CrossMark

English Language and Linguistics 18.3: 387–405. © Cambridge University Press 2014
doi:10.1017/S1360674314000094

Inorganic *-e* and double *n* in the Caligula *Brut*: implications for case marking[1]

SEIJI SHINKAWA
Hakuoh University

(Received 17 October 2011; revised 20 May 2013)

This article investigates variant forms of the demonstrative 'that' and the adjective in the Caligula Manuscript of Laȝamon's *Brut* and concludes that they to a large extent maintain the traditional category distinction between the accusative and the dative by the use of the suffixes *-ne* and *-Vn* (where *V* stands for any vowel) respectively. There are, however, factors that potentially compromise the status of these terminations as case markers: phonetic reduction (which has often been invoked), capricious addition or deletion of final *e*, occasional doubling or simplification of nasals, and simply unexpected choices of forms in the paradigm. These seem to be consistent with the sort of mistakes that scribes might occasionally make when faced with an original that has a different orthographical and morphological system from their own, and they are not as disruptive of the case-marking system as at first sight they might appear. For one thing, they occur rather rarely and are generally outnumbered by historically expected forms; for another, the resultant unexpected case forms, usually with the stem vowel preferred by the historical forms in the case of the demonstrative, are predominantly accompanied by a historically motivated case form of their head noun. The status of accusative *-ne* and dative *-Vn*, in fact, appears to be stable enough to lead to the development of a system or subsystem of indicating case regardless of gender considerations in their respective case contexts. These suffixes can therefore be treated validly as independent case markers, although in concrete cases the possibility always exists that there is an optional final *e*, an unhistorical double or single *n*, or an unexpected choice of inflectional forms.

1 Introduction

This article investigates variant forms of the demonstrative 'that' and the adjective[2] in the Caligula Manuscript of Laȝamon's *Brut*[3] in order to establish whether or not the variation between *-ne* and *-Vn* (where *V* stands for any vowel) is morphosyntactically conditioned, the former serving as an accusative marker and the latter as a dative marker. The text, consisting of over 16,000 lines, is among the longest documents of the Early Middle English period, when category distinctions between cases were being lost, and is one of the most important for the study of the case-marking system at that time. The archaic or archaistic features of the text (see Stanley 1968, 1969), while hindering

[1] The writer would like to express his deep gratitude to two anonymous *English Language and Linguistics* referees and to the editor, Dr Wim van der Wurff, for their useful comments on earlier drafts.

[2] The *adjective* here should be understood to include possessives, quantifiers and others that decline like adjectives. The word *attributive* is used in a broad sense to include both demonstratives and adjectives.

[3] Henceforth Caligula. The edition used for this discussion is Brook & Leslie (1963, 1978). All subsequent references to the *Brut* will be to this edition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exact chronological placement and therefore proper interpretation of the language, are actually beneficial in research on a decaying system such as this, because it allows us to trace the direction of linguistic change in progress at the time in that elements of a new system of the scribes or the author can occasionally be identified in a generally traditional system.[4] This potentially adds to the importance of the text.

Considering its probable date of composition of '1189 to some time not very early in the second half of the thirteenth century' (Stanley 1968: 88), Caligula retains a surprisingly rich case-marking system. However, the relationship between the case categories and the case-marking forms is at times not clear. Allen (1995: 198) convincingly demonstrates a living dative–accusative category distinction in Caligula chiefly on the evidence of pronominal usage, but regarding the originally accusative singular masculine attributive *-ne* termination, which is the main concern of the present study, she questions the validity of treating it 'as one suffix which always carried the same case information', since 'this suffix was so rarely used with adjectives or the [demonstrative] stem *þe-* in anything other than an accusative function, while the same suffix was frequently used in dative functions with the stem *þa-*'. She also points out that *anne* and *nanne*, the historically expected reflexes of the Old English masculine accusative singular forms of the nasal stems *ān* 'an' and *nān* 'no', often appear with historically feminine nouns. She therefore has doubts about the idea that these spellings represent the originally masculine suffix *-ne* and suggests that they may instead represent cases of *n*-doubling not triggered by morphology and carrying little significance as to case or gender (Allen 1995: 198, fn. 41).

Allen's arguments seem to weaken the claim that *-ne* is a specific marker of the accusative case. Nevertheless, a more detailed analysis of *-ne* and related forms suggests that the status of the suffix as an accusative case marker is stronger than it might seem at first sight. The argument for this case will be made in the following sections.

The present article can be viewed as an expansion on a point made regarding variant forms of dative *-Vn* and accusative *-ne* in Shinkawa (2012: 109–15), which traces the loss of grammatical gender in English through an analysis of unhistorical gender assignment within the noun phrase in Laȝamon's *Brut*. Since gender and case are realized on the same elements, such as demonstratives, adjectives and personal pronouns, changes in one system necessarily have implications for the other, and therefore studies on gender and case complement each other. It is hoped that this article, a spin-off of a work on gender, sheds some light on the development of case proper in Early Middle English.

