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INTRODUCTION

The objective of this study is a description and explanation of the mechanism of one particularly puzzling word order change: the dramatic decrease in the frequency of subject-verb inversion between Old English (OE) and Modern English and the narrowing of the range of verbs, subjects and preposed heads that occurred in inverted sentences.

The matter of the history of subject-verb inversion has been largely neglected in recent years despite a resurgence of interest in word order change. This neglect can certainly not be attributed to the existence of exhaustive studies on inversion. As recently as 1974 Haiman comments, after citing some facts about the historical development of inversion in English, "We will not attempt an explanation of these phenomena here, for two reasons, the first of which carries particular weight: no explanation is known" (p. 65). One reason for the neglect of inverted word order in the development of English is the longstanding preoccupation with the change SOV to SVO. Another reason is the paucity of traditional work in the area and the obscurity of the major comprehensive work that has been done. Dahlstedt (1901) is written
in a style that sometimes is virtually unintelligible to the modern reader and Jacobsson (1951) was published in Sweden. Other studies have been done (e.g., Reszkiewicz, 1966; Świeczkowski, 1962; Barrett, 1953; and MacLeish, 1969). However, they are relatively unknown among linguists, perhaps because they are either analyses of individual pieces of OE literature or are by East European linguists.

In any case, recent advances in our knowledge of Modern English inversion make it tempting to take a fresh look not only at OE inversion but also at the entire nine century span between OE and Early Modern English (roughly 850 A.D. to 1750 A.D).

English offers several advantages to the historical linguist. One advantage is the availability of historical syntactic data and another is the amount and quality of work that exists for the modern stage of the language. In the present study it was precisely this comparison of OE and Modern English that provided the deepest insights into the nature of the changes in question.

Chronological studies in general have gone out of vogue, with a few recent exceptions, as have historical studies that compare language across literary styles within one historical period. As a result, misconceptions about the rate of changes and the time of changes are not uncommon (cf., Świeczkowski, 1962). It is just such a detailed cross stylistic chronological study that has been lacking in the case of inversion in
English. This study is an attempt to fill that gap.

Among the questions to be answered are: exactly what was the change? how did the change occur? why did the change occur? It is an indication of how little is known about the history of verb-subject word order that not one of these questions has been answered satisfactorily.

In Chapter 1 I survey the literature on inversion in Modern English and attempt to set forth the main functions of inversion in Modern English. In Chapters 2, 3, and 4 I investigate the forms and functions of inversion in Old English, Transition English, and Early Middle English, respectively. In Chapter 5 I investigate inversion in Late Middle and Early Modern English and attempt to explain some changes in inversion that occurred between the Middle and Modern English periods.
In the first part of this chapter I list the types of inversion in Modern English and some restrictions on the occurrence of these inversions. In the second part I investigate the functions of inversion proposed in the literature and offer some suggestions of my own for explaining how inversion functions in Modern English.

Inversion is here defined as the sentential surface structure word order in which the verb of the sentence precedes the subject of the sentence. When the entire verb precedes the subject, the inversion is traditionally called "full inversion". Inverted order contrasts with non-inverted order, i.e., order in which the subject precedes the verb. Non-inverted order has been variously termed "straight," "normal," "basic," "neutral," or "unmarked".

In Modern English subject-verb order, as the unmarked order, occurs much more frequently and has a wider distribution than does verb-subject order. Subject-verb order is felt to be devoid of any special meaning inherent in the order itself. On the other hand, verb-subject order is less freely distributed; that is, there are many restrictions on when and with
what subjects and verbs it can occur. In addition, numerous special meanings have been attributed to verb-subject order.

In contrast to full inversion, "semi-inversion" is the inversion of the subject and the auxiliary or the inversion of the subject and the first of several auxiliaries:

(1) Only in Waukesha can one see the famous Silurian Springs.

(2) So much will he have accomplished that there will be nothing left for him to do.

Later I will discuss some restrictions on the occurrence of full inversions and semi-inversions.

Part 1: Types of Inversion in Modern English

In this section I list the types of inversion in Modern English. In addition, I will note whether the inversion can be full inversion only, semi-inversion only or both and whether the inversion is optional or obligatory.

A. INVERSION AFTER PREPOSED ADVERBS OF DIRECTION, TIME, PLACE, MANNER, AND SUCCESSION

Inversion types A-F most frequently occur with full inversion. Type A is one of the more common types of inversion encountered in narrative prose, and is used with both single word and phrasal adverbs.

Adverb of Direction

(3) Out popped a jack-in-the-box.

(4) Away trotted the dog.

(5) Up to a low hanging cloud flew the bird.
Adverb of Succession

(6) First came the tin man.
(7) Next began the dancing.

Manner Adverb

(8) Thus ended his story.
(9) In this way began the city that was to be Rome.
(10) With such effort arose a new city from the ashes of the old.

Time Adverb

(11) Now comes the time to make peace.
(12) Then began the building of a huge empire.
(13) At noon tolled the chimes.

Place Adverb

(14) Here lives the world's oldest man.
(15) Across the river lived seven dwarfs.
(16) Near the road was a huge redwood tree.

Semi-inversion is acceptable with the manner adverbs and the single word time and place adverbs:

(17) Thus did his story end.
(18) In this way did the city that was to be Rome begin.
(19) Now has the time come to make peace.
(20) Then did the building of a huge empire begin.
These semi-inverted Ss are formal and somewhat archaic. With

\(^1\)I will use a dagger to note those Ss which probably strike most speakers as being archaic. Some Ss seem more archaic than others; for example, to me (77) seems more archaic than (17-20). I use a double dagger for the more archaic Ss.

other adverbs in the list above semi-inversion is bad:

(21) *Out did/has a jack-in-the-box pop(ped).
(22) *First did the tin man come.
(23) *At noon did the chimes toll.
(24) *Across the river did the seven dwarfs live.

Passive verbs can occur with Type A inversions:

(25) In the concrete was written, "Sam was here --'79.'"
(26) At noon were blown all the whistles in town.

Transitive verbs occur in inverted Ss with adverb fronting only when the direct object is so much a part of the verb that it "amounts to a single verb" (Bolinger, 1977b, p. 100). Bolinger calls such a verb phrase a "semantically analytic intransitive" one.

(27) In that realm sway (=ruled) a hated despot.
(28) Hear here have taken place (=occurred) some of the most striking events in the state's history.

Notice that acceptable instances of semi-inversion occur after those adverbs which either are thematic (referring back to something in the previous S) or are frequently found in clause initial position (e.g., thus, then, here). Inversion after the fronting of these adverbs is optional. However, as we will see in Part 2, long and/or syntactically complex
subjects produce more awkward Ss in XSV order than shorter, less complex subjects. Hence:

(29) Thus his story ended. but

(30) ?? Soon after two Elizabethan songs written for three voices and lute accompaniment followed.

B. INVERSION AFTER THE PREPOSING OF A PREDICATE NOUN

(31) An essential aspect of our disease prevention plan is a nutritious diet.

(32) H A very generous person is (this) Mr. McDonald.

(33) Another very generous person is Mr. McDonald.

Semi-inversion is odd:

(34) *? An integral part of our plan has the creation of a new governance structure been.

Preposing with no inversion is also odd, but especially with long subjects:

(35) *An essential aspect of our plan a nutritious diet has been.

(36) ?? A very successful runner Bill has been (here at O.S.U.).

C. INVERSION AFTER THE PREPOSING OF A PREDICATE ADJECTIVE

(37) Highly visible are the particles of dirt that get caught in the cracks.

(38) Plainly detectible were the scars from his old football injury.

Haiman (1974) notes that the S:

(39) H Very old are the woods.

is archaic and concludes that "it is awkward to prepose
predicate adjectives under any circumstances" (p. 65). However, Bolinger (1977b) quite convincingly shows that the difference between acceptable and unacceptable cases of inversion after preposed adjectives has to do with prosodic, pragmatic and semantic features of the S, which will be discussed below. It is not true that all Ss with inversion after predicate adjective preposing are archaic.

Semi-inversion in these Ss is strange:

(40) *? Plainly detectible had the scars from his old football injury been.

XSV order is also strange:

(41) *? Plainly detectible the scars from his old football injury had been/were.

D. INVERSION AFTER FRONTED PARTICIPLES

(42) Lying in front of me was a cat.

(43) Stolen were all of the newlyweds' gifts.

Semi-inversion of these Ss is quite bad:

(44) *Lying in front of me had a cat been.

(45) * Stolen had all of the gifts been.

XSV order does not usually occur (but see (198), Part 2 for a somewhat acceptable example of XSV).

(46) *Lying in front of me a cat was.

(47) *Stolen all of the gifts had been.
E. INVERSION IN "THERE"-SENTENCES

(48) There are three robins at my window.
(49) There were seen several new ones.
(50) There were several new ones seen.
(51) *There made the shoemaker some shoes.

This inversion is obligatory.

F1. INVERSION IN DIRECT QUOTES

Hartvigson and Jakobsen (1974, p. 79ff), who studied the dialogue mechanism of three novels, note a tendency to straight order, especially with personal pronoun subjects (inverted order with pronominal subjects is rather archaic), complex verbs (V + Aux), phrasal verbs (e.g., "go on") and verbs with indirect or direct objects. According to H & J, inversion occurs mainly with the verbs say, ask, and answer. If the subject is post-modified, inversion is likely. Inversion is also likely when the verb is a simple form of be, as in (55).

(52) "I have a headache," she said ("said she" is archaic.)
(53) "Don't drink the water," Mother had said many times.
(54) "Beware of the devil," said the man in the overcoat.
(55) "I was hungry," was her reply.

F2. INVERSION WITH ONOMATOPOEIC WORDS

(56) "Bang" went the gun.

This type of inversion is very common.
This type of inversion is found often in the media and is common even with personal pronoun subjects (H & J, p. 83).

(57) Says lovely actress Mary Malone, "I always have a wonderful time in Columbus."

(58) Says she, "I always have a wonderful time there."

The remaining types of inversion occur only with semi-inversion in the modern language. Among the adverbs obligatorily "triggering" inversion are: only, scarcely, hardly, never, nothing, nor, neither, little, less, and the like.

(59) Never had I heard such a commotion.

(60) *Never heard I such a commotion (archaic).

(61) Little did I think that I would get this job.

We also get obligatory inversion following a negative direct object preposing, though not after a non-negative direct object:

(62) Not a soul did we see.

(63) *A soul did we see.

The inversions in groups H and I have been thrown into a "miscellaneous" category or in a category such as "other openers triggering inversion" (e.g. H & J, p. 36). The inversions in group H all involve complex Ss, one clause having SV order and the other clause having VS order. I will further discuss
these inversions in Part 2.

H1. INVERSION IN THE SUBORDINATE CLAUSE, ORDER: VS, SV OR SV, VS

a. So ("degree"):

(64) So sure of the sincerity of the Soviet Union are we, that we will readily sign Salt III.

(Inversion is optional but XSV order must stress the verb are.)

b. Such: (Inversion optional):

(65) With such sincerity have the Soviets conducted disarmament talks that we surely must agree to sign Salt III.

If the clauses are reversed in order, there still is inversion so long as a that clause would still be possible (H & J, p. 39)

(66) We will readily sign Salt III, so sure of the sincerity of the Soviet Union are we.

There is no inversion in so clauses when there is no that clause either in fact or in paraphrasis:

(67) "I had a boy once," Mrs. Ockham went on brokenly.

