final position. Both positions are not infrequent in relative and subordinate clauses. It can be stated that the assertion by Bernhardt & Davis (1997: 61) does not only relate to questions, but also to statements: the negative particle, be it ne or nicht (or in my opinion also nieman and niemir), does not influence the element order of non-dependent, dependent or relative clauses in any way.

Still, clause 12 must be entered in the list of negated sentences, though the only negation which can be found is the adverb niemer:

12. SVO der scol niemir daz ambahte kiuuinnen der bredigi.

Whether this clause is exceptional or whether it was possible to place only the negative adverb in order to negate the clause is not sure. The exceptional nature is enforced by Harbert (2007: 389), who maintains that Old High German tended to prefer clausal over constituent negation. The latter option would then occur in analogy to the later stage in which only nieth/nicht was used.
4 Conclusions

4.1 General

Though from both fragments an equal number of clauses has been selected, they differ immensely in the division of clause types. Both excerpts for instance, have 42 non-dependent clauses. However, of these 42 clauses, 21 are conjoined and 21 are non-conjoined in Secundum Lucam, whereas 39 are non-conjoined and 3 conjoined in Predigtsammlung B. The former can be introduced by 2 different conjunctions: 7/and and bonne, whereas the latter only has enti, the equivalent of 7/and. It appears that it was less common in Old High German, or at least in the Predigtsammlung B, to introduce a main clause with a coordinating conjunction. In the end, it is possible that coordinated clauses are part of Wulfstan’s style, for the use of coordinated clauses is considered as common in Old English. Moreover, 49 clauses are subordinate in the Old English fragment, while only 39 are dependent in the Old High German excerpt. Another distinction is that it is not obligatory for Old High German subordinate clauses to be introduced by a conjunction, which is completely different from the Old English fragment, in which all dependent clauses are conjoined. Beside, only 8 Old English clauses are relative, of which in 5, the subject has emerged with the relative particle and of which the object has fused with the relative particle in 2 clauses, in Wulfstan’s fragment, whereas the fragment of the Predigtsammlung B author contains 25 relative clauses, in which the relative particle can not only function as a subject or an object, but also as an adverbial. These distinctions can be ascribed to the writing style of the authors as well as to the inability of the languages to construct certain structures.
4.1.1 **Principal clauses**

When the subject is the first element, it seems that verb second is the norm in both languages. However, verb third also occurs in Old English, because the pronominal object can be placed pre-verbally. In contrast, the verb second rule appears to be absolute in Old High German: all objects must be positioned after the finite verb. When the first element is not the subject in non-conjoined principal clauses, there does not seem to be an absolute rule regarding the placement of the finite verb in second position, but, as exceptions are noted in Old English (verb final) and in Old High German (verb first), there is certainly a strong tendency towards it, consequently leading to an inverted subject-verb order.

When conjoined, both languages portray different element orders. On the one hand, SV and VS can be found in the Old English clauses, whereas, on the other hand, only the normal order emerges in the Old High German excerpt. In the former, verb second appears only once; in all other clauses the finite verb is positioned more towards the end. In the latter, the simple verb is still placed in second position, but when there is a compound verb phrase, the finite verb is placed immediately before the non-finite verb at the end of the main clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVSO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVoS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V;O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSVo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSoV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjVO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjVS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjoSV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjASV(o)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjA(o)VS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2 Subordinate clauses

In contrast with principal clauses, verb second and inversion are exceptional in Old English as well as in Old High German dependent clauses in both excerpts. The accepted patterns here are verb third, Späterstellung or verb final, in which the number and the weight of the elements are often decisive factors. Old High German can also portray verb first in certain conditional-concessive constructions, because dependent clauses are not obligatorily introduced by a conjunction. Unfortunately, not enough data are available to draw hard and fast conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patterns</th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjS...V(...)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSVo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSoV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSOV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjSoVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjOV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjOVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConjV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Relative clauses