2 The health of the accusative–dative distinction: the demonstrative 'that'

To see any patterning that may occur in the data, it is necessary to examine the occurrence of various forms of the demonstrative 'that' in dative, accusative and

[4] Despite such works as McSparran (2005), knowledge about the textual history of the *Brut* is limited, which is natural in view of the fact that it survives only in two manuscripts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

post-prepositional case contexts in Caligula, mapped against the historical gender of the nouns with which they are explicitly in construction.[5] The full data for this are given in table 1. There are two scribes involved in the production of the manuscript. Hand B is the main hand, while Hand A is responsible for just under a tenth of the manuscript.[6] The occurrence of forms used by the two scribes is listed separately. By dative and accusative contexts are meant contexts where in Old English dative and accusative forms are normally expected: the dative is used for the indirect object, the direct object of some verbs, with most prepositions, and adverbially in various expressions where English today requires the use of prepositions; the accusative is used for the direct object of most verbs, with some prepositions, and adverbially, especially in expressions of time or space. However, the instances appearing after (or before) prepositions are collectively treated as 'post-prepositional', since different case forms in such contexts tend to be neutralized in favor of the numerically superior dative form.[7]

In dative singular contexts, *þVn*, the reflex of the Old English dative singular masculine or neuter (see appendix 1 for the Old English forms of the demonstrative 'that'), is used with masculines or neuters 90.0% (9/10) of the time by Hand A and 92.5% (111/120) of the time by Hand B. Of the *þVn* forms here, *þan* is by far the most frequent, making up 88.9% (8/9) and 82.9% (92/111) of their total in the two respective hands. In accusative singular contexts, *þVne*, the reflex of the Old English accusative singular masculine, appears with masculine nouns 91.7% (33/36) and 88.2% (299/339) of the time respectively in A and B. Of the *þVne* forms here, *þene* is dominant, being the only form employed by Hand A (33 occurrences) and accounting for 90.3% (270/299) of their total in B. Judging from these numbers, the dative–accusative distinction seems to be clearly maintained, with *þan* and *þene* being the most representative markers of respective case categories. It is highly probable that the different stem vowels in the *þVn* or *þVne* forms are reduced ones and reflect not the speech, but an orthographical convention, of the time.[8] Different preferences for the stem vowel in dative and accusative forms, however, should be noted, since they potentially serve to add to the dativeness of *þVn* or to the accusativeness of *þVne*, and, in case of possible confusion of the two forms, help determine which case function is intended in the particular example.

[5] Included are head nouns that are not attested in Old English but whose gender is reasonably assignable on the basis of Old English word-formation processes. Loan words that are not listed in Bosworth & Toller (1898) or Toller (1921) and proper nouns are excluded. Also excluded are adjective heads, which themselves do not belong to any particular gender class, because the present study considers gender as well as case. Abbreviations and contractions in the manuscripts are given in their expanded forms as they appear in Brook & Leslie (1963, 1978). Their emendations involving demonstrative and adjective forms are, however, ignored, and so are the hyphens 'used to join elements of a compound [noun] which are not joined in the manuscript' (Brook & Leslie 1963, 1978: 1, ix).

[6] On the scribal hands and stints, the analysis of Laing & Lass (2003: 277) is adopted.

[7] Bennett & Smithers (1982: 343), for example, distinguish the dative and prepositional cases and list the same forms as representative markers for both in their paradigm of selected forms of the pronoun 'that'.

[8] Final *e*, for that matter, might also be an orthographical convention without phonetic or phonological reality employed for accusative contexts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *Distribution of forms of the demonstrative 'that' in dative, accusative and post-prepositional case contexts*

	Masculine		Feminine		Neuter		Plural	
	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B
Dative								
þan	6	84	0	0	2	8	0	25
þæn	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
þen	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
þeon	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þon	0	13	0	0	0	1	1	1
þare	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
þere	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0
þane	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þene	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
þone	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þa	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
þe	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
þat	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
þaie	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	8	107	2	18	2	13	4	27
Accusative								
þane	0	17	0	2	0	2	0	0
þæne	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
þænne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þene	33	270	0	2	0	4	0	1
þenne	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
þeone	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
þonne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þa	0	8	18	139	0	13	34	242
þæ	0	1	0	8	0	1	0	7
þe	1	15	9	47	0	2	4	26
þea	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
þeo	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1
þat	0	5	1	3	36	210	0	1
þæt	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
þet	0	1	0	0	1	6	0	0
þaie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
þan	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1
þen	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	36	339	28	205	38	240	42	281
Post-prepositional								
þan	26	536	1	17	18	249	9	153
þæn	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	2
þen	1	15	3	0	0	10	0	10
ðen	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
þeon	1	1	0	0	0	8	0	1

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *Continued*

	Masculine		Feminine		Neuter		Plural	
	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B
þon	24	52	1	1	17	39	15	9
ðon	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
þare	0	2	12	26	0	0	0	0
þære	1	2	2	19	1	0	0	0
þera	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
þere	1	5	14	156	2	4	0	0
ðere	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
þer	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
þane	4	4	0	0	4	2	3	1
þanne	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
þæne	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
þene	3	56	0	0	0	3	0	1
ðene	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
þone	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
þa	1	6	3	9	1	3	3	28
þæ	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
þe	2	10	0	5	1	8	0	9
þea	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
þat	2	2	1	0	12	36	1	3
þet	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
þaie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	68	710	39	236	57	367	32	219

After prepositions, originally dative *þVn* appears respectively 76.5% (52/68) and 61.4% (35/57) of the time in A and 85.9% (610/710) and 84.2% (309/367) of the time in B with singular masculines and neuters.[9] Hand A prefers *þan* and *þon* equally strongly, the former representing respectively 50.0% (26/52) and 51.4% (18/35), and the latter 46.2% (24/52) and 48.6% (17/35), of the total post-prepositional *þVn* forms found with masculine and neuter nouns. In B, *þan* accounts for 87.9% (536/610) with masculines and 80.6% (249/309) with neuters, and *þon* 8.9% (54/610) with masculines and 12.9% (40/309) with neuters. Hand A's stronger preference for *þon* is not clear in dative contexts, probably because of the lack of data available. Historically accusative masculine *þVne* comprises only 13.2% (9/68) in A and 9.9% (70/710) in B of the total post-prepositional forms constructed with singular masculines, and accusative neuter *þVt* 22.8% (13/57) in A and 10.4% (38/367) in B of those constructed with singular neuters. Thus it appears that the post-prepositional instances largely have the same forms as in dative contexts. This does not, however, mean that the accusative–dative distinction is completely neutralized after prepositions: *thurgh*

[9] In B, demonstratives rarely occur with initial *ð* instead of *þ*. They are not distinguished in the general argument, where *þ*- forms should be understood to include variants with *ð*-.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'through',[10] for example, which generally takes accusative in Old English, is followed twelve times by a masculine singular noun with originally accusative *þVne* and three times by one with historically dative *þVn* in B. The *Brut* data therefore appear to reflect a continuation of the Old English situation, where most prepositions take dative but a few take accusative.