"So like you he was..." (H & J, ibid.)

In such clauses where there is no possibility of a that clause, inversion still may occur:

(68) Possessions, money, property—on such corrupt standards as these do you people measure happiness and success (H & J, p. 40).

H2. INVERSION IN MAIN CLAUSES (CORRELATIVE CLAUSES)

The order in these clauses is S-V, V-S and the clauses are not reversible. Inversion is optional.
a. the...the...

(69) The more I've thought about these Ss, the more confused have I become.

b. If/as...so:

(70) If it had been hard for Carter to bring together Begin and Sadat, so had it been hard for him to bring together Kennedy and Brown.

(71) Just as it had been hard for Carter to bring together Begin and Sadat, so had it been hard for him to bring together Kennedy and Brown.

I. INVERSION AFTER OTHER OPENERS

Inversion often occurs after such openers as: many, much, more, most, rather, particularly, especially, well, and numerals (H & J, p. 36ff). The inversion is optional.

(72)† Most of all did I need to consult a native speaker of Hindi to confirm my hypotheses.

(73)† Much rather would I be one of those forward kinds of people.

(74)† Well might I fear not getting this thing done.

(75)† Particularly do I fear not getting this thing done.

(76)† Three times have I seen a UFO.

I believe the Ss with these inversions are somewhat archaic. We can expand this group to include many other emphatic fronted adverbs. For example, Ss with fronted-LY manner adverbs belong in this group. Most of these Ss are definitely
Swiftly did the great beasts run across the plains.

J. INVERSION AFTER "SO," "NOR," "NEITHER," AND "NO MORE"

These openers are predicate pro-forms. It should be noted that if the subjects of the pro-form clause and the preceding clause are coreferential there is no inversion. Inversion occurs obligatorily if the subjects are not coreferential as in (79).

(78) She's terribly flighty, but so she was before leaving home.

(79) My teacher wasn't very happy with my overdue paper, and neither was I.

K. INVERSION IN COMPARATIVE "THAN" AND "AS" CLAUSES

Inversion is optional.

(80) John has more money than does Mary. I believe the inverted than and as clauses are somewhat more formal than the corresponding non-inverted Ss.

L. INVERSION IN APPENDED CLAUSES

These are colloquial inversions as opposed to the formal inversions discussed above.

(81) He lied alot, did that man.

(82) He's a very good guy, is Bob.

M. INFINITIVE INVERSION

This inversion is also colloquial and results in the order: infinitive-subject-aux.

(83) I said he would fail and fail he did.
SO-CALLED NON-TEXTUALLY PROVOKED INVERSION (H & J, p. 18 ff.)

This is the inversion of questions, wishes, imperatives, conditions, exclamations and concessions. Semi-inversion is the norm in Modern English, while full inversion is archaic except in wishes and certain relic uses, e.g.:

(84) Long live the king.
(85) Enter the king (stage direction).

Here I will summarize the data on inversion in Modern English. First, we must note the correlation between semi-inversion and the possibility of unstressed personal pronoun subjects. These pronoun subjects readily occur in all instances of semi-inversion. However, they do not occur in Modern English full inversions, hence the following unacceptable Ss:

(86) * Away trotted he.
(87) *Here lives he.
(88) *Then came he.  but:
(89) Now has he come.
(90) Here has he lived.

The inversion of a pronominal subject after predicate adjective and predicate noun fronting is archaic.

(90a)†† A very nice man was he.

It appears that, at least for some people, (86–88) improve slightly if the pronoun subjects are stressed, as in contrastive environments.

(91) Here lives he - the one and only octopus-eating O.S.U. student.
The acceptable personal pronoun subject inversions in direct quotes are also stressed.

(92) "I'll think about that," said she, while he paced around the room. (contrastive)

Demonstrative pronoun subjects, especially when stressed, also result in somewhat better SS than (86-88).

(93) First came that! I couldn't believe it!

The basic problem with (86-88) is that an unstressed pronoun occurs at the end of the clause (a relatively emphatic position) and furthermore, this unstressed subject is in a highly marked (and hence emphatic) position for a subject, namely, after the verb. Hence, there is an incongruity between the low stress of the personal pronoun subject and the high stress of the clause position it occupies. Thus, heavy stress on these final subjects improves matters. The constraint against putting unstressed personal pronoun subjects in clause final position is probably the same one that bars unshifted particle + pronoun object (*I picked up her) and shifted indirect object + pronoun object (*I showed Sammy her). These Ss, too, are better if the object pronouns are stressed.²

²I am indebted to Arnold Zwicky for pointing out to me these instances of this constraint.

Notice that the same constraint does not apply to semi-inversion pronoun subjects because the unstressed pronoun does not occur in clause final position. Clause medial position,
which semi-inverted subjects occupy, is a relatively low stress position.

Second, we can observe that the large number of archaic Ss having inversion is a clue that inversion is more restricted or at least differently restricted than it was in slightly earlier stages of the language. In subsequent chapters we will investigate just what this difference is.

Third, it should be noted that the inversion types divide themselves rather easily into two groups: types with unmarked semi-inversion and types with unmarked full inversion.

**UNMARKED SEMI-INVERSION**

Neg. Preposing

WH Preposing

Complex Ss with so, such

Ss with "other adverbial openers"

Comparative than clauses

Appended clauses

Non-textually provoked inversion

Inversion after pro-forms: so, nor, neither, etc.

**UNMARKED FULL INVERSION**

Single word and phrasal preposing

Preposed Predicate Nouns

Preposed Predicate Adjectives

Preposed Participles

There Ss

Comparative Adverb Preposing

Direct Quotes
Journalistic Style

Fourth, we should note the restrictions on the occurrence of a negative in full inversion Ss. Negative full inversion Ss are severely restricted, but negative verbs are allowed in Ss with contrastive stress and in \textit{there}-clauses.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(94)] Into the house didn't come one but two gigantic grizzlies.
  \item[(95)] Into the house didn't march any gigantic grizzly. \hfill (sarcastic or a correction of the preceding S)
  \item[(96)] There is no one at home.
  \item[(97)] There isn't anyone at home.
\end{enumerate}

Finally, let us note that in the literature semi-inversion and full inversion are treated as two aspects of one phenomenon. But we should ask: What, if any, is the relation between these two types of inversion? What, if any, has been the historical relation between these two types? These questions will be investigated in subsequent chapters.

Part 2: FUNCTIONS OF MODERN ENGLISH INVERSION

In this section I will discuss some functions of inversion in Modern English that have been proposed in the literature. I will point out what I believe to be the most plausible functions of inversions. The discussion will focus on the use of inversion in narrative prose.

The following questions are central to the study of the occurrence and functions of inversion:
1. What is the nature of the fronted constituent? thematic? rhematic? emphatic?

2. What is the nature of the subject? thematic/ rhematic? simple/complex?

3. What is the relation between fronting with inversion and fronting without inversion?

4. What is the relation between full and semi-inversion?

5. What is the nature of the verb? transitive? emergence on the scene?

In order to answer these questions we need to consider four factors that have long been considered crucial to the occurrence and function of inversion: rhythm, thematicity, emphasis, and connection. In addition, we need to consider some more recent analyses of inversion that center on the discourse environment of inversion. These factors I will discuss in this section. For each I give first some historical information on how traditional grammarians analyzed inversion. Then I give more recent analyses and finally I discuss the value of the analyses for explaining inversion.

**Rhythmic Explanations of Inversion**

First, let us consider one of the earliest and most common explanations for the occurrence of inversion, namely, rhythm (prosody). As a basic organizing principle of language rhythm has often been regarded as the ultimate "cause" of word order, a cause of a higher nature. That is, other "causes" of inversion could not produce Ss that violated a language's rhythmic principles.
Rhythm refers to the metrical value of the syllables of words and phrases in a S. The prosodic value of syllables is sometimes described as "light" (unstressed and/or short) and "heavy" (stressed and/or long). In the literature on English this same distinction is often applied to words and even phrases and clauses.

Among traditional grammarians rhythm is a popular explanation for a variety of syntactic phenomena, including inversion. Rhythm is closely related to and often confused with two other factors in inversion, namely, emphasis and balance (so-called "functional weight"). In this section I will look at only those explanations that are specifically termed "rhythmic".

Jespersen (1961), Curme (1931), Wood (1956), Potter (1961) and Jacobsson (1951) all offer brief discussions of rhythm. Jespersen (Vol. II, p. 57) notes that "Lighter elements can be placed near the centre (of the S) while heavier elements are relegated to more peripheral places." Curme and Wood apply this notion to inversion in direct quotes: the "heavier word," whether verb or subject, comes last.

(98) "Harry," continued the old man ...

(99) "You must think that over again," our dear mother would say. (Curme, 1931, p. 348).

Curme also invokes rhythm in his discussion of Ss like:

(100) Seven times did this intrepid general repeat his attack.
He says that the "light auxiliary has become attached to the emphatic fronted constituent....Originally accent was the controlling force, and still is felt here, but the controlling force now is the association of inversion with negatives, interrogatives, and restrictions" (p. 347).

Jacobsson cites the Ss:

(102) So am I.

(103) So I am.

as an example of the interplay between "rhythm and syntactic function" --- i.e. (102) is used when the subject contrasts and (103) occurs when the subject does not change.

Discussions of rhythm are not confined to the early grammarians of Modern English. H & J's (1974) "formal weight" is synonymous with rhythm. They define formal weight thus: "The more complex an element is, the heavier it is. Thus a subject which is modified by a relative clause is heavier than a subject which is not; a complex verbal is heavier than a simple verbal..." (p. 50). For example, the fronting with obligatory inversion of the following S is said to be due to the heaviness of its subject:

(104) Among the subjects gamed at Byfleet have been the capability of British forces east of the Suez and the duration of the resistance that allied forces could offer to a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. (p. 56).
H & J also attribute other inversions to formal weight. "If the subject is a weakly stressed personal pronoun we always get straight order; if BE is complex we normally get straight order."

(105) Pretty she was not exactly but...

(106) She told Marian that she might stay inside or come outside, but locked the door must be until the morning.

(107) ...For destroyed all his hopes were. (p. 56).

H & J believe that introductory there Ss maintain a S's distribution of formal weight by placing at the end "complex subjects teamed with weak verbs."

(108) There followed two Elizabethan songs full of grieving intervals and grave sporadic cadences. (pp. 69-70)

Bolinger (1972), in discussing certain Ss with preposed adjectives, observes that "It (is sometimes) necessary to inflate the complement with extra modification (which) for the most part increases the semantic force, but not always." (p 109).

(109) Fairly clear is the argument that refunds will have to be made.

(110) ? Clear is the argument that refunds will have to be made.

(111) Rich and deep were the tones of her voice.

(112) ? Rich were the tones of her voice.
Bolinger notes that the first and second Ss of both pairs differ not in impact (i.e. "the visible effect of the action") but in prosody. Compare these pairs of Ss to a pair that differs in impact as well as prosody.

(113) Thoroughly mangled were most of the first class passengers.
(114) Shaken up were most of the first class passengers.

