

Word Order in the Two Different Versions of *The Life of St Margaret* in Old English*

Yuki TAKAHASHI

1. Introduction

When we analyze word order in Old English (henceforth OE), what kind of positional framework should be applied? And what does word order distribution tell us about the diachronic status of the syntax in the text under study? How far, then, do pragmatic factors influence word order? I shall pursue these questions by comparing the two different OE versions of *The Life of St Margaret*: Cambridge, Corpus Christie College 303¹⁾ (henceforth abbreviated to CCCC 303) and British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii²⁾ (hereafter Cotton Tiberius). This study will demonstrate that CCCC 303 maintains the word order of late West Saxon OE, but that Cotton Tiberius shows the emergence of Early Middle English (henceforth Early ME) word order.

According to Clayton & Magennis (1994: 97–103), CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius are both written in ‘predominantly late West Saxon’. They state that the ‘breakdown of the OE inflexional system is unusually far advanced’ in the text of Cotton Tiberius (Clayton & Magennis 1994: 101). Interestingly, they also observe that the language of CCCC 303 ‘approximates more closely in some ways to “standard” late West Saxon than does that of the considerably earlier Cotton Tiberius analogue’ (103). Their linguistic description of the texts chiefly focuses on the phonological, morphological, lexical and stylistic aspects.³⁾ On the basis of their linguistic observation, I assume that there must

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the Annual Conference of the English Literary Society of Kyoto University, held at Kyoto University on November 11, 2017. I am grateful for the helpful comments and suggestions made by Professor Yoko Iyeiri, Associate Professor Atsuhiko Hirota and Dr. Daisuke Suzuki. All remaining errors in and deficiencies of this paper are mine.

1) According to Ker (1957: 99–105), the manuscript date is s. xii¹.

2) The manuscript date is s. xi med (Ker 1957: 240–8).

3) This by no means undermines the value of their work, since the edition of Clayton & Magennis (1994) first and foremost laid the groundwork for further linguistic analysis such as the one I ↗

also be some differences in word order between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius. In the rest of my paper, I will argue that both texts show a different distribution of the word order patterns, and that the distributions were motivated not only by syntactic factors but also by pragmatic factors.

1.1 Word order in Old English

Numerous works on word order, from different schools of thought and to varying degrees, maintain that OE has the object-verb (OV) word order with verb-second phenomena in the main clause (e.g. Mitchell 1985; Traugott 1992; Denison 1993; Fischer et al. 2000; Molencki 2017). The clause-initial adverbs such as *þa* and *þonne* play a unique role in OE word order (Enkvist 1986; Enkvist & Wårvik 1987; Taylor & Pintzuk 2012; Kemenade 2012; Cichosz 2017, to name a few). The alternation between the OV and VO order has much to do with the formal weight of the clause constituents and information structure (Taylor & Pintzuk 2012, 2014). From Early ME onwards, the change from OV to VO order occurred, together with the decline of the case-marking system (Mustanoja 1960; Kohonen 1978; Pintzuk 1996, 2002; Pintzuk & Taylor 2008). The concomitant loss of verb-second also brought about the change in the discourse-pragmatic and information-structuring strategy of OE (Los 2009, 2012; Petré 2010; Los & Dreschler 2012).

1.2 Syntactic and pragmatic factors relevant to word order patterns

1.2.1 Clause-initial *ond/ac*

The clause-initial *ond/ac* in OE is regarded as one of the key triggers that influenced word order. This influence was twofold: syntactic and discourse-pragmatic. First, Kohonen (1978: 36) points out that the ‘clauses introduced by the *and/ac* conjunctions had a well-known tendency for verb-final word order’. Mitchell also states that ‘such OE conjunctions as *ond* and *ac* are frequently followed by the element order S...V, which is basically subordinate’ (Mitchell 1985 I: 694). He continues that ‘[t]his order [S...V] — sometimes called “subordinate” — is common in clauses introduced by *ond*, *ac*, [...] and in subordinate clauses’ (Mitchell 1985 II: 967). However, according to Bech (2017), OE scholars have not properly understood whether the conjunction *ond/ac* caused the verb-final word order, or vice versa. Her quantitative study, based on the thorough search of the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE), proved the claim that ‘conjunct clauses are not typically verb-final/

↘ am going to undertake.

verb-late, but verb-final/verb-late clauses are typically conjunct clauses. These two perspectives have been mixed up in the course of a century of research' (Bech 2017: 23). Her large-scale investigation unraveled the misconceptions about the verb-final in relation to the conjunct clauses in OE. Although such a macroscopic view is of undoubted value, this paper puts the differences of the word order distributions of the two versions of *The Life of St Margaret* under the microscope.

In OE, *ond/ac* conjuncts function as more like pragmatic markers. In the light of this view, Traugott states that '[f]rom a discourse perspective, co-ordinate clause [sic] elaborate on the initial main clause and in this sense modify it, although they are not syntactically subordinate' (Traugott 1992: 277). Bech draws on Traugott's view and maintains that elaboration and modification are the functions of the *ond/ac* conjunct clauses, which provide a discourse-pragmatic link to 'the (immediate) previous context in a more direct way than non-conjunct clauses' (Bech 2001: 110). The discourse-pragmatic difference between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses has an impact on the realization of the word order patterns (Bech 2001, 2008, 2012). Along the lines of the discussion presented above, I shall assume that the clause-initial conjuncts *ond/ac* have a decisive influence on word order in the texts of *The Life of St Margaret*, so that a distinction between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses will be made.

1.2.2 Temporal adverbs as discourse partitioners

A syntactic trigger and a pragmatic marker often go hand in hand in OE. A certain group of adverbs, including *þa*, cause inversion into verb-second order (Cichosz 2017). In the case of *þa*, Enkvist and Wårvik's empirical study (1987) suggests that *þa* serves as a boundary to mark a narrative unit. Wårvik (1990, 2011, 2013, 2014) further pursues the discourse function of *þa* and *þonne* in narrative prose and describes them as foregrounding markers.