3 Cases with 'dative' *þVne* and 'accusative' *þVn*

Despite the general pattern of historically motivated use of accusative and dative forms, there are sporadic unexpected occurrences of *þVne* in dative contexts and of *þVn* in accusative contexts. 'Dative' *þVne* is employed only with masculine nouns. All the examples are given below:

(1) <Wa> wrðe auer **þene** smið᾽ (A 783a)
'Woe be ever to the smith'
(2) Galoes wes feirest᾽ of alle þan oðren.
leouest **þone** kinge᾽ (B 1358–9a)
'Galoes was the fairest of all the others, dearest to the king'
(3) Þa andswarede Merlin᾽ **þane** kinge þe spac wið him. (B 7995)
'Then answered Merlin to the king who spoke with him.'

Allen (1995: 198–9) proposes that such examples should be explained by a considerable time lag between the composition of the *Brut* and its copying: the scribes, who most probably did not have the same old dative–accusative system as the exemplar any longer, were likely to make hypercorrections. In example (1), *þene*, an accusative form, is used with a head noun lacking a dative ending probably as a general object marker.[11] The same explanation could also apply to examples (2) and (3), but they might reveal another phenomenon. Note that they both involve minority *þVne* forms, *þane* and *þone*. The former accounts for only 5.7% (17/299) of the total *þVne* forms in B constructed with masculine nouns in accusative singular contexts, and the latter is never found in the relevant contexts. They respectively have the same stem vowel as *þan* and *þon*, the most and the second most frequent form in dative singular contexts. Moreover, their head nouns have a dative ending. It is therefore possible that the scribes, faced with a language that has a different orthographical and morphological system from their own, introduced unhistorical *-e* in dative *þVn* forms.

Post-prepositional instances of *þVne*, especially in A, lend some support to this argument. While *þene* is the sole *þVne* form found with masculine nouns in accusative singular contexts (33 occurrences) in A, it accounts for a mere 33.3% (3/9) of the total

[10] Since spelling varies widely within the manuscript, that of the headwords of the *Middle English Dictionary* will be henceforth cited, unless a specific word form is referred to.

[11] The Old English *a*-stem declension, to which most masculine and neuter nouns belong, is well preserved, and the accusative and the dative are usually distinguished by the absence in the former, and presence in the latter, of the ending *-e*. See appendix 2 for forms of *a*-nouns in Old English. In the case of nouns with stem-final *e*, the dative and accusative forms are indistinguishable. Occasionally, *-en* is found for expected *-e* in Caligula, practically serving as a dative marker, whatever its origin.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

þVne forms post-prepositionally. Here *þane* and *þone*, which do not occur in accusative contexts, make up respectively 44.4% (4/9) and 22.2% (2/9); all their head nouns have a dative ending, e.g., *to* ***þane*** *kinge* 'to the king' (A 467) and *æfter* ***þone*** *kinge* 'after the king' (A 1026). This can be compared with post-prepositional instances of *þene*, where none of the head nouns has a dative ending, e.g., *for* ***þene*** *almiten Godd* 'for the almighty God' (A 30). These examples suggest that some *þVne* forms in post-prepositional contexts, especially those that have the same stem vowel as the normal dative forms and whose head nouns have a dative ending, should be analyzed as being dative *þVn* with optional final *e*, rather than as accusative *þVne*. In B, the percentage of both normal *þene* and minority *þane* among the total *þVne* forms is not very different in accusative and post-prepositional contexts, standing respectively at 90.3% (270/299) and 82.9% (58/70) in the case of the former form and 5.7% (17/299) and 5.7% (4/70) in that of the latter, but *þone*, which does not occur in accusative contexts, appears once in a post-prepositional context. The head nouns of *þene*, as expected, have an unambiguous dative ending in only four cases out of 58. Those of *þane* and *þone* together appear once each with an unambiguous dative and an ambiguous stem or dative ending, and three times with no ending, indicating no particularly strong preference for the dative.

The instances of 'accusative' *þVn* may reflect the same uncertainty about the inflectional ending on the part of the scribes, who, in this case, possibly left out final *e*. There are two occurrences of *þen* in A and two each of *þen* and *þan* in B. Examples are:

(4) Þar com Eneas᾽ & grette **þen** alde king. (A 68)
'There came Aeneas and greeted the old king.'
(5) and alle ich wulle for-don᾽ þa biluueden **þen** swike-dom. (B 14066)
'and all I will destroy who approved the treachery.'
(6) þer-to weoren ilaðede᾽ his leond-cnihtes alle.
riche men and hæne᾽ to hæȝen **þan** king. (B 9963–4)
'Thereto were invited all his land-knights, rich men and poor, to honor the king.'