In contrast to principal and subordinate clauses, relative clauses show different patterns in Old English in comparison to Old High German. In Old English, relative clauses always contain a verb third. When the relative particle functions as the subject, another element, object or adverbial, must precede the finite verb. These clauses indeed portray an
S...V(...) order, which supports Quirk & Wrenn’s statement (1955: 44). However, when the relative particle has fused with the object, the relative clause will portray an OSV pattern. Just as in subordinate clauses, an inverted element order is impossible. In Old High German, only clauses 69 and 95 reveal inversion, but still this seems rather exceptional. There is no verb third rule, as half of the relative clauses display a verb final element order. However, also Späterstellung is highly frequent, in contrast to verb third and verb second. My hypothesis that Old High German relative clauses portray S...V(...) structures in analogy with Old English relative clauses can only partially be confirmed. When the relative particle functions as a subject, S...V(...) does indeed emerge, but when it functions as an object or an adverbial, other patterns can be found, as is indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSOV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASVO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Inversion

Inversion is more often used in the Predigtsammlung B excerpt (20%) than in the Secundum Lucam fragment (12%). Inversion occurs most often in both languages in principal clauses in which an element other than the subject has taken the topicalised position. In Old English, it can also appear, seemingly arbitrary, in main clauses conjoined by and/7. In both fragments, inversion is found in a few other clause
types, but the inverted order is presumably the result of considerations of for instance the weight of the subject or of style.

Now, with regard to Gerritsen’s assertion (1984: 113), it must be said that inversion in declarative main clauses is not regular, nor in Old English or Old High German, but it may be regarded as a rule when an adverb is placed in initial position or immediately after the coordinating conjunction and when the subject is heavy. When the subject is pronominal and therefore light in weight, the clause will encompass an SV order in declarative principal clauses with a fronted adverbial. As no exceptions to this assertion are found in the excerpt, it can be deduced that Kohonen’s conclusions ((1976) in Bean 2001: 206 – 209) are the result of his failure to distinguish pronominal from nominal subjects.

4.3 Negation

The element order patterns with negation are more consistent in Old English than in Old High German. In Old English, only 1 non-conjoined main clause is negated, in which the negative particle is placed in first and the finite verb in second position, as a consequence of which inversion occurs. This order corresponds with the unmarked neVS order proposed by Mitchell (1985: 977). Even though Bacquet ( in Mitchell 1985: 977) asserts that this order is marked, there is no indication (mainly caused by the low number of clauses used in this dissertation) to believe that Bacquet is correct. Also 6 subordinate clauses are negated, all of them with verb final. 1 clause reveals an SOneV order, which more or less corresponds a second order proposed by Mitchell (1985: 977), except that the object is pronominal. 1 clause contains only a few adverbials preceding the negated verb final, which might be similar to the third order by Mitchell (1985: 977), SneVO, as it may be plausible to believe that this clause would
portray this order if subject and object were included. However, even though 3 orders are proposed and more or less found, 4 other clauses entail even different orders, because Mitchell (1985: 977) has not taken ne as conjunction into consideration. 4 clauses are so introduced and all portray a verb final structure. In 3 of these, the finite verb is not immediately preceded by ne. In 1 clause this is the case, as a consequence of which double negation occurs.

With regard to Old High German I wondered whether the previously proposed orders can also be found. However, this does only take the negation ne+verb into consideration and neglects the combination ne+adverb, i.e. nieth, nieman or niemir. With a focus on the former, I have discovered that only neVS and SneVO are possible structures in Old High German, as SpronOneV is not attested in this excerpt. In the case of nieth and nieman, the negated adverb can take in the function of object in the excerpt. In contrast to Old English, no clear patterns emerge, as verb first, verb second, Späterstellung and verb final are structures found in the negated clauses. In 8 clauses, the finite verb stands in second position, of which 4 have the normal and 4 the inverted order. Another difference is that ne cannot introduce the clause as a conjunction in Old High German.

4.4 Suggestions for further research

As already mentioned before, historical syntax is far from thoroughly researched. After reading the literature, it became clear that, even though many comparative works exist, many syntactic similarities and differences are still to be revealed. In comparing different Old Germanic languages, all clause types and all clause elements should be regarded separately. As my analysis has shown, especially the position and influence of objects and adverbials in subordinate and relative clauses must be more deeply studied. Moreover, a
greater corpus should be used than for instance my own research, in which one hundred clauses of each language were taken, in order to create a complete and detailed understanding of the syntactic system of the language. Of course, there are more lacuna’s in syntactic studies to be mentioned here, but the greate number of gaps as well as the scope of my dissertation does not allow me to mention all of them. After all the past years, decades and even centuries, in which historical linguists have examined many passed down manuscripts, have formulated, accepted and rejected many hypotheses, have compiled entire dictionaries and have reconstructed entire grammars, including the areas of morphology, phonology and syntax, there are even more years, decades and centuries of research to come. However, future historical linguists will be grateful as they will grasp the full meaning when reading manuscripts as Beowulf, Tatian, the Maldon poem or Notker.
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Appendix