**Evaluation of Rhythm as a Factor in Inversion**

At least among the earlier grammarians rhythm too often was a "catch-all" explanation for syntactic alternations. What was not readily explainable by other means was attributed to prosodic considerations. In fact, I believe that most of the inversions discussed above can be explained in more concrete terms than rhythm. Ss (104) and (108) I will discuss later in connection with thematic fronting and the presentative construction. Further, complex be and personal pronoun subjects (105-106) are ill-suited for presentative constructions with adjective fronting and straight order is expected in these Ss on these grounds, not on factors of rhythm. Finally, the contrast of the straight order of anaphoric repetitions (103 with no subject shift) and the order of (102) with subject shift is related to thematicity as well as to differences in stress. In short, it is important to attribute inversion to the need to maintain S rhythm only when evidence exists for such a conclusion. Ruling out semantic alternations corresponding to word order alternations and ruling out
the factor of semantic weight (balance) are difficult tasks. Not to do this, however, is to make rhythm devoid of interest as a factor in inversion.

However, I certainly do not want to rule out rhythmic considerations completely, for languages do have a rhythmic organization. Jespersen's notions about heavier elements occurring in peripheral places in the S, especially in last place, is corroborated by the tendency in English to put at the end heavy (long, syntactically complex) subjects as well as stressed subjects which have weakly stressed verbs, such as in (104). Semantic balance considerations are most certainly also involved here, however. Indeed, formal weight and functional weight are often difficult to distinguish.

Bolinger's arguments for prosodic influence are also compelling. We may well be seeing such influence at work in comparative inversions such as the following:

(115) Nearer and nearer came the bear. but:
(116) ?Nearer came the bear.

and in the following contrasting Ss:

(117) If there stood before us now either Solomon or Socrates, I doubt that we could draw the answer to this problem.

(118) *If there stood before us now Solomon, I doubt...

(Bolinger, 1977b, p. 118)

Heavy NP Shift (the rule putting a heavy object, one that is long and syntactically complex, at the end of a S) is, I believe, another example of prosodic factors at work, though
this rule does not involve inversion.

(119) They attributed to vandalism the garbage that was strewn all over the lawns in the northern sections of the city.

I believe the main conclusions to be drawn about rhythm and its relationship to inversion are these: English has a strong tendency to place rhythmically heavy (stressed and/or long and/or syntactically complex) constituents at the end of the clause rather than in medial position. Clause-initial position is another position that is commonly occupied by stressed constituents. Between these two stressed positions is a relatively unstressed position -- medial position. Hence, the rhythmic organization that we find in many of the above Ss is an alternating stress pattern: /v/ This is precisely what we find, for example in (102) and (103). In both Ss, the final constituent is stressed. In (102) stress is on I; in (103) the stress is on am. Likewise, note the final stressed verb in (106) and (107).

Inversion, by moving the subject out of its unmarked position in the clause, produces stress on the subject. However, full inversion Ss and semi-inversion Ss move the subject to different positions in the clause and have different rhythmic organizations. Full inversion clauses have the organization /uM/, where the subject is heavily stressed in emphatic end position (cf., (3) - (16)). Semi-inversion clauses put only part of the verb before the subject and the subject ends up medially. Their rhythmic organization is
with greater stress on the preposed constituent especially and on the infinitive verb than on the aux. or subject, (but greater stress on the subject than on the auxiliary).

We will see in Chapter 2 that there has been at least one major change in the rhythmic organization of English. OE could stress the beginning of a clause without stressing the end of a clause; for example, "There many thousands of people were" //v. To the modern ear, such a S sounds rhythmically unbalanced, as were does not normally receive sufficient stress in the above S to counterbalance the preposed constituent (PC) and the subject. Notice that (30) sounds somewhat odd for the same reason, though follow seems capable of bearing more stress than were.

Within this framework of Modern English rhythmic organization, we can probably rule out a rhythmic factor also for (100) and (101). These Ss with fronted emphatic adverbs and semi-inversion are now archaic, remnants of an earlier stage of English in which semi-inversion after fronted adverbs was much more common than it is today. When uninverted after adverb preposing the rhythm of these Ss is: Bitterly we repented our decision ( //uu). When inverted the rhythm is //uuu. In other words, in Modern English the inverted and the uninverted clauses are rhythmically similar in regard to the location of the primary and the secondary stress. Given the fact that these inversions once were common, we can conclude that either the rhythm of such Ss has changed, such that
once inversion was necessary to maintain the rhythm, but now is not, or a factor other than rhythm formerly caused these inversions.

Finally we should note briefly the relation between length of a constituent and rhythm. The traditional view of rhythm regarded long (multi-word) constituents as heavy, in the same category as stressed constituents. Conversely, short and unstressed constituents were grouped together as "light" for rhythmic purposes. I merely point out here that the two groups are not absolutely divided. Generally, the longer the constituent the more important it is and hence the more stress it has. For example, consider (115) and (116). The PC is longer in (115) than the PC of (116). Moreover, I believe the PC in (115) is also more stressed than in (116). Likewise, the subject of (117) is more stressed than the subject of (118). However, short constituents (one word) can also be heavily stressed (e.g., in So do I), given the right context, making up in stress for what they lack in length. Thus, length and stress are interrelated yet distinct factors that are relevant to rhythm.

The Nature of the Subject and Preposed Constituent: Thematicity

In the preceding section we touched upon some aspects of the subject that bear upon inversion. We saw that full inversions have more heavily stressed subjects than semi-inversions do. Further, we saw that relative stress of the subject and verb determines inversion in some cases. In this section I
will further discuss the nature of the subject of inverted clauses by discussing thematicity.

Since thematicity is an important notion in this and subsequent chapters, a few words about it are appropriate here. Further discussion will be found in the section on Functional S Perspective.

Thematicity refers to the old/new (known/unknown) information content of constituents of a clause and is best regarded as a non-dichotomous and relative property of words and phrases. In prose, thematic nouns generally have been previously introduced into the discourse and in any case are known (identified) to the reader/hearer whether through shared knowledge or through the linguistic context. Thematicity is to be distinguished from topicality: a topic is what the discourse is about. Thematic nouns are not necessarily topics and topics need not be thematic nouns (See also the discussion of topics on p.47). Athematic nouns can in some environments be clearly understood as topics, e.g. in performative topic introduction Ss of the type: "Next regarding Carter..." in which an athematic noun is both introduced and established as the topic in one S. In addition, full inversions generally introduce the subject as the topic regardless of the subject's thematicity, as we will see. Mostly I am concerned in this study with thematicity --- while topicality often enters into discussion as a special case of thematicity, i.e. some thematic nouns are also topics.
However, during the course of the discussion certain specific instances of topics will be noted; especially topic introduction and topic switch, which will be defined below.

To differentiate the concepts of thematicity and topicality, I give here one example of a thematic noun that is not a topic (at least not the primary one) and one example of a thematic noun that becomes the topic.

**THEMATIC NOUN—NOT A TOPIC**

(119a) The largest and heaviest of the elephants surveyed his surroundings. He saw a bridge up the street and proceeded to lead the rest of the herd over it and then bellowed triumphantly as the trainers frantically ran after him.

The topic here is the **LARGEST ELEPHANT**. A THEMATIC noun, but not the primary topic is **bridge** (=it). However, one could call nouns like **bridge** secondary topics or potential primary topics (c.f. also the discussion in Kantor, 1976). I will mostly use **topic** to refer to primary topics.

**THEMATIC NOUN—TOPIC**

(119b) The Pope was considered the primary world leader. Even the kings deferred to him and in return the Pope bestowed his blessings upon the king and all the people of the country.

The topic here is the **POPE**, a thematic noun which is known to the reader either through the context or the cotext.
It should also be noted that the topic need not be expressed as a single noun or noun phrase. A topic can also be expressed as a SI: For example, in a paragraph which lists ways in which the leader of the herd of elephants harassed the trainer the topic could be expressed as: how the leader elephant harassed his trainer. Thus, sometimes the noun that I term topic is really only part of the full expression of what the discourse is about.

Thematicity is not a property unique to subjects or objects. In regard to inversion we need to speak of the thematicity of PC's: adverbs and adverbial phrases, preposed adjectives and nouns. There are many adverbs that refer to something known in the linguistic or extralinguistic context. Thus, such adverbs as: after that, in the garden, with him are thematic by virtue of a linguistic context that has already introduced the referent of that, a garden, and him. Adverbs like now and here are thematic either by virtue of the linguistic or the extralinguistic context. Adverbs like so, such, therefore, thus, may also be regarded as thematic. Rather than making reference to a known place or time, these adverbs refer to more general information from the linguistic environment: they refer to the verbs, adverbs and/or the content of entire clauses or even sequences of clauses. This too is a kind of thematicity.

Traditional grammarians treated the subject of inversion largely through the notion of functional weight. Functional weight (or "notional weight" or "balance") has been widely
used to explain the function of inversion in Modern English. Balance is the older term, which traditional grammarians used in contrast to (and often in confusion with) rhythm.

Functional weight has several sources. Early grammarians seem to refer most often to the semantic content of constituents and to their emphasis. Emphasis and semantic content usually are correlated: constituents of greater semantic content have relatively more stress while low content constituents have less stress. However, contrastive or otherwise unusual stress can cause low semantic content constituents to have relatively greater functional weight. Traditional grammarians also implicitly referred to thematicity in gauging functional weight: thematic constituents have relatively less stress and relatively lower semantic content than do rhematic constituents. Again, of course, contrastive or other special circumstances can alter this relationship. It should be noted that length and complexity of constituents also enters into the notion "functional weight." Constituents having greater semantic content (i.e., constituents that say more) are often longer and syntactically more complex (heavy) than constituents that contribute relatively little semantic content to the clause. Further, thematic constituents tend to be shorter and less complex (lighter) since they are already known and require less identification (relative clauses, adjectives, etc.). Thus, the boy who sawed off the board holding up the roof can become, when thematic, he.
In spite of the multiple sources of functional weight, I believe we can separate out the notions of semantic content and thematicity as basic when talking about subjects, PC's that are prepositional phrases, and nouns in general. Emphasis, length and syntactic complexity usually depend on the value of these two factors. Also in regard to subjects, semantic content is generally a subordinate factor to thematicity, since thematic nouns lose semantic content relative to rhematic nouns. On the other hand, in regard to verbs, inherent semantic content is a relatively more important factor than thematicity in determining semantic weight.

In the view of traditional grammarians, a balanced S, just as a rhythmic S, places the heavier (semantically more complex) elements either in the beginning or at the end of the S. Lighter (semantically less complex) elements tend to be centrally located. Poutsma (1928), for example, says that inversion depends upon which S element is heavier --- the subject or the predicate. After a preposed element, whichever is heavier goes last, as in the S:

(120) In my father's house are many mansions. in which the subject is deemed "heavier" than the predicate (p. 398). Curme (1931) and Wood (1956) note that heavy subjects are almost invariably S-final:

(121) Up went this roaring dragonfly in which Peter was sitting (Curme, p. 350).

(122) What has been the result of all our efforts to help him? (Wood, p. 25)
In contrast to the traditional term "balance," the term "functional weight" has been more rigorously defined as part of the theory of functional sentence perspective (FSP). The FSP approach to syntax goes back to the work of Mathesius, though in the West such Prague School linguists as Firbas and Danes are best known for their work in this area. FSP is based on the notion of communicative dynamism (CD). The theory of FSP assumes that "it is in accordance both with the character of human thought and with the linear character of the S that S elements follow each other according to the amount (degree) of CD that they convey, starting with the lowest CD and proceeding to the highest" (Firbas, 1966, p. 240). A low degree of CD is carried by elements which are inferrable from the verbal or non-verbal context. These elements are the theme of the S. The elements carrying the highest degree of CD, those that "push the communication forward," i.e. that provide new information, are the rheme of the S. The higher the degree of CD an element has, the heavier it is. There is also a transition which ranks between the theme and the rheme in regard to its degree of CD.