Such an interpretation is favored by the fact that none of their head nouns has a dative ending and the form *þen* with the same stem vowel as the normal accusative form *þene* is here more frequent than *þan*, which elsewhere outnumbers it.[12]

Next, let us consider instances of *þVne* in post-prepositional plural contexts and of *þer* in post-prepositional singular feminine contexts (see table 1), where respectively *þVn* and *þere* are normally expected. Here the presence or absence of final *e* does not obscure the distinction between the dative and the accusative, the accusative case form of both the plural and the feminine being *þV*. It appears that unhistorical final *e* can sometimes be added or historical final *e* deleted.[13] When *þVne* forms are found

[12] They are unlikely to be the result of misabbreviation, an attested abbreviation for *þVne* being *þV̄e*, with the bar over the vowel conventionally being taken to stand for a missing nasal, in this case *n*.

[13] Meter may have something to do with addition or deletion of final *e* but is not rigid enough to render its presence or absence predictable, nor is hiatus resolution always applicable. See Millar (1995: 148–9).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. *Distribution of* þVn *and* þVne *forms constructed with* king *in dative, accusative and post-prepositional case contexts*

	∅		*-e*		*-en*		Total	
	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B
Dative								
þan	2	4	4	48	0	6	6	58
þen	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
þeon	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
þon	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	10
þane	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
þone	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	2	6	5	59	0	6	7	71
Accusative								
þane	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	8
þæne	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
þene	10	80	0	1	0	0	10	81
þeone	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
þan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
þen	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	11	93	0	2	0	0	11	95
With *tō*								
þan	0	3	6	86	0	6	6	95
þæn	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
þen	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
þon	0	0	2	5	0	1	2	6
þane	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	3	9	96	0	7	9	106
With *with*								
þan	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
þæne	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
þene	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total	0	5	0	8	0	0	0	13

where the dative form is historically expected, especially those with the same stem vowel as the usual dative forms, they should therefore be interpreted as dative *þVn* with optional addition of *-e* rather than as accusative *þVne*. Similarly, *þVn* forms in accusative contexts, especially those that have the same stem vowel as the usual accusative form, should be interpreted as accusative *þVne* with optional deletion of *-e* rather than as dative *þVn*.

To demonstrate the extent of the variability of final *e*, which also affects nouns, table 2 provides data for relevant instances constructed with the very frequent noun *king*. The word is a masculine *a*-stem and historically distinguishes the accusative and the dative singular by the absence in the former, and presence in the latter, of the ending *-e*; unhistorical *-en* is occasionally found for expected *-e* in Caligula and in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

effect serves as a dative marker (see fn. 11). The table shows with which form of *king* the *þVn* and *þVne* forms are found in dative, accusative and post-prepositional singular contexts. Post-prepositional instances are represented by those used with *tō* 'to' and *with*, of which the former historically governs the dative and the latter the dative and accusative.

Both demonstrative and noun have a historically expected form in 71.4% (5/7) in A and 80.3% (57/71) in B of the instances in dative contexts, and 90.9% (10/11) in A and 96.8% (92/95) in B of those in accusative contexts. All instances of the nominal form with unhistorical *-en*, found only in B, are employed with *þan*, a normal dative form of the demonstrative. Unhistorical final *e* or lack thereof occurs only marginally: twice in B on the demonstrative form and twice in A and six times in B on the nominal form in dative contexts, and once each in A and B on the demonstrative form and twice in B on the nominal form in accusative contexts, and never on the demonstrative and the noun at the same time. These unhistorical forms might be thought to be signs of the complete breakdown of the formal dative–accusative distinction. However, this would be an incorrect interpretation. In each case, an unhistorical case form of the noun is accompanied by a historical case form of the demonstrative, or an unhistorical case form of the demonstrative, which usually has the stem vowel that is preferred by the historical form, is followed by a historical case form of the noun. Unsystematic addition or deletion of final *e* thus appears to be one of the factors that occasionally confuse the generally well-maintained accusative–dative distinction, though it is minimally disruptive of the overall case system.

Post-prepositional instances corroborate the preceding argument. Those found with *tō*, which historically takes dative, confirm the situation in dative contexts. After *with*, which traditionally governs dative and accusative, the demonstrative and the noun both have a dative form seven times and an accusative form five times. There is only a single instance of the demonstrative and the noun having conflicting case forms, which appears with the verb *spēken* 'speak'. In combination with this verb, the preposition is elsewhere used twice each with consistently dative, and consistently accusative, nominal and demonstrative forms apparently without difference in meaning. It is important to note that even where both cases are equally possible, once the one or the other is chosen, the choice is in general expressed on both demonstrative and noun, which seems to indicate that these case forms are still being distinguished.

4 Optional final *e* and *n*-doubling on adjective forms

The same optionality of final *e* can be observed also in adjective morphology, both weak and strong. The relevant forms here are *-ne*, the reflex of the Old English strong accusative singular masculine *-ne*, and *-en*, the reflex of the strong dative singular masculine or neuter and the strong or weak dative plural *-um* and also of the weak form *-an*, which covers more than half of the categories in the paradigm of weak adjectives (see appendix 3 for the Old English adjectival declensions). The neuter *word*, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example, occurs in weak positions in post-prepositional plural contexts twice with an adjective with *-en* as in *mid **milden** his worden* 'with his mild words' (A 598) and once with an adjective that has *-ene*, in *mid **godene** heore worden* 'with their good words' (A 334), in A. The form *-en* is the normal development of Old English *-um*, from which *-ene* would not result organically. It is hardly possible that *-ene* here represents the strong accusative singular masculine *-ne*, and in the highly unlikely event that it does, the form is unusual: it should be *godne*, not *godene*. What is much more likely is that the form *godene* represents *goden* with unhistorical addition of *-e*.