1. Secundum Lucam

a. General analysis

I have divided the fragment, taken from Bethurum (1957: 123-126), into different clauses, which were then given a number between one and onehundred. In some occasions, the clause is interrupted by another clause, but repeated afterwards. These parts will have the same number, yet have the letter a or b to indicate that they belong to the same clause. Each colour represents a different type of clause: red indicates the non-dependent, green the subordinate and blue the relative nature of the clause.

Erunt signa in sole et luna et stellis, et reliqua.

1.SV Ðis godspel segd 7 swutelad
2.SV þæt fela fortacna sculon geweardan wide on worulde, ãgder ge on heofonlicum tunglum ge on eordlicum styrgnum,
3.SV ær dam þe se dom cume
4.SOV þe us eallum wyrd gemæne.
5.SV And witodlice ealswa flod com hwilum ær for synnum,
6.VS swa cymd eac for synnum fy设立了 mancynn,
7.SV 7 dærto hit nealsæcd nu swyðe georne.
8.VS And dy is fela yfela 7 mistlicra gelimpa wide mid mannum,
9.SV 7 eal hit is for synnum.
10a.VS And gyt weorped mare,
11.SV þæs de bec secgad,
10b.S wracu 7 gedrecednes
12.V þonne æfre ær wære ahwar on worulde;
13. SV þæt bid,
14. SV þonne Antecrist weded
15. OV 7 ealle woruld breged,
16. SV 7 ðærto hit nealæcd nu swyde georne.
17. SV And dy hit is on worulde a swa leng swa wyrse,
18. SV ðæs pe we sylfe gecnawad ful georne.
19. VS And eac is on us sylfum swytol 7 gesyne
20. SVO þæt we to wace hyrad urum Drihtne,
21. SVO 7 þæt we to ortreowe syndan Godes mihta 7 his mildheortnessa,
22. SOV 7 þæt we him oftor swyðor abelgad
23. SV þonne we beporftan,
24. SOV 7 eac betweonan us sylfum rihte getrywda healdad to wace for gode 7 for worulde.
25. OVS And dy us deriad 7 dearle dyrfad fela ungelimpa,
26. SOV 7 ælpeodige men 7 utancumene swyde us swencad,
27. SV ealswa Crist on his godspelle swutollice sæde
28. V þæt scolde geweordan.
29. SV He cwæd:
Surget gens contra gentem, et reliqua.
30. SV Þæt is on englisc,
31. VS upp ræsad peoda,
32. SV he cwæd,
33. V 7 widerræde weorpad 7 hetelice winnad 7 sacad heom betweenan for ðam unrihte
34. SV þe to wide wyrd mid mannnum on eordan.
Leofan men,
35. VS clæne wæs þeos eorde on hyre frumsceafte,
36. SOV ac we hi **habbad** syddan afylede swyde 7 mid urum synnum pearly besmitene.

37. SVO And ure misdæda eac **wregead** us gelome,

38. SVO fordam þe we **nellad** Godes lage healdan

39. SV swa swa we **scolda**,

40. OV ne gode **gelæstan**

41. OSV þæt þæt we **scoldan**,

42. SOV ne we teoðunga **syllad**

43. OV swa swa us **gebyrede**,

44. SOV ne we ælmessan **dælad**

45. SV swa swa we **bedorftan**,

46. VO ac on æghwylce wisan **waniad** to swyde eal

47. OSV þæt we **sceoldan** on godes est gelæstan.

48. VS And fordý us eac **swencad** 7 ongean **winnad** manege gesceafte,

49. SV ealswa hit **awritten is**:

Pugnabit pro Deo orbis terrarum contra insensatos homines.