The unmarked order or "basic distribution" of the S elements is: theme-transition-rheme. The dog bit the stranger. As FSP was originally stated, deviations from the basic distribution of CD are a language's mechanism for expressing emotion. Emotive Ss might, for example, have the CD order rheme-transition-theme: A new truck was called to the scene of the fire — or the order: rheme-theme-transition: Lobster my dog.
loves.

In spite of the relative rigidity of SVO order in Modern English, Firbas (1966) believes that English still is susceptible to FSP in the majority of its Ss, i.e., that an unambiguous interpretation of what is the theme and what is the rheme can still be made. However, word order is not the only means of marking themes and rhemes: intonation, articles, the semantic character of verbs (e.g., appearance on the scene verbs), and quantifiers all play a part in conveying the theme/rheme distinction. For example, in the following S the indefinite article is the clue that the subject is rhematic, while the definite article is the clue that the adverb is thematic:

(123) A girl came into the room.

The FSP claims that inversion, as a deviation from normal order, produces either: 1. a S in conformity with the basic CD (theme-rheme) order or 2. an emotive S deviating from the basic CD order. Thus, Ss of the type:

(124) Across the room stood a distinguished young man.
(125) In the passageway was standing the girl.

preserve FSP by placing the thematic prepositional phrase before the rhematic man, girl. On the other hand, Ss of the type:

(126) Out flew the cuckoo.
(127) Up jumped the dog.

deviate from normal order by placing thematic subjects in S-final position. This deviation results in emotive, here
emphatic or exclamatory Ss.\(^3\)

\(^3\)I will return later to a discussion of Ss of the type (126)- (127). In particular, I will suggest that such Ss may not deviate from the theme-rheme order, although their deviation is almost universally assumed in the literature. (Bolinger is the exception)

Recently, linguists outside the Prague School (H & J, 1974; Breivik, 1978) have applied the FSP to inversion, and in so doing have defined a category of functional weight inversions in English. H & J, for example, have investigated the inversion type:

(128) On the sideboard was some whiskey. They observe that "...fronted non-subjects (as in (128)) followed by weight inversion are normally thematic...." (p. 51). The fronted elements can be known either from their "cotext (linguistic or verbal context)" or from the context (situational context). H&J include the following types of inverted Ss in the category of "weight inversion after thematic fronting": Preposed Predicate Nouns, Preposed Predicate Adjectives, Preposed Participles and Preposed Adverbs of Place and Time. That is, in each of these inversion types, the preposed element is thematic and the inverted subject is rhematic (unknown, new).

H & J also apply the notion of FSP to There-Ss, as in:

(129) There is whiskey on the sideboard. They claim that the so-called "weak" there is used to maintain the distribution of CD when there is no thematic adverbial. In this case, either a fronted (non-thematic) adverb or a
fronted (nonthematic) subject would produce a marked S. The use of *there* in S-initial position maintains S balance by placing rhematic subjects at the end of the S.

It is hardly necessary to point out the explanatory value of FSP over previous imprecise and confusing explanations of inversion. One of the obvious improvements is in the often noted alternation of Pronominal Subject + Verb order alternating with the order Verb + Nominal subject. Instead of attributing this alternation to a vague concept of balance, or to rhythm, it can be attributed to the theme-rheme distinction. Personal pronouns, being thematic and therefore less stressed, occur before the predicate, which is rhematic and therefore more stressed. Nominal subjects, however, can be thematic or rhematic, and hence occur either before or after the verb.

In later sections I will discuss two other approaches to inversion which utilize the theme/rheme distinction: the presentative construction approach and the discourse analysis approach. First, however, let us turn to inversions that are not explainable in terms of thematicity. That is, we must answer the question: what is the function of inversions with athematic heads and/or thematic subjects --- inversions that are the exact opposite of ones we have been discussing. To answer this question, we must turn to the role of emphasis.

**Emphasis Inversions**

In the past emphasis has been a frequently cited "cause" of inversion. It has been widely claimed that inversion
stressed either the subject or the PC. Among the traditional grammarians, Jespersen (1961) and Poutsma (1928) believed that S-final position in general is emphatic. Sweet (1891) believed any abnormal word order is emphatic. Others believed emphasis was the function of inversion in only a few specific S types, for example:

(130) Now comes my best trick.

where Curme (1931) says the subject receives the heaviest stress (p. 349).

Wood (1956) believes that postposition of the subject is emphatic in Ss such as:

(131) Down came the rain.

but in interrogatives he finds midposition of the subject more emphatic or prominent than postposition. He notes (p. 25) that "The importance of a postposed subject is diminished and the interrogative becomes the center of interest" in, for example:

(132) What has the usual practice been? (someone wants to follow the usual practice)

as opposed to:

(133) What has been the usual practice? (an inquiry out of curiosity).

Wood reverses his position again when he explains that SV order tends to be used in direct quotes with expected subjects because postposition of subjects is more emphatic (p. 79).

It is quite clear from the literature that emphasis, like rhythm, has been something of a garbage category which included
a great many hard-to-explain inversions.

However, there is no doubt that inversion has to do with emphasis. I am not convinced that the contrast observed by Wood in (132) - (133) is one shared by many other speakers of English. However, for those speakers for whom the contrast exists the basis of the contrast is surely correlated with the stress difference between final and medial clause position. Final clause position has greater stress and hence is the position for the subject usual practice when it is a new (athematic) subject. In contrast (132) puts the expected (thematic) and less stressed subject in medial position.

In addition, the observed tendency for the place of the subject in direct quotes also would seem to follow the theme-rheme/ less stress-more stress order. Kermon (1979) shows how the alternation: X said/said X in children’s literature is correlated with, among other things, the expectedness or relative stress of the subject and verb. Thus, said Bill, which places the subject in stressed final position, is likely to occur when the speaker is unexpected or unpredictable. The order Bill said is likely to occur when the speaker is predictable or the predicate carries relatively more weight than the subject, e.g., "You better watch out!", Bill mumbled through his teeth.

The traditional notion of the prominence of S-final position is, I believe, indisputable. English, after all, in unmarked order places primary stress on S-final constituents
which are rhematic and the ability to remember the final item in a list is a well-known fact of verbal learning research. However, Sweet's belief that abnormal (including inverted) Ss are generally emphatic is not easily defended. As we will see later, there are places in a discourse where speakers/ readers of English expect that presentative or inverted Ss may well occur. I do not believe we could say that the inverted S in environments where it is expected is emphatic or abnormal.

We now turn to some recent analyses of inversion that relate inversion to emphasis of either the PC or the subject.

Langacker (1974) offers "a functional explanation for the existence and for the special properties of movement rules in natural languages." Langacker's hypothesis is that raising, lowering and fronting rules all "serve the function of increasing the prominence of objective content in surface structure." Of special interest to us is his discussion of fronting rules, since fronting is involved in most types of inversion. Langacker believes that all fronting rules except WH-Movement are topicalization rules, which render the fronted elements greater relative prominence. For example, Y-Movement, as in:

(134) Lobster my cat will eat.

and Adverb Fronting, as in:

(135) Tomorrow I think he said it was possible he would have to paint the fence.

However, Kantor (1976, p. 181) points out, correctly in my opinion, that not all fronting seems to give prominence to the
objective content. For example, in the S:

(136) With them came many difficulties.

it seems that many difficulties is much more prominent than with them. Notice that the PC with them is thematic as well as unemphatic.

Hooper and Thompson (1973) also attribute movement rules to emphasis. They have investigated the applicability of root transformations in subordinate clauses. Some of these root transformations involve inversion, and all root transformations involve the moving, inserting, or copying of constituents "immediately dominated by a root in the derived structure" (Emonds, 1967, p. 7). For example:

Negative Constituent Preposing:

(137) I have never had to borrow money.
(138) Never have I had to borrow money.

VP Preposing:

(139) Mary plans for John to marry her, and marry her he will.
(140) Mary plans for John to marry her, and he will marry her.

Directional Adverb Preposing:

(141) Up the street trotted the dog.

Preposing Around HE:

(142) More significant would be the development of a semantic theory.
Participle Preposing:

(143) Standing next to me was the president of the company.

Prepositional Phrase Substitution:

(144) On the wall hangs a portrait of Mao.

Subject Replacement:

(145) That Henry forgot the key irritated Carmen.

(146) It irritated Carmen that Henry forgot the key.

and Subject-Auxiliary Inversion (pp. 468-469).

There are other Root Transformations, too; however, they do not involve inversion. It is noted that Sub-Aux. inversion is different from the other RT's in that it is obligatory for questions (and meaningful in the sense of serving to distinguish questions from statements). With Neg. Preposing it is also obligatory; other RT's are optional.

Hooper and Thompson discuss some "effects" of the transformations. VP Preposing, Neg. Preposing and Dir. Adv. Preposing are said to result in a "more emphatic S" (p. 469). Part. Preposing and PP Substitution are said to have the effect of giving the subject "added emphasis or importance by its relative position at the end of the S" (p. 470). Subject replacement also, they say, seems to put emphasis on the S-final element. Other RT's, e.g., topicalization, emphasize constituents by moving them to S-initial position.

In sum, RT's are said to have the function of emphasizing certain constituents. Their occurrence is limited to assertions because, H & T claim, in order to emphasize something
one must assert it. H&T are correct, I believe, in grouping together VP Preposing and Neg. Preposing as opposed to Preposing Around BE, Part. Preposing, and PP Substitution. I prefer to say that the latter group is composed of Ss with thematic fronting. These PC's do not receive the primary stress of the clause; rather, primary stress falls on the subject, the rheme (On the wall hangs a portrait of Mao). Ss with thematic fronting, as Kantor points out, are not necessarily perceived as emphatic Ss. However, Neg. and VP Preposing are indeed emphatic Ss; for example, they might be punctuated by an exclamation mark. The vast majority of Neg. inverted Ss in this group have primary stress on the PC.

(147) Never have I had to borrow money.

(148) Only once did I see a purple cow.

VP-Preposing places primary stress on the final verb: marry her he will. As we will see, the contrast thematic fronting/emphatic fronting is extremely important in distinguishing the two basic types of Modern English inversion.

We turn now to a more detailed examination of Ss with thematic fronting, such as those discussed by Kantor. In particular, we will look at a semantically based approach and at a discourse analysis approach to thematically fronted inversions.

Presentative Analysis of Inversion

One of the first to apply the term presentative to inversion in English was Bolinger (1977). Bolinger analyzed several types of inverted Ss:
(149a) There is a fish in my closet.
(149b) In front of the carriage rode two men.
(149c) In front of the carriage there rode two men.
(149d) There rode two men in front of the carriage.
(149e) Approaching was a weird procession.
(149f) In the afternoon were shown to us several interesting specimens.