Temporal adverbials, including *þa*, have wider consequences in OE. Los argues that OE is a 'bounded' language—a system of language which encodes the action and events into a sequence of temporal segments, 'each requiring an explicit temporal marker' (2012: 29–30). Petré (2010) also examined the collostructional strength between the copula *weorþan* and time adverbials. He revealed that the boundedness of OE and verb-second syntax are closely connected; the eventual collapse of verb-second syntax led to the development of the progressive in English in the later periods.

This study takes the view that temporal adverbials, filling an important discourse-pragmatic 'slot' at the clause-initial position, have a bearing on the realization of word order patterns. By synthesizing the theories and implications of the previous literature, I will demonstrate that the language of CCCC 303 shows such features more often than

that of Cotton Tiberius.

1.3 The present research

The present study examines the differences in word order of the two different versions of *The Life of St Margaret*: CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius. I will argue that the differences between the two texts reflect the diachronic development of the English language from OE to Early ME, although both texts are said to maintain the late West Saxon language. Then, I will explain that the differences are motivated by the discourse-pragmatic factors by looking into the adverbials and complements within the clause.

This section so far has introduced the key concepts relevant to this study. Section 2 will now present a positional framework to describe word order patterns. Section 3 will show the results of the investigation and then discuss the differences between the two texts. Section 4 will summarize the findings of this study.

2. Methodology

The subject of the analysis is declarative main clauses with an overt subject. Subjectless clauses are excluded from the study. All the clauses have been searched by means of YCOE (Taylor et al. 2003) via CorpusSearch 2 (Randal et al. 2005–2013). The obtained data were then manually checked and sorted out.

2.1 Positional framework

A positional framework for this analysis builds on the previous studies on word order (Kohonen 1978; Bean 1983; Mitchell 1985; Bech 2001, 2008, 2017; Heggelund 2007, 2010). The analysis focuses on the surface structure of word order only. Prior to presenting the framework it is also necessary to mention the ‘clitic hypothesis’, under which non-topicalized pronouns and certain adverbs are regarded as clitics.⁴⁾ It is only the negative particle *ne* which is treated as a clitic in the analysis.⁵⁾

This section goes as follows. First, a distinction between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses will be made. Then, eight types of word order patterns will be introduced with

4) There are conflicting views on the clitic hypothesis. Kemenade (1987: 126–143) analyzes pronouns in OE as clitics. A cluster consisting of a preverbal pronominal object— and a finite verb, analyzed as XV in this study, is subsumed under V. However, Koopman (1995), Bech (2001: 79–86) and Bech & Salvesen (2014) state that this has empirical problems.

5) I thank the reviewer’s comment that the status of *ne* as a clitic might also be controversial.

illustrative examples.

2.2 Conjunct/non-conjunct clauses

A point of departure is that all clauses are categorized either as a conjunct clause or a non-conjunct clause. The sole criterion is the occurrence of the clause-initial *ond/ac*, as illustrated in (1) and (2).⁶⁾

- (1) And þa wearð **Olibrius** swiðe yrre⁷⁾
 ‘And then Olibrius became very angry’
 (comargaC, LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 6. 12. 81)

- (2) Ða wearð **se gerefa** eorre geworþan
 ‘Then the prefect become angry’⁸⁾
 (comargaC, LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 10. 1. 135)

Example (1) has the clause-initial conjunct *and*, and so falls under the category of conjunct clauses. By contrast, example (2) does not have a clause-initial conjunct, and thus comes under the category of non-conjunct clauses. I distinguish between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses throughout the analysis.

2.3 Word order patterns

To describe word order patterns, the following notation is used : S stands for an overt subject and V for a finite verb, and X represents any clause constituent(s) other than the subject and the verb. If necessary, a non-finite verb is notated as V_{NF}.

2.3.1 SVX

This word order pattern begins with a subject, immediately followed by a finite verb.⁹⁾ No other clause element should intervene between the subject and the verb. After the verb, there may be one or more constituents. (3) is an example of a conjunct SVX

6) The present-day English translation is taken from Clayton & Magennis (1994). I provide footnotes wherever I have modified a translation or changed the wording according to my reading.

7) In all the numbered examples in this paper, finite verbs are underlined and subjects are shown in bold.

8) ‘By now the prefect had become angry’ (Clayton & Magennis 1994 : 161).

9) In present-day English, subject-verb word order is undoubtedly the most typical pattern. Whether we could call SVX in OE ‘unmarked’ word order is uncertain. The status of SVX depends on the texts in OE.

clause beginning with *and*.

- (3) and **ic** awrat ealle hire gebedu
 ‘and I wrote down all her prayers’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 12. 1. 124)

The clause-initial conjunct is not counted as the X element, since at this point of the analysis the clause has already been categorized as either conjunct or non-conjunct. Example (4) is a non-conjunct SVX clause.

- (4) **He** wæs swiðe gelæred man
 ‘He was a very learned man’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 2. 2. 9)

As (5) shows, X may be more than one. (5) can be notated as SVXXX consisting of the pronominal *þe*, the *for*-prepositional phrase and the *þæt*-clause.

- (5) Ac **ic** bidde þe for þinne mægþhad þæt þu me ne geswinge.
 ‘But I ask you for the sake of your virnigity that you do not beat me’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 14. 7. 163)

For the sake of simplicity, the pattern SV, such as in (6)—the subject-verb order without any following clause elements—is also included in SVX.