50. SV Ðæt **is** on Englisc,

51. SV eal woruld **winned** swyde for synnum ongean þa oferhogan

52. SV þe Gode **nellad** hyran.

53. SOV Seo heofone us **wind wid**

54. SOVO þonne heo us **sended** styrnlice stormas

55. OV 7 orf 7 æceras swyde **amyrrred**.

56. SOV Seo eorde us **wind wid**

57. SVO þonne heo **forwyred** eordlices wæstmas

58. OV 7 us unweoda to fela **asended**.

59. SV Eac hit awritten **is**, 
dat sunne apystrad är worulde ende
7 mona adeorcad
7 steorran hreosad for manna synnum;
7 dat bid
ponne Antecrist weded
pat hit bid gelic
ponne swylce hit swa sy.
Hit is gecweden
pat sunne adystrad;
pat is,
ponne God nele cydan on Antecristes timan his mægen
ne his mihta
swa swa he oft är dyde,
donne bid gelic
ponne swylce sunne sy apystrad.
And mona,
hit cwed,
adeorcad;
dat is,
ponne Godes halgan ænige tacna ponne ne wyrcad
swa swa hy oft är dydan.
And steorran,
hit cwed,
hreosad ufene of heofonum;
dat is,
ponne licceteras 7 leaslice cristene hrædlice hreosad
of rihtan geleafan
7 to Antecriste geornlice bugad
7 weorþaþ his gefystan eallum heora mihtum.

And done geweorþede egþa se mæsta

þætre ær ware,

7 ehtnes seo mæste wide on worulde.

Ne byrhd se gesibba þonne gesibban þe ma þe þam fremdan.

And be ðam egeslican timan Matheus se godspellere sodlice þus cwæð:

In diebus illis erit tribulatio talis qualis non fuit ab initio mundi nec postea erit.

Þat is on Englisc

þæt swylc yrmd 7 earfodnes bid þonne on worulde

swylce æfre ær næs

ne eft ne geweorþed.

And raðe æfter þam syddan astyred wyrd þurh godcunde mihte eal heofonlic mægen

7 eordwaru aræred of deade to dome.

Þonne mæg gecnawan (S is next clause)

se þe ær nolde sodes gelyfan

þæt Crist þurh his mægenþrym þonne geleanad manna gehwylcum ærran gewyrhta.

Wa

þam (bonne) þe ær geearnode hell wite.

Þær is ece bryne grimme gemencged,

7 þær is ece gryre;
b. Translation

Taken from:
http://webpages.ursinus.edu/jlionarons/wulfstan/IIItframe.html, but own subdivision

"There will be signs in the sun and the moon and the stars, etc."