Bolinger argues that all of these Ss are examples of the presentative construction, i.e., the grammatical means of presenting things "on stage," or into the reader's/hearer's awareness. In (149a) -(149d) this construction is characterized by the occurrence of a thematic locative or there or both preceding the verb. Ss without there bring something on "the immediate stage (bring something literally or figuratively before our presence)" (p. 94). Ss with there present "something to our mind (bring a piece of knowledge into consciousness)." The more visible, vivid or "stagey" something is, the less likely is there to occur. Hence, when pointing to a store across the street from where one is standing, one is likely to say, "Across the street is a store". If one cannot see the store, one is likely to say,"On the corner of 5th and High there's a store". Likewise, when an action is very visible, one is not likely to use there:

(150) Out jumped a white-faced clown.
(151) *Out there jumped a white-faced clown.

Bolinger thus has discovered semantic and functional differences for alternations that previously were unexplained.
Instead of locative expressions (149e) has a participle. Bolinger (1977b) argues that presentatives with participle or adjective fronting are acceptable only when the participle or adjective sets something before our eyes. Thus, the verb 

exhume in Exhumed were seven corpses, describes an action the result of which is something (a corpse) that is visible. On the other hand embalm is a verb that contains no sense of the emergence of anything. There is no sense of locativeness, something emerging at/on/in a particular place in space or time. In short, there is nothing being presented. Hence the distinction:

(152) Exhumed were a dozen corpses.
(153) ? Embalmed were a dozen corpses.
?There were embalmed a dozen corpses.

Bolinger claims (p. 108) that the degree of impact of an action—the visibility of an action's effect—also has a bearing on the occurrence of the presentative; highly visible effects of actions are acceptable in presentatives:

(154) Ruined are the ideals we stood for.
(155) ? Weakened are the ideals we stood for.
Likewise, high impact adjectives are more acceptable than low impact adjectives in presentatives.

(156) Very obvious is the effect of tonight's voting.
(157) ? Essentially uninteresting is the effect of tonight's voting.

Bolinger notes that "in presentatives without there, the stage
is a link to what has gone before; it is in a sense topicalized" (p. 110). Journalistic style often uses such there-less Ss:

(158) Blamed for the failures was Turner's chief assistant R. Dunaway.

(159) ?Blamed for his failures was Turner's chief assistant R. Dunaway. (ibid.)

Here the ties the S in with the context; the failures were presumably already discussed.

While one may not always agree with Bolinger's judgments on the grammaticality of specific Ss, there is no doubt that the presentative approach provides explanations for the restrictions on there and there-less Ss that as yet no other approach can offer. Relating such a large and diverse assortment of Ss to the concept of locativeness may lead to some strains in the line of argument. Nevertheless, in general I find the arguments for the related requirements of locativeness and visual impact compelling.

However, I would suggest that the notions of visual impact and of the locativeness of verbs have their basis in stress and ultimately in pragmatics. For instance, one is not likely to stress (and hence invert) the subject of the S: Embalmed were a dozen corpses simply because generally one would not speak of embalming corpses unless those corpses were already known to exist. And if they are known to exist (are thematic) then, as we will see shortly, one would not usually want to invert them.
Furthermore, *embalm* is not inherently an emphatic word that would tend to receive the stress. Neither is *weaken* an emphatic word, as in: (155) ? *Weakened are the ideals we stood for*. Because preposed adjectives are marked and stressed, we are forced to stress an unemphatic word. Hence, (155) is odd. Thus, I suggest that some of the semantic limitations on verbs and adjectives in inverted Ss that are observed by Bolinger follow simply from the topic introduction function of inversion (see next section) and from the conflict between the relatively high stress that results from moving constituents out of unmarked order and the inherent stress (semantically based stress) of an adjective or participle.

It should be noted that there is some recent evidence that presentative constructions are near universal. Atkinson (1973) found that the two forms of inversion in French:

(160) Verb + Noun: Vint un Homme.
(161) Il + Verb: Il vint un homme.

have much the same functional distinction as just described for English *there*-less and *there* Ss, respectively. That is, (160) is used for "Staged activity" while (161) is used for unstaged activity.

Hetzron (1975) claims there is a universal tendency in languages "to put into final position elements what the speaker wants to keep available for further reference." By placing important S elements in final position, the presentative is used to urge the hearer/reader to remember the element in question" (p. 348).
Clark (1970) examined the equivalents of the Ss:

(162a) The book is on the table.

(162b) There is a book on the table.

in over thirty languages, and found different syntactic structures for locatives and existentials (presentatives) in the majority of the languages.

Inversion For Topic Shift

Still another function of inversion, topic shift, has been observed through a discourse analysis of English narrative prose. This function is closely related to the presentative; yet, the terms in which it is stated are quite different.

Kantor (1976) has proposed that inversion in Ss with thematic adverbial fronting can be explained in terms of the notion "discourse topic", i.e. "what is being talked about in a discourse". Kantor's characterization of the structure of a discourse is as follows: "We may speak of an element as being a topic if it is discussed in two or more adjacent or near-adjacent Ss in a discourse... The potential introduction of a topic... (is)... the first mention of a NP referring to that topic. If the NP is followed by other mentions of it in following discourse, then it becomes an established topic. Elements will not become topics simply by being anaphoric" (ibid.).

In this framework preposing plays a role as a means of getting old topics out of the way by placing them in thematic position. Such preposing "deemphasizes the importance" of the old topic and the subsequent inversion introduces the new potential topic in rhematic position. For example:
(163) After them came a whole new group of immigrants.

Kantor notes (p. 181) that "inversion is not a necessary property of topic shift Ss", since preposed, but non-inverted Ss can also shift a topic.

(164) After them, a whole new group of immigrants came.

Kantor's approach is innovative and his conclusions intuitively correct. In subsequent discussion, the term topic shift inversion will continue to be used to denote inversions having subjects which become the new discourse topic. But additional terms will be needed, especially for earlier stages of English---in particular (potential) topic introduction inversion and topic switch inversion. A topic introduction inversion has a subject which is a potential topic, but which does not subsequently become the new topic. A topic switch inversion has a subject which was a topic in the discourse but which has been interrupted by another topic. These inversions will be discussed in Chapter 2.

While inversion is optional for topic shift as it is viewed here, nonetheless, the inverted Ss place new potential topics in the same rhematic position as the "presented" NP's of the presentative construction. Although he is the first to discuss in depth and define topic shift as a function of inversion, Kantor is not the first to observe the phenomenon of topic shifting in English. I note here one aspect of topic shift that has been observed elsewhere (Wood, 1956; H&J, 1974), namely, the relation between fronting with inversion and
fronting with straight order.

While Kantor notes the interchangeability of Adv + VS and Adv + SV for topic shift, Wood (p. 32) observes a distinction between these two orders. The S:

(165) From this arose the belief that the earth is flat. answers the question: What did this give rise to? On the other hand, the S:

(166) From this the belief arose that the earth is flat. answers the question: What was the origin of the belief that...

Wood describes the distinction in terms of emphasis: medial subjects, he says, are more emphatic. However, it is clear that we are really dealing here with a distinction in the thematicity of the subject belief. In (165) belief is athematic, a potential new topic. In (166) belief is thematic if the S is used to answer the question: what was the origin of the belief that...? This S might, for example, be used to sum up a lecture on the origin of the belief that the earth is flat. In this thematic use of belief, the fronted constituent from this is stressed. However, as Kantor notes, this S could also be construed with an athematic belief. In this reading it means the same as (165) and the stress is on belief. S (165), however, cannot mean the same as (166) with a thematic belief. In other words, we can make the following generalization:

(167) The subject of an inverted S with thematic fronting is athematic, never thematic. The subject of
A S with thematic fronting and straight order is either thematic or athematic.

In other words, if the subject is thematic, the order must be Adv SV. If the subject is athematic it is optionally inverted. Next we ask the question: to what types of inversion does this generalization apply?

Presentative Constructions: The generalization applies across the board to presentative constructions. That is, presentatives with definite subjects are used, not with thematic subjects, but with subjects that need to be recalled to mind, i.e., reintroduced. If one says: There's the whisky on the sideboard, one knew about the whiskey once, but it was not in mind at the moment.

So-called Emphatic Fronting or Directional Adverb Fronting: Does the generalization hold for Ss with emphatic direction adverb fronting, another sentence type with full inversion in Modern English? I believe it does. However, here both the thematicity and the topicality of the subject are relevant. With other presentatives, the subject must be athematic (most often first mentioned) and hence is not the established topic. When the subject of a S with this so-called emphatic fronting is topical, the order must be Adv SV; as in (168) where dog is thematic and topical:

(168) I met a dog with brown spots the other day. He was a charmer—looked lonely and sat there quietly with me for awhile. He and I watched the passersby. But suddenly, away the dog trotted.
I haven't seen him since.

I believe that the use of an inverted S in this discourse would sound decidedly odd. In contrast, let us look at a discourse in which the subject of the emphatic S is thematic but not topical:

(169) John was attaching a rope for a swing to a large oak tree. He had the knots tied and was just climbing down the ladder when suddenly down came the tree/ down the tree came with a resounding crash.

Either variant sounds fine, with or without inversion, just as is the case with the thematic fronting discussed above.

The "less topical" a NP is in these Ss the greater is its ability to be inverted, just as Kantor observed for Ss with thematic fronting. The following discourse is from a newspaper article on making lard:

(170) "...Most of the membrane (of the hog fat) has been coarsely ground. We leave it in the freezer until a cold day.

COCk OCRER LOW HEAT (sub-heading)

Early in the morning we fetch the blue granite-ware canning kettle from the basement. In goes the hog fat, a few pounds at a time, to cock over a low heat." (The Milwaukee Journal)

The topic of the paragraph before the sub-heading is hog fat. The reason that hog fat can be reintroduced in the inverted S is because both a sub-heading and a new topic (kettle) inter-
vene between the underlined hog fat and the topical hog fat of the preceding paragraph.

The fact that these "emphatic inversions" follow the same discourse rules as thematic inversions and the fact that they are another full inversion type, like thematic inversions, in Modern English lead me to believe that directional adverb fronting inversions are really thematic fronting inversions also. The direction adverbs that are preposed in "emphatic inversion" Ss have a locative reference point known to the reader/hearer. Hence in the Ss: Out came the bear. Away trotted the dog. Up flew a robin. the hearer can fill in the blanks: Out from where to where? Away from what? Up from where to where? even if it is only a vague notion such as "up from the ground to the sky". The action in these Ss is "on stage" and highly visible. While the Ss as a whole are emphatic, the fronting is thematic. I thus disagree with Hooper and Thompson's special treatment of directional adverb fronting and concur with Bolinger's grouping these Ss with other presentatives.

However, there are two interrelated and important differences between these fronted directional adverb inversions and topic shift inversions. One difference is that the PC has greater stress in the fronted directional adverb clauses than in the majority of topic shift inversions. Since the PC has greater stress, the subject has somewhat less stress than in most topic shift inversions.
The other difference has to do with the degree of subject athe-
maticity required for acceptable inversion. Full inversions in
Modern English occur most frequently with first mention subjects
and if the subject had previously occurred it is at considerable
discourse distance from the reintroduction by inversion. However,
in example (170) above we find a perfectly acceptable direction-
al adverb inversion that has a subject which was recently men-
tioned (thematic) in the discourse, though is not topical. I
claim the reason these inversions, but rarely other thematic
fronting inversions, can occur with recent mention subjects is
because the stress on the PC draws away some of the stress on the
subject/topic, making it possible to invert the subject even
though the subject does not receive as heavy stress as athematic
(topic introduction) subjects receive. The inversion in (170) is
a topic switch inversion. Other inversions with the same prop¬
ties, including the potential to occur in topic switch environ¬
ments, are inversions with stressed fronted here/there: (Here's
John)⁴ and fronted comparative adverbs (Nearer and nearer came.
the bear). The subjects are thematic (possibly former but inter¬
rupted topics) and the PC is stressed more than in most full in¬
versions. These inversions have both a presentative and a PC
stress function.