- (6) and **þu** leofast.
 ‘and you will live’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 9. 8. 87)

2.3.2 XVS (verb-second)

This word order pattern, known as the verb-second, begins with an initial X element ; the initial X has only one element. In the second position comes the finite verb, followed by the subject, as in (7) and (8). One or more elements may intervene between V and S, or may follow S, as in (9). This pattern holds so long as the relative order of the finite verb and the subject is kept VS.

- (7) Ða coman **englas**

‘Then angels came’

(comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 23. 1. 303)

- (8) Þider coman **þa manega engla** ofer þære halgan Margaretan lichaman

‘Then many angels came over the body of the holy Margaret’

(comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 22. 10. 301)

- (9) and þær wearð inne swa **mycel leoht**, swa hit beoð on middæg

‘and there was a great light within just as there is at mid-day’

(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 15. 1. 225)

When the verb is complex, the finite verb and non-finite verb need not be contiguous, as in (10). Its pattern is XVS_V_{NF}X, in which the finite verb *com* is separated from the non-finite verb *gan* by the subject *hire fosterfæder*.

- (10) Ða com **hire fosterfæder** gan to hire

‘Then her fosterfather came to her’

(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 12. 1. 175)

I also treat the correlative construction such as *þa . . . þa . . .* in (11) as XVS, following Bech’s extension of the definition of the dislocation (2008: 58-9). The initial *þa* in the main clause in (11) stands as ‘proxy’ (Mitchell 1985: 1416-7) for the adverbial subclause.

- (11) And þa hi hire gebedu gefyld hæfde, þa beseah **hio** hio on þære wynstre
healfe þæs carcernes

‘And when she had completed her prayers, she looked into the left-hand side
of the prison’

(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 14. 1. 208)

In the same manner, the correlative *gif . . . þonne . . .* in (12) is also regarded as XVS. Such ‘recapitulatory’ constructions are so prevalent in OE that they should be taken into consideration.

- (12) and gif hi is þeowa, þonne wille **ic** gifen fih for hire and hæbban hi me to
cefase

‘and if she is a slave, then I will pay money for her and have her as my concubine’

(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 5. 6. 52)

2.3.3 XSV (verb-medial)

In this word order pattern there is one single initial X element, followed by the subject in the second slot. In the third position comes the finite verb. When the verb is complex, the finite and non-finite verbs must be contiguous, and their order must also be VV_{NF}. One or more X element may follow the verb. (13) is a conjunct verb-medial, whereas (14) is a non-conjunct verb-medial. As in (15), the initial X may be an adverbial subclause.

- (13) and deade **he** awæhte to life

‘and he awakened the dead to life’

(comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 2. 6. 10)

- (14) Sumne **hi** pinedon mid wallende leade and mid hatum stanum.

‘They tortured one with boiling lead and with hot stones’

(comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 4. 17. 36)

- (15) and mid þy þe heo wæs ut agangende, **heo** gebletsode eall hira lichoma mid Cristes rodetacene.

‘and, as she was coming out, she blessed all her body with the sign of Christ’s cross’

(comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib._A.iii] : 17. 1. 214)

2.3.4 SXV (verb-final)

SXV order has the finite verb at the absolute clause-final position. One or more X element(s) must intervene between the subject and the verb. The definition of the verb-final word order in OE is controversial and sometimes unclear. According to the analysis of Kohonen (1978), SXV in Kohonen’s label includes not only the verb-final order, but also what I call verb-late order. More recent studies of word order treat the verb-late and verb-final separately (Bech 2001, 2017; Heggelund 2007). In his seminal work, Mitchell (1985: 965–6, quoted by Bech 2017: 9) states that such clauses that have a pronominal object or an adverbial between the subject and the verb should not be seen as S ... V, but as variants of SV. Thus, in Mitchell’s view, (16) and (17) below

are not verb-final, while (18) is certainly verb-final.

- (16) **Sancta Margareta** him andswerode
 ‘St Margaret answered him’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 7. 8. 98)
- (17) And **ures Drihtnes ænglæs** þider comon
 ‘And our Lord’s angels came there’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 23. 6. 362)
- (18) **Þu** hine þonne mid Cristes rodetacne acwealdest
 ‘You slew him then with the sign of Christ’s cross’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib_A.iii] : 14. 6. 161)

However, I believe that the preverbal element (s) are important from the discourse-pragmatic view and thus should be taken into consideration whatever their syntactic status. For that reason, I have decided to include clauses with a single element between the subject and verb, such as (16) and (17), into the category of verb-final, in addition to clauses with two or more X elements in between, such as (18).¹⁰⁾

In the verb-final order, one X element may precede the subject, as in (19), notated as XSXV.

- (19) Ða **þa leasan gewiten** hi swiðe gepinedon
 ‘Then the false advisers tormented her terribly’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 10. 16. 157)

2.3.5 SXVX (verb-late)

What is characteristic in this word order pattern is that the verb is separated from the subject by one or more X elements in between, and the verb is also followed by one or more X elements, as in (20) and (21). When the verb is complex, the finite and non-finite verbs must be contiguous.

10) This form of analysis could be taken as problematic according to some theoretical positions. However, this study is concerned with how the surface structure of constituent order is influenced by the discourse-pragmatic factors.

- (20) and **he** hire brohte bread and wæter
 ‘and he brought her bread and water’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 12. 1. 177)

- (21) **Se cwytra** þa mid gefyrhto genam his swurd
 ‘Then the executioner took hold of his sword with trepidation’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib_A.iii] : 22. 6. 295)

In the verb-late word order, one X element may precede the subject, as in (22) and (23). In (22), the pattern is X₁XXXXVX; in (23), X₁XXVX. What is crucial in this pattern is that the verb-late word order never has the finite verb at the clause-end position.