1. This gospel says and makes clear
2. that many portents must occur widely in the world, both
   in the heavenly stars and in earthly movements,
3. before the judgment comes
4. that is common to us all.
5. And certainly, just as a flood came once before because
   of sin,
6. so also a fire will come over mankind because of sin,
7. and it is now coming very quickly.
8. And therefore there are many and varied evil events
   occurring widely among people,
9. and it is all because of sin.
10. And yet more evils and afflictions will come,
11. as the book says,
12. than ever happened before anywhere in the world;
13. that is,
14. when Antichrist rages
15. and terrifies all the world,
16. and that is now coming very quickly.
17. And therefore it is always the longer the worse in the
   world,
18. as we ourselves know very well.
19. And it is also clear and to be seen within ourselves
20. that we obey our Lord too weakly,
21. and that we are too disbelieving of God's might and his
   mercy,
22. and that we anger him more often
23. than we need to,
24. and also that we keep good faith among ourselves too
   weakly in front of God and the world.
25. And therefore many evil events injure and afflict us
   harshly,
26. and foreigners and strangers severely oppress us,
27. just as Christ clearly said
28. must happen in his gospel.
29. He said,
   "Nation will rise up against nation, etc."
30. That is in English,
31. "nations will rise up,"
32. he said,
33. and become opposed, and strive violently and contend
among themselves because of the injustice
34. that has become too widespread among people on earth."
Beloved people,
35. this earth was clean at its creation,
36. but we have since greatly fouled and defiled it with
our sins.
37. And our misdeeds also constantly accuse us,
38. because we do not want to hold God's law
39. as we should,
40. nor to grant to God
41. what we should.
42. Nor do we give tithes
43. as is required of us,
44. nor distribute alms
45. as we need to,
46. but in every way all
47. that we should do in God's grace lessens.
48. And therefore much of creation also oppresses and
strives against us,
49. just as it is written:
"the world will fight for God against insensible men."
50. That is in English,
51. all the world strives greatly against proud people
52. who will not obey God, because of their sins.
53. Heaven strives against us
54. when it sternly sends us storms
55. that greatly injure cattle and land.
56. The earth strives against us
57. when it withholds earthly fruits
58. and sends us too many weeds.
59. It is also written
60. that the sun will grow dark
61. before the world ends
62. and the moon will darken
63. and the stars fall because of the people's sins,
64. and that will be when Antichrist rages
65. that it will be like
66. as if it were so.
67. It is said
68. that the sun will grow dark;
69. that is,
70. when God will not reveal in Antichrist's time his
strength and his power
71. as he often did before.
72. Then it will be like
73. as if the sun had grown dark.
74a. And the moon,
75. it says,
74b. will darken.
76. That is,
77. that God's saints will not perform any miracles then
78. as they often did before.
79a. And the stars,
80. it says,
79b. will fall from heaven.
81. That is,
82. that liars and false Christians will quickly fall from
correct belief
83. and eagerly bow down to Antichrist
84. and honor his helpers with all their might.
85a. And then there will be the greatest terror
86. that ever was,
85b. and the most widespread persecution in the world.
87. Then kinsmen will not protect kinsmen any more than
strangers.
88. And about that terrifying time Matthew the evangelist
truly said thus:
"In those days there will be such tribulations as have never
been from the beginning of the world or afterwards."
89. That is in English,
90. that such misery and affliction will then be in the
world
91. such as never before was
92. nor ever again will be.
93. And quickly afterwards all the hosts of heaven will be
roused through divine might;
94. and earthdwellers will be raised from death to the
judgment.
95a. Then the one
96. who before would not believe the truth
95b. will know
97. that Christ in his majesty will repay each person for
his earlier deeds.
Woe to
98. the one who earlier earned the torments of hell!
99. There are eternal flames grimly flickering
100. and there is eternal horror;
2. Predigtsammlung B

a. General analysis

The fragment is divided per sentence into different clauses, which were then given a number between one and hundred. In some occasions, the clause is interrupted by another clause, but repeated afterwards. These parts will have the same number, yet have the letter a or b to indicate that they belong to the same clause. Each colour represents a different type of clause: red indicates the non-dependent, green the subordinate and blue the relative nature of the clause.

1. SVO Daz eungalowium zélit uns,

2. SVO daz unser herro Ihesus Christus zuo den heiligen bóton imo iruueliti sibinziic unta ziuueni iungerun,

3. OS(O)V der er îe ziwweni unte ziuueni fure sante mit sinera predige in îeginliche burch unte stat,

4. SV dare er selbi chomen uuolti.

5a. S Die ziuueni iungerun,

6. OSV die er sante in dera brediga,

5b. SVO die pizeichinent die ziuei kibot dere minne,

7. SV die niemir irfullet nimagen uuerdén,

8. V niuuari iêdoh zi minniste unter ziuuain.

9. VOS In imo selbemo nimac si nieman irfullen,

10. SVO suntir er scol si irfullen an einemo anderemo.

11. SOV Der die minne uuider siden nahisten nieth nihat,

12. SVO der scol niemir daz ambahte kiuuinnen der bredigi.

13. SOV Daz er die ziuueni iungerun so fure sante in alla die stete,

14. SV dare er selbi chomen uuolti,
daz **bizeichinet:**

suenne unseri muot imo kilúteret **uuerdent** mit dera heiligen bredige unte mit demo brunnen dera zahire,

dare nah **chumet** er

unte **pisizzet** siu mit sinemo liêhte.

Do er siu do hina **sante,**

do **sprah** er,

daz der arin michel **uuare**

unte dero snîtare luzil **uuari.**

**Nu sprichit** sanctus Gregorius,

**pittit** den almahtigen got,

daz er **senti** die uuerhmanne in sinen aren.

Diu uuerlt **ist** fol dero,

diê dir **habent** den phaflichen namen:

da **ist** auer unter uile unmanic uuerhman,

der sin ambahte so **irfulle,**

so iz gote **liche**

oder imo selbemo nuzze **si** oder dero diheinigemo,

demo er iz spenten **scol.’**

Daz **kischehet** ofto,

daz der predigare **irstummet:** ettisuenne durh sin selbis unreth,

daz er die nieth vuurchen **niuule,**

die er da **brediget;**

ettisuenne so **kischehet** iz durh des liutis unreth,

daz si is niêth uuert **nisint** ze firnemenne.