These endings appear to have been further confused with *-ne* owing to the general instability of vowels in weak syllables. In B, *-ne* is found instead of *-en* twice in dative contexts as in (7), and, conversely, *-en* instead of *-ne* once in a strong position in an accusative context, in (8), against historical expectations:

(7) **auerelcne** cnihte: he ȝef ȝeoue brihte. (B 3841)
'To every knight he gave a bright gift.'
(8) & þa he sculde of liue wende: he hæfde **feiren** ende. (B 3415)
'and when he should depart from life, he had a fair end.'

In both instances of *-ne* in dative contexts, the head noun has an expected dative ending. In the only instance of *-en* in an accusative context, the head noun has stem-final *e*, which is not informative as to case.

More relevant in this context, however, may be the doubling of *n* suggested by Allen (1995: 198, fn. 41). Indeed, most instances of unhistorical *-ne* concern adjectives and possessives with stem-final *n* such as *an* (*a*), *mīn* 'my' and *thīn* 'thy'. Occasional occurrences of such forms as *þVnne* for *þVne* (B 2205, 2293, 2831, etc.) and *Vnnes* for *anes*, the genitive singular masculine or neuter form of *an* (A 785; B 4333, 5249), support Allen's suggestion. The following example, where *ane* and *anne* are found juxtaposed with each other in similar contexts, is the most diagnostic:

(9) whær he wes in **anne** wude: in **ane** wilderne: (B 6135)
'where he was in a wood, in a wilderness'

The preposition *in* traditionally takes dative in the sense of 'rest in a place' and accusative in the sense of 'motion toward a place'. In the contexts represented by *ane* and *anne* in (9), where the sense of 'rest in a place' is relevant, Old English would have dative *ānum*.[14] Its reflex in Caligula is *ane*, probably through an intermediate stage of *anen*. So *anne* with double *n* in example (9) is unhistorical. The same phrase is also found in the sense of 'motion toward a place':

(10) þat he com in **ane** wude: in **ane** wilderne. (B 10093)
'that he came into a wood, into a wilderness'

[14] The word *wōde* 'wood' is masculine, and *wīlderne* 'wilderness', which is not attested as a noun in Old English, seems to align with reflexes of either masculine or neuter.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here *ane*, not expected accusative *anne*, is employed without historicity, which shows that simplification of double *n* also occurs.[15] Whatever their phonetic or phonological value, *ane* and *anne* in these examples appear to be interchangeable with each other.

These unexpected occurrences of *ane* and *anne* may alternatively be regarded as wrong choices of forms in the paradigm. Such errors are consistent with the sort of mistakes that are likely to be made by scribes copying an exemplar with a language different from their own. Whatever their origin, they are used only occasionally, and when they are, they usually appear with a head noun that has the expected case form. For example, *king* in accusative singular contexts occurs five times with expected *anne* or its variant and once with unhistorical *ane* in B, and is always in the accusative form; and *castēl* 'castle' in the singular after the preposition *tō* 'to', which governs dative in Caligula as well as in Old English, is found four times with expected *ane* and twice with unhistorical *anne* or its variant in B, and always has a dative ending. Occasional doubling or simplification of nasals, or a wrong choice of inflectional forms, thus appears to be another factor that disturbs the accusative–dative distinction, though its impact on the case system as a whole seems to be very much limited. More details of the situation regarding adjectives will be given in the following sections.

5 The health of the accusative–dative distinction: the adjective

Adjectives are more susceptible to phonetic reduction than demonstratives, and their historically distinctive endings are often replaced by a leveled or zero form. The endings that remain and serve to distinguish cases are the following: *-es*, *-en*, *-ne* and *-re*, which are respectively the reflexes of the Old English strong genitive singular masculine or neuter *-es*, the strong dative singular masculine or neuter and the strong or weak dative plural *-um*, the strong accusative singular masculine *-ne*, and the strong genitive or dative singular feminine *-re* or the strong or weak genitive plural *-ra*. The ending *-en* poses a problem. As mentioned in section 4, it could be a development not only of dative *-um*, but also of the weak form *-an* with its distribution extending into other case contexts. The distinction between the two, however, is still signaled syntactically: in Old English, adjectives are declined weak when accompanied by a demonstrative, possessive or noun genitive, but strong without such an element.[16] When discussing the Middle English *-en* suffix, its double origin should always be kept in mind. There is a further complication in that Caligula shows the peculiarity of adding final

[15] If *wīlderne* is treated as neuter, *an* is the expected form. The second prepositional phrase could be taken to modify *wude* and have the sense of 'rest in a place', in which case *ane* is historical. However, other instances of prepositional phrases involving *wōde* and *wīlderne* tend to indicate that they are used appositively. See A 263; B 4284, 8048, 9379.

[16] This is a highly simplified version of the rules and admits of various exceptions. See Mitchell (1985: 1, 51–67) for details. Some adjectives are always declined strong or weak; see Campbell (1959: 261). For brevity, any position in which the strong or weak form is historically expected, whether syntactically or lexically, will be called strong or weak. In some positions, both strong and weak forms are allowed. Such positions are treated as weak so as not to contaminate the data of strong forms with historically possible weak forms, the focus of this study being on strong rather than weak forms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. *Distribution of the reflexes of surviving case-distinctive adjectival inflections in dative, accusative and post-prepositional case contexts: strong positions*