⁴I thank M. Geis for bring this S type to my attention.

We now attempt to apply (167) to other types of inversion.

So, Nor, Neither, No more; Wood and H & J observe that subject
switching occurs in Ss with fronted so, nor, neither and no more.
(171a) I was in London last week. (Speaker A)  
(171b) So was I. (Speaker B)  
(172a) Mary said that you were in London last week  
    (Speaker A)  
(172b) So I was. (Speaker B)

We can see that this subject switching in dialog works differently than topic shift in narration, thus we are not dealing with the same type of inversion as that discussed above. In particular, while Adverb + VS switches the subject, Adv + SV does not switch the subject. While we might describe the contrast XSV/XVS to differences in the thematicity of the pronoun subject, the word order differences also correspond to the differences in the stress of the subject. When I is contrastive it is heavily stressed and hence S final. When the verb receives primary stress, it is S-final.

Direct Quotes: A tendency rather than a hard and fast rule has been observed here. Wood (p. 29) notes that front position tends to be used with expected (read "topical") subjects while final subjects are usually used if a contrast is desired. Hermon (1979) arrives at essentially this same conclusion.

Generalization (167) does not hold at all for other types of semi-inversion. With negative and restrictive openers inversion is obligatory regardless of the thematicity of the subject. In all other types, inversion is optional and its use is not dependent on the thematicity of the subject.

Next we turn to a more thorough analysis of non-thematic PC's. Since many of these PC's in the past were seen as
triggering "connective inversion", I turn now to a discussion of connection.

**CONNECTION AND INVERSION**

In this section we look at the so-called connective function of inversion, a function which supposedly explained most inversion after non-thematic PC's. We can divide this inversion into two kinds: inversion for connection of elements within a clause and inversion for the connection of clauses.

In his study of the connection of clauses in English Karlsen (1959) discusses certain inverted Ss which express clause connection with the help of "explicit connectors". For example, the Ss: *So have I. Neither have I. Nor will I.* are said to combine an explicit connector (*so, neither, nor*) plus inverted order to connect these clauses with a previous clause. However, Karlsen does not attempt to answer the question: why is there inversion in addition to the explicit connectors?

Other grammarians stress the connection of intra-clausal elements, particularly in reference to inverted Ss of the kind: Negative/Restrictive Adverb + Semi-inversion. Kruisinga (1932) says that "The reason for this word order is that a negative word emphatically put at the beginning of the S naturally attracts the finite verb" (p. 325). Similarly, Jacobsson (1951), who first used the term "negative attraction", says that inversion (after only) "takes place regardless of rhythmic considerations and the primary cause of this inversion must be the desire to establish a closer connection between the restrictive adverb and the predicate verb" (p. 54), and again (p. 77), "Apart from
the emphasis due to front-position, the main factor determining the choice of word order in these Ss appears to be the degree of connection between the S-opener and the verb. Specifically, "negative modifiers" stand in a close relationship with the verb.

More recently, Klima (1964) speaks of "affective attraction," i.e., inversion of the subject and aux. in Ss with sentence negation. Ss with S negation are obligatorily inverted whenever the Neg. is not incorporated in the auxiliary. Ss with constituent negation are never inverted. The following are examples of S negation with and without inversion:

(173a) Never have I heard such a commotion.
(173b) I have never heard such a commotion.
(174a) Nowhere have I seen such a messy desk.
(174b) I haven't seen such a messy desk anywhere.

The following Ss are examples of constituent negation:

(175) Not far away it snowed on October 31.
(176) Not long ago it snowed here.

These Ss have no inverted counterparts.

H & J (p. 25ff.) also speak of "attraction inversion", again with the attraction in question being that of a verb to an opener. The openers included in H & J's definition of attraction inversion are: interrogative (WH) words, negatives, restrictives (few, only, alone, rarely, seldom, hardly, scarce) and so, such, the...the, thus, many, much, most, rather, numerals and a few miscellaneous openers.
H&J divide negative opener Ss into three classes on semantic grounds: (p. 31)

1. Inversion occurs when "what is denoted by the verbal construction does not take place/ is not true, i.e., is contrary to fact.

2. Inversion almost invariably occurs when "what is denoted by the verbal construction of the clauses takes place/is true only under the conditions specified in the opener."

3. Inversion hardly ever occurs when "what is denoted by the verbal construction of the clause takes place/is true irrespective of the opener."

H & J give the following examples of the three classes respectively:

(177) Nor do I count my room at my Aunt Emily's ...
(178) Only under his eyes was there any colour.
(179) Only last year I could look out of the window and see nothing but gardens.

It is noted that some exceptions to these "rules" do occur. H & J offer no explanations for these classes of Ss. I know of no other Ss in which inversion is tied to truth value. Below I will offer an explanation for these facts.

H & J reject emphasis as the common denominator of the Ss with the adverbial openers discussed in this section, reasoning that most emphatic openers do not cause inversion, e.g. a topicalized noun (p.37).
The obvious problem with the above analyses of inversion as a means of connection is that no one has adequately explained why the opener and the verb should be attracted to each other in the first place. That is, why should one group of adverbs (negatives and restrictives) be "more closely related to the verb" than, say, affirmative adverbs. Klima says, "inversion is a device that sees to it that Neg. and Aux. are not separated" (p. 313). By why should neg. and aux. or aux. and any other adverb not be separated? I offer here some suggestions for explaining these inversions. First, let us turn to some observations of the class of adverbs that "provoke" the inversions in question.

H&J refuse to term the "attraction inversion" adverbs emphatic because, they say, other emphatic openers do not cause inversion. However, the adverbs that readily admit inversion in Modern English are not really a randomly selected group. First, we can observe that both the negative and the restrictive adverbs in Ss of this type are stressed: indeed, they readily receive the primary stress of the S even when non-contrastive. For example, in the following discourse, the never of the inverted S is rhematic and receives primary stress:

(180) I've told my parents at last! I won't go back to that horrid place next year. In fact, never will I go back there.

It is difficult even to imagine contexts in which an inverted "attraction" S may be used without the opener being emphatic
and receiving heavy stress. I can think of only two instances in which the PC of a semi-inverted clause may regularly receive less than primary stress:

(181) Bill cannot dive. Nor can he swim.

(182) Bill cannot dive. Nor can Mary dive.

The contrastive nor and neither have secondary stress when the subject or the verb have primary contrastive stress.

Second, a sub-class of the openers under discussion have the property of referring in varying degrees to the prior S. For example, so, such, the superlative and comparative, in particular, and rather can be readily emphasized, but they also refer to or make a comparison with something else. Particularly or in particular point to one thing as opposed to all members of the set to which that thing belongs. Rather expresses an implicit or explicit comparison with something else.

H & J themselves observe that so and such are used with inversion only when they refer forwards or backwards, as in the Ss:

(183a) So mean was she that she beat her students regularly.

(183b) She beat her students regularly, so mean was she.

Such is always referential in meaning and occurs in inverted Ss even without result clauses:

(184a) To such heights does the eagle soar, that even in airplanes man cannot follow him.
(184b) My creative writing class was stimulating, well-taught and innovative. In such a class, does one work best.

As was noted before, so does not provoke inversion when it is not referential, i.e., when it means "very much", as in:

(185) So like you he was.

Likewise, H & J observe that thus does not cause inversion when it means "for example", but only when it means "in such a manner", in other words when it is referential. In sum, in a number of "affective attraction" Ss there is a direct reference to something said before or there is an implicit comparison. In this sense this subclass of S openers does have a connective function, serving to link the clause or S to its context or cotext.

However, what is more important, is that these referential constituents are most commonly found in clause-initial position, the usual position for constituents that are thematic or back referring. We can further observe that the inherently emphatic fronted constituents are those which trigger obligatory semi-inversion in Modern English when they are fronted: negative direct objects, so, such, only, hardly, scarcely, and the like. The rest of the PC's optionally trigger semi-inversion, e.g., thus, therefore, in particular, rather. When they do trigger semi-inversion they receive heavy, primary stress. Their stress is much less when not followed by semi-
inversion.

From these facts I draw the following conclusions:
Semi-inversion occurs after heavy stress PC's --- either inherently stressed PC's or stressed in particular contexts. Semi-inversion occurs when the stress on the PC is too heavy to be indicated by preposing alone, because the PC is inherently very emphatic or because the constituent is usually preposed even when not heavily stressed. Furthermore, a constituent which is stressed when preposed can be stressed even more by semi-inversion, although this use of inversion seems to be declining. For example, semi-inversion after -LY adverbs is now archaic: Loudly did the lion roar.

In short, my claim is that the puzzling facts about the acceptable and unacceptable inversions in this section and in Part 1 inversion types G-M can be explained in terms of the contrast between the stress resulting from preposing alone or from unmarked clause initial position and the additional stress on the PC that results from semi-inversion. Consider for instance H&J's observation that inversion is almost invariable when the PC denotes a necessary condition for the activity/state denoted by the verb to occur.

(186) Not until Leamas was inside and the front door closed did Control put on the hall light (H & J, p. 31).

I suggest that semi-inversion occurs in this S and in others like it because a necessary condition is also an emphatic condition, one likely to receive primary stress. A non-necessary
condition, as in Ss with constituent negation, receives considerably less stress, as in:

(187) Only last year I could look out of the window and see nothing but gardens.

Notice also that, as in (185), inversion to stress the PC cannot apply if the result would be an unstressed final subject (a violation of Modern English rhythmic organization): * So like you was he.

Most adverbs can be fronted and followed by semi-inversion if the context is emphatic enough (as in contrastive contexts) to support a primary stress on the adverb. It is this emphatic-contrastive fronting and semi-inversion that occurs in the following Ss with thematic PC's, which usually occur with full inversion in presentative/topic-shift functions. The Ss are formal:

(188) Then did the building of Rome begin.

(189) In this way was the city of Rome begun.

These Ss behave identically to the emphatic inversions discussed in this section. When written they can be interpreted as having emphatic fronting with thematic subjects (188)-(189), or they can be interpreted as having emphatic fronting with rhematic subjects, as is the reading with the word also added:

(188a) Then also did the city of Rome begin.

(189a) In this way also had the city of Rome been founded.

Compare these Ss to Ss with fronted seldom.
(190) Seldom has Bill earned much money.
(191) Seldom has Bill earned much money.
(contrastive stress on Bill)

These Ss differ from full inversion topic shift Ss in that the semi-inversion places heavier stress on the fronted constituent than does full inversion, even in Ss where the subject is rhematic or contrastive.

It seems that even preposed predicate nominals and predicate adjectives can be used with semi-inversion if the context is emphatic enough. However, in general fronting alone emphasizes the adjective or noun and only contrastive stress would trigger semi-inversion.

(192) Plainly detectible had his scars been for years.
The longer the subject, however, the more awkward these Ss are:
(193) Plainly detectible had the scars from his old football injury been for years.
The rhythm of (193) seems odd.

Semi-inversion for emphasis is bad with adverbs of direction:

(194) *Out has the jack-in-the-box popped.
(195) *Out did the jack-in-the-box pop.
(196) *Up did the bird fly.