Daz **ist** unsemfe zi firstênni,

vona uues sculden iz **si:**
taret iz ettesuenne demo hirte,
iz taret aue iêntie demo quartire,
uuante
nimac der bredigare nieth sprechen,
er chan iêdoh daz reth wurchen,
unte doh iz der liut uuelle wurchen,
er nichan,
iz niuuerde imo kichundit.
Vone diu so sprah unser herro zi sinen iungerin,
do er siu zi dera brediga sante.
Er sprah
,Ich sento iûuuuih also die scaf unter die uuolfe’.
Er gab in den kiuualt prediginnis
unte hiez siu haben die miteuuari des lampis,
so daz si íre crimme nieth niûobten in diê íre untertanen,
so sumelichere site ist,
so si kiuualt kiuuinnent,
daz si denno den tarent,
den si frûme scolten.

Daz évangelium zelit uns,
daz daz himilrih kelih si demo hûsherro,
der des morgenis fruo in sinan uuinkarten samenoti
die uuerhliuti.
Vuer uuirdit rehtere kikagenmazzit demo husherren,
denne unser herro der heilige Christ,
der dir *rihtet* alla,
die er *kiscuof*,
also der hushérro *rihtet* die imo untertanen?
Der huosherro *ladote* allen den tac die uuerhliûte in sinan uuinkarten, sumeliche fruo, sumeliche ze mittemo morgene, sumeliche zi mittemo taga, sumeliche ze nona, sumeliche ana demo abanda oder in suêlihemo cite si imo zuo chomen.
Also *negistilte* unser herro der almahtige got uone anakenge dere uuerlti unzi ana den ente die predigare ci sentenna zi dera lera sinere iruuelitono.
Der uuinkarte *pizeichinet* die gotis e,
in der dir kisezzet unde kerihtet *uuerdent* elliu miteuuuare, diu chûske, diu kidult, diu guôte, diu ensticheit unte andere tugendi desin keliche.
*Nu sehen,*
mit uueliacemo flîzza uuir den gotis uuinkarten *ûoben*.
Adam *uuart* kescaffen,
daz er *uurai* ûoberi des paradysi;
do er do *firbrah* daz gotis kebot,
do *uuart* er dannen kistozzen in daz ellentuom disere uuenicheit.
Also *biren* uuir kisezzet,
daz uuir *sin* ûobare dere gotis e:
*uirruochelon* uuir die,
so *uuerde* uuir firstozzen uone demo gotis riche also die iuden.
Suer die sunta *uuurchet,*
der *ziuueibet* den gotis uuinkarte,
der dir aus *uuurchet* daz gotis reth,
der ûobet inan wole.
Vuir **nesculen** niéth ûoben die irdisgen acchera durh den uuerltlichen rihtuom, suntir durh den rihtuom des euuigen Ionis.

Die uinf uuile,

in den dir dér huosherro **ladote** die uuerhliuti in sinan uuinkarten,

die **pizeichinent** die uinf uuerlti,

die dir uore Christis kiburte uuaren;

áua die uuérhliute **pizeichinent** diê,

die dir der almahtige got in den uinf uuerlten **ladite** zi demo euuigen libe.

Daz uuas in dere eristen Adam unde sin kislahte, in dere anderen Noe unde sin kislahte, in dere uierde Moyses unde sin kislahte.

An demo ente dere uinften uuertle do **gáreti** sanctus Iohannes baptista den uuuch demo gotis sune durh die touffa unde durh die riuuua.

In dere sehsti uuertli,

in dere uuir nu **piren**,

do **chom** selbo unser herro der filius

die unte **pichérte** mit sinera euangelisgen prediga unte mit sinon zeichenin die heidinen,

uona den dir **iruuohs** diu heiliga christinheit,

diu dir **stet** unzi an den enti dere uuertle.