	Masculine		Feminine		Neuter		Plural	
	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B
Dative								
-en	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
-re	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0
-r	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
-ne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
-nne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	2	1	21	0	0	0	2
Accusative								
-ne	7	67	0	3	0	3	0	0
-nne	27	205	1	22	0	1	0	1
-en	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
-re	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
-es	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	34	273	1	26	0	4	0	9
Post-prepositional								
-an	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-æn	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
-en	3	5	0	4	0	11	1	9
-ne	2	9	1	0	0	2	0	0
-nne	2	26	0	0	0	2	0	0
-es	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
-ra	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
-re	0	11	40	312	1	10	0	4
-r	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	53	42	317	1	25	1	13

n unhistorically to nouns and adjectives among several other parts of speech (for this 'nunnation', see Madden 1847: 1, xxix), which, coupled with the optional addition and deletion of final *e* discussed above, obscures the status of *-ne* and *-en*. Further still, some examples of what appears to be the suffix *-ne* may actually represent a combination of doubled stem-final *n* and the ending *-e*. In the tables and discussions that follow, *-nne* of whatever origin will be distinguished from *-ne* for the sake of effective argument, not because they are held to be distinct as morphemes. Tables 3 and 4 show the distribution of adjectives with the remnant case-distinctive suffixes in dative, accusative and post-prepositional contexts respectively in strong and weak positions.

Of *-en*, *-(n)ne* and *-re*, the three strong forms relevant in these contexts,[17] the first suffers most seriously from phonetic reduction. The fact that Old English *ānum*, the

[17] Prepositions take genitive only rarely.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. *Distribution of the reflexes of surviving case-distinctive adjectival inflections in dative, accusative and post-prepositional case contexts: weak positions*

	Masculine		Feminine		Neuter		Plural	
	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B	Hand A	Hand B
Dative								
-en	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Total	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Accusative								
-en	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	9
-na	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
-ne	4	58	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	5	61	1	3	0	1	0	9
Post-prepositional								
-an	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
-en	2	29	7	16	3	26	6	36
-n	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-æm	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
-ne	1	13	0	2	0	0	1	0
-nne	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
-re	0	0	3	60	0	1	0	0
-r	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total	4	42	13	79	4	30	7	36

dative singular masculine or neuter form of *ān* ‘an’, does not give *anen* but is further reduced to *ane* is briefly touched upon in section 4. This is generally the case with other adjectives, and it explains the limited occurrence of *-en* in both strong and weak positions. The development of the demonstrative ‘this’, which is outside the scope of this study, is also revealing. The dative singular masculine or neuter form, *þissum* in Old English, is often *þisse* rather than *þissen* in Caligula (see Shinkawa 2012: 78, 80, 83). Thus even if *-en* proves to remain a distinctive dative or weak form, it is no longer the main marker of either function.

The other strong forms, *-(n)ne* and *-re*, on the other hand, appear robust in accusative, and dative and post-prepositional contexts respectively, so much so as to spill over into weak positions, where *-en* is historically expected. Concentrating on accusative *-(n)ne*, it shows no instance in A of confusion with dative *-en* in accusative singular masculine contexts and only a single instance against 272 of historical *-(n)ne* in B (see example (8)). Given also its marginal status in the adjective paradigm, *-en* is not a threat to the health of *-(n)ne* as an accusative case marker.

Post-prepositional occurrences of *-(n)ne*, too, indicate its health as an accusative marker. Those constructed with masculine nouns in A are found with prepositions that traditionally govern (a) either accusative or dative (*for*, *umbe* ‘about’) and (b) accusative in the particular contexts concerned (*in* ‘into’, *on* ‘on to’). The head nouns

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that follow the type (a) prepositions have no dative ending, and those used with the type (b) prepositions appear with an endingless form and a dative form once each. Thus *-(n)ne* can be seen to be associated strongly with the accusative. In B, the prepositions involved are those that take (a) either accusative or dative (*for*, *onyēn* 'against', *thurgh* 'through', *with*), (b) accusative in the particular contexts concerned (*in* 'into', *on* 'on to', *ōver* 'over'), and (c) dative either generally or in the particular contexts concerned (*amid(de)* 'amid', *tō* 'to', *in-tō* 'into'; *in*, *on*, *ōver* 'over'). The head nouns governed by the type (a) prepositions occur thirteen times in an endingless form and once each with an ambiguous stem or dative ending and an unambiguous dative ending. Those found with the type (b) prepositions occur seven times in an endingless form, three times with an ambiguous stem or dative ending, and once in an unambiguous dative form. Those following the type (c) prepositions occur once in an endingless form and four times each with an ambiguous stem or dative ending and an unambiguous dative ending. With the exception of those that are governed by type (c) prepositions, *-(n)ne* forms are strongly associated with the accusative. All the exceptional, or non-accusative, instances of *-(n)ne* here involve *anne* or its variant, which, as discussed in section 4, is probably a variation of *ane* with double *n* or a form wrongly chosen for *ane*. However, they are rare and unlikely to have adversely affected the status of *-ne* as a marker of the accusative case.

Post-prepositional *-en* and its variants occur only rarely in strong positions, but when they do, they tend to mark the dative distinctively. The instances in A of *-en* and *-an* constructed with singular masculines (there is no neuter instance) appear three times with *mid* 'with', which traditionally takes dative, and once with *for*, which governs either dative or accusative. Their head nouns have an ambiguous stem or dative ending three times and probably dative *-en* once. In B, *-æn* is found once with a singular masculine, and *-en* five times with singular masculines and eleven times with singular neuters. Most follow prepositions that historically take dative either generally or in the particular contexts concerned (*mid* 'with', *of*, *tō* 'to'; *on*), the only exception being one preceded by *for*, which can take accusative as well as dative. Their head nouns appear nine times in an unambiguous dative form, three times with an ambiguous stem or dative ending, twice each with probably dative *-en* and with no ending, and once in a genitive form.[18] It thus appears that *-en*, as well as its variants, for the most part represents the dative.