- (22) and nu **ic** þe eft gebidde, þæt ic hine ofercumen mote.
 ‘and now I pray you again, that I may overcome him’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 12. 8. 190)

- (23) Ðurh engla mægen **ic** þe swerige þæt swa hwæt swa þu bæde, eall hit biþ
 gehered ætforan Godes gesyhþe
 ‘Through the power of angels I swear you that whatever you have asked for
 shall be heard in the sight of God’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib_A.iii] : 20. 3. 269)

2.3.6 Verb-initial

The verb-initial order includes such clauses which begin with a finite verb and have an overt subject, such as (24) and (25). The position of the subject does not matter, so long as the clause starts with the finite verb. Here, the finite verb includes not only the indicative but also the subjunctive.

- (24) Nelle **ic** næfre me gebiddan on eowerne god, se þe is dumb and deaf.
 ‘I will never pray to your god, who is dumb and deaf’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib_A.iii] : 17. 7. 222)

- (25) ac sy þær **sib and lufu and soþfæstnesse gast**
 ‘but may peace be there and love and the spirit of truth’
 (comargaT,LS_16_[MargaretCot.Tib_A.iii] : 19. 23. 263)

2.3.7 SVXV_{NF}

In this word order pattern, what Bech (2001 : 61) calls ‘brace construction’, the finite verb and the non-finite verb in the clause are separated by one or more elements, as in (26) and (27). One or more X elements may follow V_{NF}, as in (27).

- (26) and **God** hæfð mine sawle fram þe generod
 ‘and God will have rescued my soul from you’¹¹⁾
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 10. 21. 162)

- (27) and **þu** scealt eal mines godes wealden mid me selfum
 ‘and you shall possess all my goods with me’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 7. 3. 97)

2.3.8 XXVS

XXVS has two initial X elements, in contrast to XVS, with only one X element. In (28) there are two X elements, *þa* and *þær*. The XXVS pattern is not regarded as XVS, since the single initial X element followed by the finite-verb in the second position plays a unique role. The two patterns should not be treated under the same category.

- (28) And þa þær com **fleogan Drihtnes ængel**
 ‘And the Lord’s angel came flying there’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 18. 6. 293)

3. Results and discussions

A total of 204 clauses from CCCC 303 and 173 clauses from Cotton Tiberius are extracted. First of all, we can see that the distribution of word order patterns differs significantly between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius. Next, I will demonstrate that the distribution between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses of each text also shows significant differences. This then helps identify what underlies those differences by analyzing X elements in the verb-second, verb-medial, verb-final and verb-late word orders.

3.1 Overall comparison between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius

Table 1 shows the frequency of each word order pattern in CCCC 303 and Cotton

11) ‘but God will have rescued my soul from you’ (Clayton & Magennis 1994 : 161)

Tiberius respectively. At a glance, there is a noticeable distributional difference: in CCCC 303, the verb-final is the most frequent word order (32.8%), whereas in Cotton Tiberius, SVX is the most frequent (38.2%). It should also be noted that the proportion of the verb-medial word order in Cotton Tiberius (19.1%) is twice as much as that of CCCC 303 (8.8%). The increased use of verb-medial word order provides partial evidence that the change towards Early ME is underway.

Table 1 Overall word order patterns of CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius

Word order patterns	CCCC 303		Cotton Tiberius	
	N	%	N	%
SVX	28	13.7 %	66	38.2 %
XVS (verb-second)	35	17.2 %	18	10.4 %
XSV (verb-medial)	18	8.8 %	33	19.1 %
SXV (verb-final)	67	32.8 %	14	8.1 %
SXVX (verb-late)	30	14.7 %	35	20.2 %
Verb-initial	14	6.9 %	3	1.7 %
SVXV _{NF}	8	3.9 %	2	1.2 %
XXVS	4	2.0 %	2	1.2 %
Total	204	100.0 %	173	100.0 %

A chi-square test of independence shows that the difference in the distribution between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius is highly significant ($\chi^2=69.596$, p -value < 0.001, $df=7$). How should we interpret this? It would be fair to say that the difference is not due to the text-type, since the story of the legend, the martyrdom of St Margaret, does not differ so much in content. I propose that it is not so much the synchronic stylistic variations between the two narrative texts but the diachronic change in language which brings about the difference.

3.2 Differences between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius

The (non-)occurrence of the clause-initial *ond/ac* is crucial in the ‘pragmatically oriented’ (Molencki 2017: 101) word order of OE. Table 2 shows the frequencies of each word order patterns of (non-)conjunct clauses in CCCC 303. A chi-square test shows that the distribution between the (non-)conjunct clauses is significant ($\chi^2=20.995$, p -value=0.0038, $df=7$). It could be said that the division of labor between (non-)conjunct clauses is at work in the text of CCCC 303.

On a closer look, Table 2 gives the impression that XVS (25.0% against 11.2%) and SXV (22.7% against 40.5%) are significantly different. The intuition is indeed support-

ed by a statistical test. If we run a residual analysis (Haberman 1973) on the result of the chi-square test, it is the XVS, SXV and SXVX patterns among the initial five patterns in Table 2 where the differences between the (non-)conjunct clauses are significant.¹²⁾

Table 2 Word order patterns in CCCC 303

Word order patterns	Non-conjunct clause		Conjunct clause	
	N	%	N	%
SVX	15	17.0 %	13	11.2 %
XVS (verb-second)	22	25.0 %	13	11.2 %
XSV (verb-medial)	9	10.2 %	9	7.8 %
SXV (verb-final)	20	22.7 %	47	40.5 %
SXVX (verb-late)	8	9.1 %	22	19.0 %
Verb-initial	10	11.4 %	4	3.4 %
SVXV _{NF}	2	2.3 %	6	5.2 %
XXVS	2	2.3 %	2	1.7 %
Total	88	100.0 %	116	100.0 %