Fore sinere kiburte so **santi** er die patriarchas unde die prophetas;

suîe uuole die **kiuuorhte** nah sinere hulde,

so **niphiegin** si doh sa nieth des Ionis,

uuande si alla zi helli **fuoren**.
b. Translation

Own translation

1. The gospel tells us
2. That our lord Jesus Christ as holy apostles for him chose seventy and two disciples
3. Whom he each time two and two sent forward with his preaching in every city and place,
4. Where he himself wanted to come.
5a. The two apostles
5b. Whom he sent in the sermon
6. They mean the two commandments of love
7. Which may never be fulfilled
8. Unless however at least between two
9. In himself nobody can fulfill them
10. But he must fulfill them to another [one]
11. He who does not have love for his neighbour
12. He must never take up the office of the preaching
13. That he sent the two apostles thus forward in all the places
14. Where he himself wanted to come
15. This means:
16. Wherever our inner selves are cleansed with the holy preaching and with the source of the tears
17. After that he comes
18. And possesses them [= our inner selves] with his light.
19. When he them then sent
20. Then he spoke
21. That of harvest a lot was
22. And of labourers in the vineyard little was
23. Now speaks Saint Gregory
24. Pray the almighty God,
25. So that he [will] send labourers to his harvest
26. The world is full of those,
27. Who have priestly names
28. There are however under [them] very few labourers,
29. Whom his assignment so completes,
30. That it pleases to God
31. Or of benefit to themself is or to anyone of them
32. To whom they must give it.
33. That happens often
34. That the preacher falls silent: sometimes because of his own injustice
35. that he does not want to [do]
36. What he then preaches;
37. Sometimes so it happens because of the injustice of the people,
38. That they are not worthy to hear it [= the preaching]
39. That is difficult to understand,
40. Of whose guilt it is:
41. Harms it sometimes the shepherd
42. It harms however always the quarter
43a. Because
44. May the preacher not speak
43b. He can still do justice
45. And though the people want to do it
46. He cannot,
47. Unless it is proclaimed to him/them
48. Thereafter so spoke our lord to his disciples
49. Where he sent them to the preaching
50. He spoke
51. “I send you like the sheep among the wolves”
52. He gave them the power of the preaching
53. And ordered them to have the meekness of the lamb,
54. So that they their harshness not executed to their subordinates
55. As is custom to some,
56. When they obtain the power,
57. [so] that they then harm those,
58. To whom they should be of use.

2.

59. The gospel tells us,
60. That the kingdom of heaven is similar to the houselord,
61. Who early in the morning in his vineyard convened the labourers.
62. Who is better compared to the houselord, then our lord the holy Christ,
63. Who judges all [people],
64. Whom he created
65. As the houselord judges the subjects of him
66. The houselord called the whole day the labourers in his vineyard, some early, some in the middle of the morning, some in the middle of the day, some in the afternoon, some in the evening or at any time they come to him
67. Also not calmed down our lord the almighty God from the beginning of the world until the end to send the preachers to the teaching of his chosen ones.
68. The vineyard means the law of God,
69. In which are established and judged all meekness, the virtuousness, the patience, the goodness, the mercy, the charity and other virtues of similar [nature]
70. Now let us look,
71. With which effort we cultivate the vineyard of God
72. Adam was created
73. So that he was an cultivator of the paradise;

---

6 Imo can relate to er, as well as to liut
When he then broke the commandment of God,
Then was he cast out from it in the captivity of this misery.
Also we are raised/created,
That we are cultivators of God’s law:
Should we neglect it
We are cast out from the kingdom of God like the Jews.
Who commits sin,
He wrecks the vineyard of God,
But he who works the justice of God,
He cultivates it well.
We must not cultivate the earthly lands with an eye to the worldly richness, but with an eye to the richness of the eternal repayment
The five points in time
In which the houselord called the labourers in his vineyard,
They mean the five worlds,
Which were before the birth of Christ
But the labourers mean them,
Whom the almighty God in the five worlds called to the eternal life.
That was in the first Adam and his offspring, in the second Noah and his offspring, in the third Abraham and his offspring, in the fourth Moses and his offspring.
In the end of the fifth world then the holy John the Baptist prepared the way to the son of God by the baptism and by the repentance.
In the sixth world,
In which we are now,
Then came of our Lord the Son himself
Who converted not only with his evangelical preaching, but also with his tokens the heathens
Of which grew the holy christianity
Which stands until the end of the world.
Before his birth so sent he the patriarchs and the prophets;
No matter how well they worked according to his mercy
They did however not receive soon anything of the repayment
Because they all went to hell.