The corresponding Ss: Out popped the jack-in-the-box. Up flew the bird. already have a highly stressed PC. Ss (194) - (196) are bad because it is difficult to think of a situation in which the direction the action took would have to be emphasized even more.
Preposed participles sound odd with semi-inversion:

(197) *Lying right in front of me had the cat been the whole time.

However, in environments where the PC receives very heavy stress, such a S improves slightly.

(198) ??Lying right in front of me had that cat been the whole time! Silly me for spending an hour calling it.

In sum, in this section I claim that semi-inversion in Modern English is restricted in use by two major requirements: the requirement of a heavy stress PC, one which receives too much stress for stress to be indicated by fronting alone, and the requirement of a stressed clause final subject/verb after fronting, which allows: So generous was he/ he was but not *so generous was he/ he was. Further, I claim that reference to these two requirements affords a unified explanation for numerous facts about Modern English semi-inversion which previously received disparate and ad hoc explanations.

**STYLISTIC DESCRIPTIONS OF INVERSION**

In the interest of completeness, I mention here that there have been numerous attempts to describe inversion in purely stylistic terms. For example, inversion has been said to impart to a discourse "liveliness, spriteliness, and vivacity" (Charleston, 1960, p. 143). In some instances Ss with inversion sound oratorical. From a subjective or literary viewpoint such descriptions have validity. However, such stylistic functions will not be dealt with here.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

As a brief summary of the behavior and function of the majority of inversions in English we can state the following:

Fronting in Modern English inverted Ss is emphatic or thematic. When thematic fronting is followed by full inversion the function of the S is presentative/topic shift. Exceptions to this are fronted directional adverb, fronted comparative adverb, and fronted stressed here/there Ss which have two functions: stress on the adverb and a presentative function. When thematic fronting is followed by semi-inversion the fronted constituent is stressed and the subject may be either thematic or athematic. The only exception to this is the semi-inverted but presentative passive type: In the courtroom were several suspects apprehended, which obligatorily has an athematic subject.

Inversion after emphatic fronting is always semi-inversion unless the PC is a directional adverb, comparative adverb, or stressed here/there. Most, but not all, emphatic inversions follow preposed adverbs.

In the next chapters I will describe inversion in earlier stages of English.
CHAPTER II
OLD ENGLISH

Overview of Old English Word Order

In this section I give a brief overview of OE word orders. The three most frequent orders in OE are SVO, SOV, and XVS, where X stands for any fronted constituent.

SVO order is now generally regarded as the unmarked order; hence, OE is categorized as a SVO language. This order is found in main clauses and in the first clause of a string of co-ordinate clauses when the clauses are affirmative. Traugott (1972) notes that the underlying S is a declaration, a promise or a prediction.¹

¹Some of the translations in this chapter are my own and some are from Garmonsway (1953). The translations are meant as an aid to the reader and no attempt is made to render the OE into "good" Modern English.

(1) Sup Pihtas waeron aer gefulode of Ninna biscope...
The South Picts were earlier baptized by bishop N.
(ASC A565)

(2) & AEthelstan waes of Myrcum gecoren to cinge & A. was by the Mercians accepted as king.
(ASC C924)

(3) Earnulf þa wunode on þaet lond be eastan Rin & Ropulf 
E. then remained in the land to the East of the Rhine & R.
then succeeded to the Middle Kingdom (ASC A887)

SOV order is used in subordinate clauses and in coordinate clauses after the first. Some subordinate clauses, for example, relative clauses, exhibit SOV order less frequently than others (Geogheghan, 1975).

(4) sona swa hie comon on Stufemuþan, þa metton hie xvi
   As soon as they came to the mouth of S., then met they 16
   scipu wicengas
   ships of pirates. (ASC A885)

(5) & þurcytel eorl hine gesohte him to hlaforde
   & T eorl submitted to him. (ASC A 918)

XVS order is found in main clauses in which some constituent, usually an adverb of time or place, a direct or indirect object or a negative particle, is fronted. It is also the order for interrogative Ss.

(6) Her forþferde Osweo Norþanhymbra cyning.
   Here died 0. king of N. (ASC A 670)

(7) & him cirde micel folc to, aegþer ge on East Englum
   ge on East Seaxum.
   to him submitted many people both from E.E.
   & from E. S. (ASC A 921)

(8) oþer heold Daniel, oþer Aldhelm
    the one held D., the other A. (ASC A 709)

There also existed a minor order VSO in which inversion but not fronting occurred. This order is frequent only with subjunctive verbs.
(9) & haefdon eac Eforwicingas hire gehaten.
& had also the people of E. her promised (ASC C918)

(10) haefde hine Penda adrifenne
      had him P. expelled                        (ASC A658)

(11) & forlet se here þa burg.
      & abandoned the host the fort             (ASC A 921)

We will be concerned with the contrast between XVS and SVO orders to the exclusion of SOV order. Some instances of verb first order will also be discussed.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON OE INVERSION

Considering the large number of studies devoted to OE word order in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it is not surprising that there have been numerous previous attempts to explain the OE use of XVS order. Among the most extensive of these studies are: Dahlstedt (1901), Firbas (1957), and Bean (1976). Early Germanic inverted order is discussed in Ries (1880), McKnight (1897), Fourquet (1938) and Smith (1971) among many others. In light of the breadth and quantity of studies on OE word order, one feels compelled to justify yet another study. Therefore, in this section I will discuss some inadequacies of previous studies.

A goodly number of conclusions about OE word order have come from analyses of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The Chronicle, begun by Alfred, King of the West Saxons, in the year 891 is the earliest extant lengthy prose work in OE that is not a translation from a Latin original. Especially in recent years, when many researchers have preferred to study one work
in depth rather than do chronological studies, the ASC has been a popular source of OE data. I cite here two passages from the ASC around which I center my discussion of inversion as it is analyzed in prior studies.

823 (12) Her waes Wala gefeoht & Defna aet Gafulforda
Here was a battle of Bretons & of the men of D at G.

(13) by ilcan geare gefeaht Ecbryht cyning & Beornwulf
In the same year fought E. king and B.
cyning on Ellendune.
king at E.

(14) & Ecgbryht sige nam
& E. won

(15) & þaer waes micel wael geslaegen
& there was a great slaughter

(16) þa sende he AEþlwulf his sunu of þaere fierde &
then sent he A. his son from his levies &
Ealhstan his bиск.
E. his bishop
& Wulfheard his aldorman to Cent micle werede &
W. his aldorman to C with a great force

(17) & hie Baldred þone cyning norþ ofer Temese
adrifon
They B. king north over the T. drove

(18) & Cantware him to cirdon & Suþ Seaxe, & East Seaxe,
The C. to him submitted & the S.S. &
the E. S.
by hie from his maegum aer mid unryhte anidde waerun because they from his kinsman earlier wrongly were forced.

(19) & by ilcan geare East Engla-cyning &-seo þeod gesohte 
that same year EE king & his court turned to 
Ecgbryht cyning him to friþe & to mund boran for 
E. king as protector & guardian for 
Miercna ege 
fear of the Mercians.

(20) & by geare slogon East Engle Beornwulf Miercan cyning 
& in that year slew the EE B. king of M. 881 (21) Her for se here ufor on Frondond. 
Here went the host deeper into F. 
(22) & þa Francan him wiþ gefuhton. 
& the F. against them fought. 
(23) & þæer þa waerþ se here gehorsod æfter þam gefeohhte 
& there was the host supplied with horses after that battle.

These passages are very typical of the prose found in the Parker Ms. of the ASC and of OE narrative prose in general.

The functions of OE inversion proposed in the literature are the same functions we encountered before in the discussion of inversion in Modern English: rhythmic reasons for inversion, intersentential connection, emphasis, and thematicity. Most certainly these are factors that enter into the use of inver-
sion in OE. However, I believe that the way in which these functions have been applied in OE is at best inadequate and at worst wrong.

Probably the two most commonly cited "causes" of OE inversion are rhythmic considerations and thematicity. First, I will show how rhythm alone is inadequate for describing the use of inversion.

One of the most comprehensive studies of rhythm and word order in OE is found in Dahlstedt (1901). Dahlstedt categorizes OE words as long or short according to whether they are accented or unaccented. Short words include personal pronouns, the pronouns se, 3rd sg.; bes this; hu who; monosyllabic adverbs not derived from nouns or verbs: her, here; baer there; bus thus; swa so; forb forth; eac also; git yet; and others; and monosyllabic prepositions used as adverbs: at, for, from, in; mid with, of off, on, to wib with. All other words are long words (pp. 26-27).

A major problem with this analysis is that there are but few ways to utilize this rhythmic/ inherent word stress categorization to explain inversions. Consider (16) above. The fronted adverb ba 'then' is one of only two adverbs in OE to trigger inversion nearly every time it occurs. Unlike all but a few other heads ba can invert even a pronoun subject, as it does in (16). Dahlstedt regards ba as a short or unstressed word, as is the personal pronoun subject he 'he'. Hence, one possible hypothesis is that OE had a rhythmic pattern allowing a short (unstressed) head to invert a short (unstressed)
subject. Such a rule, however, could not account for the inversion in (12) or (21), in which a short head has triggered the inversion of a long subject. Nor would it explain why other short heads do not invert a pronoun subject.

Conversely, we could hypothesize that the rhythmic pattern was such that a long head inverts a long (stressed) subject, as it does in (13). However, in (19) we see that a long head does not invert a long subject, even though the head is identical to that of (13), by ican geare, 'in that year.' Thus, this rule would not adequately describe OE inversion either.

As far as I can see, there is only one aspect of inversion that can be "explained" in Dahlstedt's terms and that is the SV order of personal pronoun subjects after almost all preposed heads (the exceptions ba, ne, bonne will be discussed later). We could argue, in Dahlstedt's terms, that personal pronoun subjects remain in unmarked (unemphatic) SV order because they are short unstressed words. Of course, why these subjects do invert after the heads noted above cannot be explained with this same argument.

Dahlstedt himself is forced to dismiss his long/short categories in order to describe inversion and the "rules" he decides upon are quite ad hoc. ba is called a strong head, because it so consistently triggers inversion. By implication heads that do not invert pronouns are weak. However, there is no independent criterion for defining these terms, or for explaining, for example, why preposed heads synonymous with ba
(e.g., after that) are not also strong. In the end, Dahlstedt is forced to admit that he cannot really predict at all when inversion occurs with nominal subjects, "...so that we can really speak about a fluctuation" (p. 89).

In sum, rhythm or stress surely has a role in inversion, but to date that role has not been adequately defined.

The relation between the thematicity or topicality of the subject and XVS order is discussed in Firbas (1957) and Bean (1976). As was noted in Chapter 1, Firbas was the first to propose that English word order was determined by considerations of thematicity. Many of Firbas' early studies were devoted to OE. He claims that OE, more than Modern English, word order basically exhibited theme-rheme order. Inversion was a device to insure that theme-rheme order could be maintained even when the subject contains new information.

There are two basic problems with this analysis of OE order. First, many Ss of OE do not conform to theme-rheme order and then, according to Firbas, are to be categorized as emotive. This analysis presents special problems when dealing with ancient languages, for we are given no means of determining what emotive Ss mean in a language about which there are no native speaker intuitions. As a result, emotive becomes in reality a category of exceptions that are not explainable or predictable.