Next, Table 3 shows the frequencies of each of the word order patterns of the (non-)conjunct clauses in Cotton Tiberius. The results of a chi-square test set out in Table 3 are also significant ($\chi^2=19.392$, p -value=0.007, $df=7$). Nonetheless, a residual analysis of the chi-square results shows that it is the XSV and SXVX patterns in Table 3 in

Table 3 Word order patterns in Cotton Tiberius

Word order patterns	Non-conjunct clause		Conjunct clause	
	N	%	N	%
SVX	36	36.4 %	30	40.5 %
XVS (verb-second)	12	12.1 %	6	8.1 %
XSV (verb-medial)	10	10.1 %	23	31.1 %
SXV (verb-final)	8	8.1 %	6	8.1 %
SXVX (verb-late)	27	27.3 %	8	10.8 %
Verb-initial	2	2.0 %	1	1.4 %
SVXV _{NF}	2	2.0 %	—	—
XXVS	2	2.0 %	—	—
Total	99	100.0 %	74	100.0 %

12) For SVX, $p=0.23$; XVS, $p=0.0096$; XSV, $p=0.53$; SXV, $p=0.0073$; SXVX, $p=0.0485$.

which the differences between the (non-)conjunct clauses are significant.¹³⁾

To sum up, the comparison between Tables 2 and 3 reveals that significant distributional differences between (non-)conjunct clauses among the initial five patterns can be observed in the XVS, SXV and SXVX patterns in CCCC 303. Regarding Cotton Tiberius, significant distributional differences can be observed in the XSV and SXVX patterns. In other words, the occurrence of *ond/ac* at the clause-initial position no longer affects the verb-second and verb-final word order in Cotton Tiberius. The results also imply that the word order patterns specific to OE seem to have given way to the verb-medial word order characteristic of ME onwards. Given that OE has the object-verb word order with verb-second phenomena in the main clause, Cotton Tiberius seems to have already reached a point of the extent at which OE syntax was about to disintegrate, and Early ME syntax began to emerge.

3.3 Types of adverbials and complements

So far, this study has examined the syntactic distribution of word order. It is necessary to look into what kinds of X elements appear in the patterns under study. In this section onwards, I will investigate types of adverbials and complements in the XVS, XSV, SXV and SXVX patterns. I will also discuss how the types of adverbials and complements contribute to the identification of word order patterns from a discourse-pragmatic perspective.

The analysis draws on the frameworks on adverbials by Bech (2014), with modifications. I distinguish between adverbials of space, time, manner, contingency, respect, participant and other/undecided. Adverbials of time are further subdivided into two categories: one is *þa* and *þonne*, and the other is time adverbials other than *þa* and *þonne*. The reason for this treatment is that the temporal adverbs *þa* and *þonne* serve as a discourse partitioner in OE. Some examples of each type of adverbial are as follows:

- Space: *þær* ‘there’, *þider* ‘on that side’, *on þam lande* ‘in the land’
- Time (other than *þa* and *þonne*): *nu* ‘now’, *eft* ‘again’, *sona* ‘soon’, *seofon tide þæs dæges* ‘for seven days’, *on þære ylcan tid* ‘at the same time’
- Manner: *swa* ‘in such wise’, *þurh fulwiht* ‘with the Holy Ghost’, *hræðlice* ‘quickly’, *swiðe* ‘very’
- Contingency: *for þi* ‘therefore’, correlative *gif . . . þa . . .* ‘if . . . then . . .’
- Respect: No examples obtained
- Participant: *on þe* in *on þe ic gelefa* ‘in you I believe’, *to his þegnum* ‘to his servants’.

13) For SVX $p=0.57$; XVS, $p=0.39$; XSV, $p=0.0005$; SXV, $p=0.99$; SXVX, $p=0.0076$.

mid oðres mannes wife ‘with another man’s wife’

With respect to complements, I distinguish between object complements and subject complements. Object complements are further subdivided into nominal and pronominal object complements in the SXV and SXVX patterns.

3.3.1 X elements in XVS

Table 4 shows the frequencies of the types of the initial X element in the XVS pattern. There is a common trend that adverbials of space and time (*þa* and *þonne* included), when combined, amount to between nearly 70% and up to 90% in both texts.¹⁴⁾

Table 4 Types of X elements in XVS

Type	Semantic category	CCCC 303				Cotton Tiberius			
		Non-conjunct		Conjunct		Non-conjunct		Conjunct	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	1	4.5 %	1	7.7 %	1	8.3 %	2	33.3 %
	<i>þa</i> and <i>þonne</i>	15	68.2 %	4	30.8 %	7	58.3 %	—	—
	Time	4	18.2 %	4	30.8 %	—	—	3	50.0 %
	Manner	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	16.7 %
	Contingency	1	4.5 %	3	23.1 %	1	8.3 %	—	—
	Participant	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Other/undecided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Object complement		—	—	1	7.7 %	—	—	—	—
Subject complement		1	4.5 %	—	—	3	25.0 %	—	—
Total		22	100.0 %	13	100.0 %	12	100.0 %	6	100.0 %

In CCCC 303, 15 out of 22 (68.2%) non-conjunct clauses are *þa* and *þonne*. In Cotton Tiberius, *þa* and *þonne* in non-conjunct clauses amount to 58.3%. Moreover, *þa* and *þonne* appear in a higher proportion in non-conjunct clauses than in conjunct clauses. The results show that the non-conjunct XVS clauses serve as narrative-advancing clauses. This is reinforced by the observation that the verb-second order in Cotton Tiberius no longer retains the distributional difference between non-conjunct and conjunct clauses.

In the case of conjunct clauses, the clause-initial position is filled with *ond/ac*, providing a link to the previous discourse. Such clauses tend to elaborate or modify the preceding discourse, for instance by means of adverbials of contingency *for þi*, as in

14) I appreciate the reviewer’s comment that the proportions of the semantic categories of time and manner adverbials are liable to change according to the content of the text rather than to diachronic differences.