The formal reduction of the dative form does not obscure the dative–accusative distinction, unless the accusative form, too, suffers from reduction and loses its distinctiveness, which has not happened in Caligula. The conclusion can therefore be that the distinction is still healthy in adjective morphology despite occasional instances of optional final *e*, unhistorical double or single *n*, and a wrong choice of inflectional forms.

[18] The genitive form may be the result of an attempt to rhyme it with the final word in the previous half-line or represent a hybrid construction of the inflected genitive and the *of*-genitive: *urnen þa brockes. of reden* ***blodes***. 'ran the brooks of red blood's' (B 15179).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6 Attributive suffixes *-Vn* and *-ne* as gender-neutral case markers

Unhistorical *anne* for *ane* has been shown to be, on the whole, uncommon, but its occurrence with feminine nouns in accusative singular contexts, where *ane* is historical, is too frequent to be neglected. Here the ratio between *anne* and *ane* (including their variants) is 1 to 23 in A and 19 to 72 in B. The ratio between the two forms found with neuter nouns in post-prepositional singular contexts, where dative *ane* is expected to be predominant and accusative *an* to occur only occasionally, for example, is 0 to 7 in A and 2 to 47 in B. The considerably greater frequency of the double *n* form with feminines in accusative singular contexts suggests that this particular deviation is not random. It may be explained as spillover into the feminine domain of accusative singular masculine *anne* as a gender-insensitive accusative marker. The double *n* form also occurs once with a neuter noun in an accusative singular context, where *an* is historically expected:

(11) þer-inne he bulde **ænne** bur. (B 14581b)
'therein he built a chamber'

Since *ænne* here is highly unlikely to have developed from *an* by phonetic, phonological or orthographical processes as it could possibly have done from *ane*, it most probably represents an extension of the accusative singular masculine form.

Unhistorical examples of *-nne* in accusative singular contexts are confined to the word *anne* and its variants, including its negative versions such as *nenne*, and they may represent a change in this particular word, not a general extension of accusative *-ne*. Examples of *-nne* in general, however, are almost exclusively of *anne* or its associated forms, and the other *-nne* forms may just happen not to occur in the relevant contexts. Moreover, the suffix *-ne* in demonstratives and adjectives occasionally appears to mark the accusative irrespective of gender as the following examples show:

(12) He luuede **þane** sunne꞉ (B 14392a)
'He loved the sin'
(13) ouer-al me brac **þene** grið꞉ (B 2013b)
'Everywhere men broke the peace.'
(14) þat þu æi **hæhne** burhȝe꞉ hæðene monne habbe bi-tæht. (B 7083)
'that you may have given any high city to a heathen man.'
(15) he dude þer **muchelne** wunde((r))꞉ (B 3735)
'He did there a great wonder.'

Accusative singular masculine *þVne* is constructed with a feminine noun in (12) and with a neuter noun in (13), and the adjective suffix *-ne* in a strong position with a feminine noun in (14)[19] and with a neuter noun in (15). In the following example, *-ne* is extended even to a plural context, possibly showing its number insensitivity:

[19] It is possible but less plausible to regard the position occupied by *hæhne* as weak. After adjectives denoting quantity or number, the strong form is historically preferred to the weak form.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(16) & falden **þene** ælden nomen: æfter heore wille. (B 3552)
'and abolished the old names after their will'

In view of these examples of the gender- and possibly number-neutral attributive suffix *-ne* in accusative contexts, unhistorical accusative *anne* is probably best treated as part of *-ne* extension rather than as representing a change in this particular word.

Dative singular masculine or neuter *-Vn*, too, shows some cases of extension to the feminine domain in post-prepositional contexts as in the following examples:

(17) Þa me mihte bihalden: þe þer bihalues weoren.
folc a **þan** uolde: feondliche adredde. (B 11917–18)
'Then men who happened to be there beside might have seen the folk on the land immensely frightened.'
(18) Wunden in-to **widen** sæ: þeines wunder bliðe. (B 12747)
'Thanes wondrously blithe wound into the wide sea.'

These developments of *-Vn* and *-ne* as well as similar gender-insensitive uses of *-es* as a genitive marker, which is not discussed in this study, constitute what is traditionally called 'masculinization', but discussion of this lies outside the scope of this study.[20] For present purposes, it suffices to point out that *-Vn* and *-ne* as case markers are stable enough to possibly begin to develop a system or subsystem of indicating case regardless of gender considerations either in the original of the *Brut* or as an innovation introduced by the scribes. Either way, such a development presupposes that there is a systematic distinction between the dative and accusative cases.

7 Conclusion

The conclusion to be drawn from the detailed analysis of case forms presented in this article is that Caligula retains the traditional category distinction between the accusative and the dative very well, confirming Allen's (1995: 196) views. The demonstrative 'that' and the adjective to a large extent distinguish the two cases by the use of the endings *-ne* and *-Vn*, even though these suffixes occasionally suffer phonetic reduction and the adjective ending *-Vn* is often reduced to *-e*, which gives little information as to case. Other factors that to some extent confuse the overall picture are the optional addition or deletion of final *e*, occasional doubling or simplification of nasals, and wrong choice of forms in the paradigm. These seem to have been introduced rather mechanically by scribes copying an exemplar with a language different from their own. In the process, they are also likely to have made some hypercorrections. These 'mistakes', which led Allen (1995: 198) to express reservations about treating *-ne* as one distinct suffix, can indeed undermine the formal accusative–dative distinction. However, their impact is less serious than it might appear, because they have rather low frequency of occurrence, there is usually a 'correct' case form of their accompanying head noun, and in the case of the demonstrative 'that', additional marking is achieved by the contrast in the stem

[20] See Jones (1988) and Shinkawa (2012) for discussion of innovative attributive morphology as a case marker.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vowel preferentially associated with each of the two cases. The status of accusative *-ne* and dative *-Vn*, in fact, appears to be surprisingly stable, even to the point that they are occasionally generalized as gender-neutral case markers in their respective case contexts. These suffixes can therefore be treated validly as consistent case markers so long as the occasional occurrence of optional final *e*, unhistorical double or single *n*, and wrong choice of inflectional forms are allowed for.