(29), although the amount of data is insufficient to prove this quantitatively.

- (29) Nu ic soðlice þe to sprece and for þi ne mæg ic na læng beon, forþon ic geseo
 þæt God is mid þe.
 ‘Now I am speaking truly to you and therefore I cannot remain longer,
 because I see that God is with you’
 (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCCC_303] : 16. 10. 267)

It has been shown that the non-conjunct XVS clauses in CCCC 303 are fine-tuned for the narrative-advancing function. In Cotton Tiberius, its non-conjunct XVS clauses tend to reserve the X slot for adverbials of time, as seen in Table 4. Although the (non-)occurrence of *ond/ac* is no longer a decisive factor for the verb-second in Cotton Tiberius, its XVS word order seems to retain the narrative-advancing function.

3.3.2 X elements in XSV

Table 5 shows the frequencies of the types of the initial X element in the XSV patterns. There seems to be a general tendency that adverbials of space and time in XSV do not seem to be as frequent as in XVS. The proportion of complements in XVS is much higher than that of XVS. It is also noticeable that *þa* and *þonne* rarely appear in the XSV patterns.

Table 5 Types of X elements in XSV

Type	Semantic category	CCCC 303				Cotton Tiberius			
		Non-conjunct		Conjunct		Non-conjunct		Conjunct	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	—	—	3	33.3 %	—	—	—	—
	<i>þa</i> and <i>þonne</i>	1	11.1 %	1	11.1 %	—	—	—	—
	Time	—	—	1	11.1 %	2	20.0 %	11	47.8 %
	Manner	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	13.0 %
	Contingency	1	11.1 %	—	—	2	20.0 %	2	8.7 %
	Participant	1	11.1 %	1	11.1 %	1	10.0 %	—	—
	Other/undecided	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Object complement		6	66.7 %	3	33.3 %	4	40.0 %	7	30.4 %
Subject complement		—	—	—	—	1	10.0 %	—	—
Total		9	100.0 %	9	100.0 %	10	100.0 %	23	100.0 %

The difference between XSV in Table 4 and XVS in Table 5 is contrastive. Importantly, given that the X position of XSV word order is for topicalization, it follows that the object complement is topicalized in the X position. This seems to indicate that

XSV word order is not used to advance the narrative, but rather it tends to meet the descriptive needs for the topicalized object.

3.3.3 X elements in SXV

SXV patterns are considerably more difficult to handle. First, there can be multiple X elements between the subject and the finite verb, such as SXXV, SXXXV and SXXXXV. Next, the SXV pattern can begin with an X element preceding the subject, (X)SXV. Then, the two phenomena can occur at the same time, such as XSXXV, XSXXXV and so on. With this in mind, Tables 6 and 7 present the types of X elements of each pattern in CCCC 303, in non-conjunct and conjunct clauses respectively.

Table 6 Types of X elements in non-conjunct SXV in CCCC 303

Type	Semantic category	Initial X		1st X		2nd X		3rd X		4th X	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	—	—	2	10.0 %	3	15.0 %	—	—	—	—
	<i>þa</i> and <i>þonne</i>	2	10.0 %	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Time	4	20.0 %	2	10.0 %	1	5.0 %	—	—	—	—
	Others	—	—	5	25.0 %	4	20.0 %	1	5.0 %	—	—
Nominal obj. complement		5	25.0 %	4	20.0 %	1	5.0 %	—	—	—	—
Pronominal obj. complement		1	5.0 %	6	30.0 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others		1	5.0 %	1	5.0 %	1	5.0 %	—	—	—	—
NA		7	35.0 %	—	—	10	50.0 %	19	95.0 %	20	100.0 %
Total		20	100.0 %	20	100.0 %	20	100.0 %	20	100.0 %	20	100.0 %

Table 7 Types of X elements in conjunct SXV in CCCC 303

Type	Semantic category	Initial X		1st X		2nd X		3rd X		4th X	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	1	2.1 %	4	8.5 %	10	21.3 %	3	6.4 %	1	2.1 %
	<i>þa</i> and <i>þonne</i>	1	2.1 %	9	19.1 %	2	4.3 %	—	—	—	—
	Time	1	2.1 %	2	4.3 %	3	6.4 %	—	—	—	—
	Others	1	2.1 %	11	23.4 %	8	17.0 %	5	10.6 %	1	2.1 %
Nominal obj. complement		—	—	9	19.1 %	2	4.3 %	3	6.4 %	1	2.1 %
Pronominal obj. complement		—	—	12	25.5 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others		—	—	—	—	5	10.6 %	1	2.1 %	—	—
NA		43	91.5 %	—	—	17	36.2 %	35	74.5 %	44	93.6 %
Total		47	100.0 %	47	100.0 %	47	100.0 %	47	100.0 %	47	100.0 %

'Initial X' means a possible X element preceding the subject. '1st X' to '4th X' refers to X element(s) between the subject and the finite-verb. For the sake of space, I have conflated categories of adverbials, except those of space and time, into the 'others' category. 'NA' (not applicable) means the non-occurrence of the X element.

There is an overall trend that very few clauses begin with *pa* or *ponne* at the initial X position. It is also clear that the pronominal object complement is proportionally higher than the nominal object complement. Pronominals are most likely to be information-structurally given. SXV word order does not seem to be narrative-advancing, but elaborates on the previous discourse, describing what occurs or has happened to the participant(s) involved.

Regarding CCCC 303, the conjunct clauses have a high rate (91.5%) of the NA in the initial X element. By contrast, the non-conjunct clauses tend to fill their initial X slot with adverbials or complements; the percentage of the NA is just 35%, significantly lower than that of the conjunct clauses. This result stands to reason: the clause-initial position in the conjunct clauses has already been filled with *ond/ac*, linked to the previous discourse; therefore, it is not necessary for the initial X to be filled, unless there is some pragmatic requirement. Furthermore, the proportions of the NA in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th elements in the conjunct clauses are lower than those in the non-conjunct

Table 8 Types of X elements in non-conjunct SXV in Cotton Tiberius

Type	Semantic category	Initial X		1st X		2nd X		3rd X		4th X	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	<i>pa</i> and <i>ponne</i>	—	—	4	50.0 %	1	12.5 %	—	—	—	—
	Time	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Others	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	25.0 %	—	—
Nominal obj. complement		—	—	1	12.5 %	—	—	—	—	1	12.5 %
Pronominal obj. complement		—	—	3	37.5 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others		—	—	—	—	1	12.5 %	—	—	—	—
NA		8	100.0 %	—	—	6	75.0 %	6	75.0 %	7	87.5 %
Total		8	100.0 %	8	100.0 %	8	100.0 %	8	100.0 %	8	100.0 %

Table 9 Types of X elements in conjunct SXV in Cotton Tiberius

Type	Semantic category	Initial X		1st X		2nd X		3rd X		4th X	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adverbials	Space	—	—	—	—	2	33.3 %	1	16.7 %	—	—
	<i>pa</i> and <i>ponne</i>	—	—	—	—	2	33.3 %	—	—	—	—
	Time	2	33.3 %	1	16.7 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Others	1	16.7 %	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nominal obj. complement		—	—	1	16.7 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pronominal obj. complement		—	—	4	66.7 %	—	—	—	—	—	—
Others		1	16.7 %	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
NA		2	33.3 %	—	—	2	33.3 %	5	83.3 %	6	100.0 %
Total		6	100.0 %	6	100.0 %	6	100.0 %	6	100.0 %	6	100.0 %

clauses. Those slots are filled with adverbials in the conjunct clauses in CCCC 303. The principal function of the conjunct SXV clauses would thus be an elaboration on what has already been told in the narrative.

However, this line of thinking does not hold good for Cotton Tiberius. As Tables 8 and 9 show, the overall frequency is too low to make a general statement. Remember that verb-final word order itself was already about to decay as far as Cotton Tiberius is concerned; but the higher rate of pronominal objects than nominal objects seems to be a clue that the SXV word order in Cotton Tiberius still retained a construction like the one in CCCC 303.

3.3.4 X elements in SXVX

X elements in the SXVX patterns can be identified in the light of preverbal and postverbal elements. In terms of the competition between OV and VO, preverbal (unquantified) nominal objects throughout the OE periods are over 50%, which eventually declined to 28.4% in the first period of ME (Pintzuk & Taylor 2008). Both in CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius, the preverbal X position in SXVX is strongly favored by object complements. Table 10 shows the frequencies of the complements of the 1st X position in SXVX word order.

Table 10 Nominals and pronominals in the 1st X position in SXVX

Type	CCCC 303				Cotton Tiberius			
	Non-conjunct		Conjunct		Non-conjunct		Conjunct	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nominal obj. complement	1	12.5 %	3	13.6 %	—	—	—	—
Pronominal obj. complement	7	87.5 %	14	63.6 %	16	59.3 %	8	100.0 %
Others (including Adverbials and NA)	—	—	5	22.7 %	11	40.7 %	—	—
Total	8	100.0 %	22	100.0 %	27	100.0 %	8	100.0 %

The overall rate of object complements of SXVX is much higher than that of SXV. Object complements, especially pronominals, are predominant in CCCC 303. Also, pronominal objects are the prevailing option in Cotton Tiberius. Pragmatically speaking, it can be said that the informationally given pronominal objects prefer the preverbal position. However, it is in the non-conjunct clauses in Cotton Tiberius in which ‘others’ amount to 40.7%: 9 out of 11 are exclusively *þa*. Single-word adverbs such as *þa* and pronominals might be treated similarly, as both are light in terms of formal weight. However, to interpret this result, I tentatively assume that the use of *þa* in SXVX is somewhat ‘remedial’, to substitute what has been lost in the OE word order typology during the transition from Late OE to Early ME.

4. Concluding remarks

This paper has examined the differences in word order patterns between CCCC 303 and Cotton Tiberius. It has demonstrated that CCCC 303 reveals a salient distinction in XVS and SXV word order, which was typical of OE. On the other hand, this study has shown that Cotton Tiberius no longer retained the same word order system as CCCC 303. Instead, verb-medial word order was on the rise, which was symptomatic of the emerging Early ME word order system. This study has also discussed the semantic categories of adverbials and the types of complements which appeared in the preverbal or postverbal positions in each word order pattern. In future research, the topicality of the subject should also be examined to pursue a discourse-pragmatic account of word order, which is left unanalyzed in this study.

Although the findings were restricted in proportion to the amount of data, especially in the analysis of the adverbials, this paper has demonstrated, through a comparison with the language of CCCC 303, that the word order of Cotton Tiberius was not reflective of late West-Saxon OE but of transitional Early ME.

Corpora

Randall, Beth, Ann Taylor & Anthony Kroch. 2005–2013. CorpusSearch 2.

URL : <http://corpussearch.sourceforge.net/CS.html> (2 April 2018)

Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk & Frank Beths. 2003. The York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE). University of York : Department of Language and Linguistic Science.

References

- Bean, Marian C. 1983. *The development of word order patterns in Old English*. London : Croom Helm.
- Bech, Kristin. 2001. *Word order patterns in Old and Middle English : a syntactic and pragmatic study*. Bergen : University of Bergen.
- Bech, Kristin. 2008. Verb types and word order in Old and Middle English non-coordinate and coordinate clauses. *English historical linguistics 2006 : selected papers from the fourteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 14), Bergamo, 21–25 August 2006* ed. by Maurizio Gotti, Marina Dossena & Richard Dury, 49–67. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bech, Kristin. 2012. Word order, information structure, and discourse relations. *Information structure and syntactic change in the history of English* ed. by Anneli Meurman-Solin, Maria Jose Lopez-Couso & Bettelou Los, 66–82. Oxford : Oxford

University Press.