It would not be appropriate to generalize the findings of this study, which deals with only a single text, and an 'idiosyncratic' one at that, to formulate any theory regarding the mechanics of the syncretism of the dative–accusative case categories in Early Middle English. Such an endeavor requires an examination of a much larger corpus. Broad-scale studies of that sort, owing to the limited availability of material from the relevant periods, would necessarily have to address an incoherent body of texts involving different areas, periods and genres, which would be difficult to interpret: geographical, chronological and genre features would not be easily distinguishable from one another. Moreover, works that cover a large number of texts tend to oversimplify and see each text as reflecting a single system, whereas there might be multiple systems underlying the forms used in the text concerned. Crucial details might be missed out or glossed over in such studies. Details of that sort can be expected to be furnished not by large-scale corpus studies, but by individual case studies. Thus philological and linguistic works complement each other. It is hoped that this research helps in fine-tuning the findings of large corpus studies such as Allen (1995).

Author's address:

Faculty of Business Administration
Hakuoh University
1117 Daigyoji, Oyama, Tochigi 323-8585
Japan
shinkawa@fc.hakuoh.ac.jp

References

Allen, Cynthia L. 1995. *Case marking and reanalysis: Grammatical relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, Jack A. W. & Geoffrey V. Smithers (eds.). 1982. *Early Middle English verse and prose*, 2nd edn, rev. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bosworth, Joseph & T. Northcote Toller (eds.). 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary: Based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*. London: Oxford University Press.

Brook, George L. & Roy F. Leslie (eds.). 1963, 1978. *Laȝamon:* Brut (Early English Text Society 250, 277). 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, Charles. 1988. *Grammatical gender in English: 950 to 1250*. London: Croom Helm.

Laing, Margaret & Roger Lass. 2003. Tales of the 1001 nists: The phonological implications of litteral substitution sets in some thirteenth-century South-West Midland texts. *English Language and Linguistics* 7(2), 257–78.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Madden, Frederic (ed.). 1847. *Laȝamons Brut, or chronicle of Britain: A poetical semi-Saxon paraphrase of the Brut of Wace; Now first published from the Cottonian Manuscripts in the British Museum; Accompanied by a literal translation, notes, and a grammatical glossary*. 3 vols. London: The Society of Antiquaries of London.
McSparran, Frances. 2005. Following the scribal trail: The BL Cotton Caligula A. ix copy of Laȝamon's *Brut*. In Nikolaus Ritt & Herbert Schendl (eds.), *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and literary approaches*, 42–66. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Middle English dictionary. 1952–2001. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/ (3 April 2011).
Millar, Robert McColl. 1995. Ambiguity in ending and form: 'Reinterpretation' in the demonstrative systems of Laȝamon's 'Brut'. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96, 145–68.
Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Shinkawa, Seiji. 2012. *Unhistorical gender assignment in Laȝamon's* Brut*: A case study of a late stage in the development of grammatical gender toward its ultimate loss* (Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication 156). Bern: Peter Lang.
Stanley, Eric G. 1968. The date of Laȝamon's 'Brut'. *Notes and Queries* 213, 85–8.
Stanley, Eric G. 1969. Laȝamon's antiquarian sentiments. *Medium Ævum* 38, 23–37.
Toller, T. Northcote (ed.). 1921. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth; Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Appendix

1 Forms of the demonstrative 'that' in Old English

	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter	Plural
Nominative	se	sēo	þæt	þā
Genitive	þæs	þǣre	þæs	þāra, þǣra
Dative	þǣm, þām	þǣre	þǣm, þām	þǣm, þām
Accusative	þone	þā	þæt	þā
Instrumental	þon, þȳ		þon, þȳ	

See Campbell (1959: 290–1) for details.

2 Forms of *a*-nouns in Old English

	Masculine	Neuter
Singular		
Nominative	zero	zero
Genitive	-es	-es
Dative	-e	-e
Accusative	zero	zero
Plural		
Nominative	-as	-u, zero
Genitive	-a	-a
Dative	-um	-um
Accusative	-as	-u, zero

See Campbell (1959: 223–34) for details.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3 Adjectival endings in Old English

3.1 *The strong declension*

	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Singular			
Nominative	zero, -e, -u	zero, -u	zero, -e, -u
Genitive	-es	-re	-es
Dative	-um	-re	-um
Accusative	-ne	-e	zero, -e, -u
Instrumental	-e		-e
Plural			
Nominative	-e	-e, -a	zero, -u
Genitive	-ra	-ra	-ra
Dative	-um	-um	-um
Accusative	-e	-e, -a	zero, -u

See Campbell (1959: 262–71) for details.

3.2 *The weak declension*

	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Singular			
Nominative	-a	-e	-e
Genitive	-an	-an	-an
Dative	-an	-an	-an
Accusative	-an	-an	-e
Instrumental	-e		-e
Plural			
Nominative	-an	-an	-an
Genitive	-ra, -ena	-ra, -ena	-ra, -ena
Dative	-um	-um	-um
Accusative	-an	-an	-an

See Campbell (1959: 272) for details.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000094 Published online by Cambridge University Press