- Bech, Kristin. 2014. Tracing the loss of boundedness in the history of English: the anaphoric status of initial prepositional phrases in Old English and Late Middle English. *Anglia*. 506–35.
- Bech, Kristin. 2017. Old 'truths', new corpora: revisiting the word order of conjunct clauses in Old English. *English Language and Linguistics* 21 : 1. 1–25.
- Bech, Kristin & Christine Meklenborg Salvesen. 2014. Preverbal word order in Old English and Old French. *Information structure and syntactic change in Germanic and Romance languages* ed. by Bech Kristin & Kristine Gunn Eide, 233–69. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Cichosz, Anna. 2017. Inversion after clause-initial adverbs in Old English: the special status of *þa*, *þonne*, *nu*, and *swa*. *Journal of English Linguistics* 45 : 4. 308–37.
- Clayton, Mary & Hugh Magennis (Eds.). 1994. *The Old English Lives of St Margaret*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Denison, David. 1993. *English historical syntax : verbal constructions*. London : Longman.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1986. More about the textual functions of the Old English adverbial *þa*. *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries : in honour of Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his 50. birthday, vol 1 : Linguistic theory and historical linguistics* ed. by Kastovsky Dieter & Aleksander Szwedek, 301–9. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik & Brita Wårvik. 1987. Old English *þa*, temporal chains, and narrative structure. *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Onofrio Carruba & Giuliano Bernini, 221–37. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, & Wim van der Wurff (Eds.). 2000. *The syntax of early English*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Haberman, Shelby J. 1973. The analysis of residuals in cross-classified tables. *Biometrics* 29 : 1. 205–20.
- Hasselgård, Hilde. 2010. *Adjunct adverbials in English*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Heggelund, Øystein. 2007. Old English subordinate clauses and the shift to verb-medial order in English. *English Studies* 88 : 3. 351–61.
- Heggelund, Øystein. 2010. *Word order in Old English and Middle English subordinate clauses*. Bergen : University of Bergen.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002 (Eds.). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Kemenade, Ans van. 1987. *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English*. Dordrecht : Foris.
- Kemenade, Ans van. 2012. Rethinking the loss of verb second. *The Oxford handbook of the history of English* ed. by Nevalainen Terttu & Elizabeth Closs Traugott, 822–34.

- Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Ker, N. R. 1957. *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Kohonen, Viljo. 1978. *On the development of English word order in religious prose around 1000 and 1200 A.D. : a quantitative study of word order in context*. Åbo : Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation.
- Koopman, Willem F. 1995. Verb-final main clauses in Old English prose. *Studia Neophilologica* 67 : 2, 129–44.
- Los, Bettelou. 2009. The consequences of the loss of verb-second in English : information structure and syntax in interaction. *English Language and Linguistics* 13 : 1, 97–125.
- Los, Bettelou. 2012. The loss of verb-second and the switch from bounded to unbounded systems. *Information structure and syntactic change in the history of English* ed. by Anneli Meurman-Solin, Maria Jose Lopez-Couso & Bettelou Los, 21–43. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Los, Bettelou & Gea Dreschler. 2012. The loss of local anchoring : from adverbial local anchors to permissive subjects. *The handbook of the history of English* ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los, 859–72. London : Blackwell Publishing.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English syntax*, 2 vols. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Molencki, Rafał. 2017. Syntax. *The history of English, vol 2 : Old English* ed. by Brinton Laurel J & Alexander Bergs, 100–24. Berlin : De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English syntax, part 1 : parts of speech*. Helsinki : Société Néophilologique.
- Petré, Peter. 2010. The functions of *weorðan* and its loss in the past tense in Old and Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics* 14 : 3, 457–84.
- Pintzuk, Susan. 1996. Old English verb-complement word order and the change from OV to VO. *York Papers in Linguistics* 17, 241–64.
- Pintzuk, Susan. 2002. Verb-object order in Old English : variation as grammatical competition. *Syntactic effects of morphological change* ed. by David W. Lightfoot, 276–299. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Pintzuk, Susan & Ann Taylor. 2008. The loss of OV order in the history of English. *The handbook of the history of English* ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los, 249–78. London : Blackwell Publishing.
- Taylor, Ann & Susan Pintzuk. 2012. Rethinking the OV/VO alternation in Old English : the effect of complexity, grammatical weight, and information status. *The Oxford handbook of the history of English* ed. by Nevalainen Terttu & Elizabeth Closs Traugott, 835–45. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Ann & Susan Pintzuk. 2014. Testing the theory : information structure in Old English. *Information structure and syntactic change in Germanic and Romance languages* ed. by Kristin Bech & Kristine Gunn Eide, 53–77. Amsterdam/

- Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1992. Syntax. *The Cambridge history of the English language: The beginnings to 1066* ed. by Richard M Hogg, 168–286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wärvik, Brita. 1990. On grounding in English narratives: a diachronic perspective. *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Cambridge, 6–9 April 1987* ed. by Sylvia Adamson, Vivien Law, Nigel Vincent & Susan Wright, 559–75. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wärvik, Brita. 2011. Connective or ‘disconnective’ discourse marker? Old English *þa*, multifunctionality and narrative structuring. *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English 8: Connectives in Synchrony and Diachrony in European Languages*.
URL: <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/08/warvik/> (1 Dec 2017)
- Wärvik, Brita. 2013. Participant continuity and narrative structure: defining discourse marker functions in Old English. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34. 209–42.
- Wärvik, Brita. 2014. Continuity and quantity: testing iconicity hypotheses on the continuities of time and participants in Old English narrative prose. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 15: 1. 93–122.