Second, Firbas gives no guidelines for determining what constitutes new or old information. This is, in fact, a
general problem of Prague School research on thematicity. Again, in modern languages, we can rely on our intuitions about what we feel to be new or old (c.f. Kantor, 1976). However, when dealing with ancient languages we need to establish clear definitions.

Bean (1976) discusses topicality and word order in the ASC. She finds, as Firbas did for other works of OE prose, that SVO order is indeed tied up with the topicality of the subject; SVO order is very common with topical subjects, as in (14) and (17) above. SVO is also very common with athematic subjects, as in (19) and (22). However, XVS order proves to be more problematic in regard to thematicity. It appears that inversion occurs with both athematic and thematic subjects. For example, compare the inversion with athematic subjects in (12) and (21) and the inversion with thematic subjects in (16) and (23). Bean is unable to define the use of inversion in such a way as to distinguish it from SVO order merely by considering the topicality of the subject. Both orders occur with athematic and thematic subjects; thematic subjects are just somewhat more frequent in SVO order and athematic subjects frequently have XVS order.

Bean's conclusion is that XVS is a "new event" or a "consecutive event" order while SVO is a "linked event" order. What is meant by "new event" and "linked event" is never precisely defined. Presumably, "linked event" refers to the frequent use of SVO order in coordinate Ss with pronominal
subjects, for instance (17) above, and also in coordinate Ss having a cause-effect or result relationship between them.

(24) Her forþferde Osweo Norðanymbra cyning & Eadbald
Here died 0 king of N. & E.
ricsode æfter him.
reigned after him. (ASC A670)

(25) Her Aebelbryht Contwara cyng forþferde & Eadbald his
Here A. king of C. died & E. his
sumu fæng to rice.
son succeeded to the throne. (ASC A616)

However, it is not difficult to find non-related events in SVO order either:

(26) her Eanfled Edwines dohtor cyninges waes gefulwad
Here E. E's daughter was baptized
in þone halgen aefen Pentecosten & Penda haefde xxxwintra rice.
on the holy eve of P. & P.
had 30 years ruled. (ASC A626)

(27) Her com se mycla wind & Byrhtmaer b gefor on Licet felda.
Here came a great wind & B. bishop died at L. (ASC C1039)

In the first example, Penda's reign has nothing to do with Eanfled and in the second example, Byrhtmaer's death was not related to the big wind. In general, it appears to me that the coordination of clauses in OE was clearly more a means of
defining a discourse unit than a means of linking events.

Nor is it difficult to find related events in XVS order, again in contradiction to Bean's hypothesis.

(28) Her Cynheard ofslog Cynewulf cyning...& òa onfeng Beorhtric Wesseaxna rices
Here C. slew king C. & then
succeeded B. to the West Saxon throne
(ASC A784)

(29) Her Stephanus papa forþferde, & aefter him was
Here S. pope died & after him was
Paschalis to papan gehadod.
P. consecrated pope. (ASC A816)

Bean's "new event" is even more puzzling. Presumably, any new verb denotes a new event, if one can call acts of thinking, being, doubting, etc. "events". (All of these verbs can occur in XVS order). It is difficult to think of the following examples as containing new events:

(30) & on aelcere burig bið cyningc.
& in every town is a king. (Or. 254.5)

(31) & sceall beon se laesta dael nyhst þæm tune...
& shall be the least portion nearest to the dwelling
(Or. 254.22)

(32) & be westan-nordan him sinðon Scride-Finnas.
& to the Northwest of them are the Scride-Finnas.
(Or. 246.35)

These particular examples come from the Orosius, another prose work of Alfred's. But they show how inadequate the new event or consecutive event notions are, especially with respect to prose other than the Chronicle, where there are fewer action or
event verbs. It appears that Bean's definition of inversion is strongly influenced by the high frequency of temporal adverb heads in the Chronicle and will not readily apply to inversions after other heads. Such ad hoc views of inversion are not very enlightening, for they force us to redefine the function of inversion for each different prose work.

It is not clear whether Bean wishes to say that XVS order stresses the verb in addition to signalling a new event. Regardless, the use of XVS order seems no clearer or better defined than in Firbas' work. In fact, the introduction of the terms linked, new, and consecutive event confuse the picture even more.

There are other serious problems in Bean's study. For example, Bean concludes that the year 865 in the ASC marks the elimination of XSV order as a new event order. This statement primarily refers to the use of VS order after preposed her 'here, in this year' (cf., (12) and (21) above) after 865, whereas both VS and SV occur after her before this date. The problem with this purported word order change is that the Chronicle was begun in the year 891 and all years prior to this were written in the relatively brief period 891-892. Hence, it is unlikely that this variation signals a change in the language taking place within the space of a year.

A similar problem occurs with Bean's analysis of definiteness and topicality. She observes that most noun subjects in SVO order in the early years of the Chronicle are definite, (actually proper nouns) while in later years pronoun subjects frequently occur in SVO order. Hence, she postulates a change from definiteness to topicality as the chief criterion for SVO order. I believe this is a case of reading too much into the data. As we noted above, all of the entries encompassing this "change" were written at approximately the same time. Entries for the early years of the Chronicle are short (usually one or two Ss) while entries for the later years are long and complex. As a result, early entries rarely use pronoun-subjects to refer to nouns introduced earlier in the entry, while this is common in later years. Hence, we have to do here with differences in the content of the entries, not with a language change. The two passages below illustrate the differences in content.
between early and late entries of the ASC.

3. (33) Her swealt Herodus from him selfum ofsticod &
   Here died H. by his own hand stabbed &
   Archilaus his sumu feng to rice.
   A. his son succeeded to the throne.

827 (34) by ilcan geare ge eode Ecgbryht cyning Miercna
   rice
   in that same year conquered E. king Mercia
   & al þaet be suðan Humber waes, & he waes se
   eahteþa
   & all that was south of the H. & he was the 8th
   cyning seþe bretwalda waes
   king who ruler of Britain was.

It is apparent then that both rhythm oriented and thematicity / topicality oriented analyses of OE have so far proved inadequate for the explanation or even description of inversion. However, I believe that the reason for this is not because rhythm and thematicity have nothing to do with XVS order in OE, but because these factors have been incorrectly analyzed. In the next section I reanalyze the word order of the ASC in a way that I believe better and more interestingly describes the use of inversion in this work of narrative prose.

A REANALYSIS OF INVERSION IN THE ASC 'PART 1'

I have studied three manuscripts of the ASC which together comprise original English prose of the years 891-1154. The earliest Ms. is the Parker or A. Ms. covering events from 1 A.D. to 1050 (with many gaps in the late entries) and written between 891 and 1050. This Ms. is in the West Saxon dialect of King Alfred, a dialect of the southwestern part of England. The second Ms. which I use where it diverges from the A and E Mss,
is the C. Ms. for the years 902-1066 at which point it ends. The early years include the Mercian Register, information about Mercian (central England) history. The Chronicle for these years was written approximately co-temporaneously with the events described. The third Ms., the Laud or E Ms. covers the years 1-1154. The early years are most likely copied from a Northumbrian (northern) chronicle and written in 1122. The Laud Ms., also called the Peterborough Chronicle, was written at the abbey of Peterborough in the North East Midland dialect of central England.

In this section I present data from the Parker Ms. First I discuss preposing of S constituents, then the verbs that occur in inverted Ss and finally the subjects of inverted Ss, thematicity, and discourse rules.

The Parker Ms. contains 366 instances of inversion, including 77 inversions after ha, 92 inversions after her, 32 there clauses, 2 inverted ne clauses and 22 inversions with no preposed constituents. The other inversions occur after a variety of other preposed constituents.

THE PREPOSING OF S CONSTITUENTS IN OE

Since OE is basically a verb-second (V/2) rather than V/1 (verb initial) language, a rule preposing to the head of a clause constituents other than the subject is an important part of inversion in OE. Constituents that could be preposed include: single and phrasal adverbs of time and place, prepositional phrases of various types, direct objects, indirect objects— in short nearly any constituent except the verb. Two very
common preposed heads in the Parker Ms. are "then" which has been mentioned before, and "here", an adverb often used in entry-initial sentences (the beginning of a new year's entry). Inversion also occurred after the negative particle ne and the non-locative (existential) there. A most common occurrence of inversion is in the second clause of a pair of correlative clauses headed by such adverbs as "then...then; or swa...swa as...so; gif...if...then, although the Parker Chronicle does not contain as many correlative pairs as other contemporary prose pieces. Below are some examples of Ss with preposed heads and inversion.

**ADVERB OF TIME**

(35) *tha wæs domne Leo papa on Rome*
then was Leo pope in Rome (ASC A 853)

(36) *þy ilcan geare ofer Eastron ymbe gang dagas ðe æt*
in that same year after Easter during Rogationtide or
*aet eowde se steorra þe mon on boc laeden haet cometa*
earlier appeared the star which in Latin is called comet. (ASC A 892)

**ADVERB OF PLACE**

(37) *þær waes micel wæl geslaegen*
there was very great slaughter (ASC A 823)

(38) *On Wiht gehergade Wulfhere Pending*
on the Isle of W. ravaged W. son of P (ASC A 661)
PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES

(39) Of lotum comon Cantware & Wihtware
from the Jutes came the people of C & W
(ASC A 449)

(40) wiþ þone here gefuhton Osric aldorman mid
Hamtunscire
against the host fought O. alderman with
the men of H
(ASC A860)

(41) from Offan kyninge Hygebryht waes gecoren
by king O. H. was appointed.
(ASC A785)

DIRECT OBJECT

(42) ober heold Daniel, ober Aldhelm
the one held D, the other A. (ASC A 709)

INDIRECT OBJECT

(43) him to com þæer ongen Sumorsaete alle...
to him came there all the men of S
(ASC A878.14)

CORRELATIVE CLAUSE

(44) þa geascade se cyng þæet hie ut on hergad
foron,
when the king learned that they had gone
eut
þa sende he his fird ægðer ge of West
Seaxum
harrying, he sent his levies both from Wessex
ge of Mercum
and from Mercia
(ASC A911.8)

We will see that the class of preposed constituents
(PC's or heads) used with inversion includes both thematic
and non-thematic constituents. The thematic constituents are
those which refer to something (usually a noun) previously introduced in the discourse, hence something known. Many thematic heads contain a demonstrative or personal pronoun. Other heads refer to the content of an entire clause or even several clauses and hence are thematic also, e.g. therefore; 
bus, thus; swa so. Non-thematic PC's followed by inversion are rarer, especially in the A Ms. but they do occur, e.g., nu now; eac also; git yet; simile ever and manner adverbs.

The fact that many preposed adverbs are thematic and/or back referring has prompted some to say that connection between Ss is a major function of inversion in OE (e.g., Smith, 1893). However, the connective function belongs to the thematic preposed element and does not explain why inversion follows the connective constituent.

In the Parker Ms. we see that these same types of heads can be preposed even if inversion does not occur. In fact, the frequency of these XSV clauses is sufficiently high that it is evident that verb-third order (V/3) contrasts with V/2 order even in the earliest extant OE prose. In this particular Ms. we find preposing without inversion with the following types of heads: her (very frequently), single and phrasal adverbs of time and place, simile, ever; agentive prepositional phrases; thus, and indirect objects.

ADVERB OF TIME

(45) Her se eadiga Petrus se apostle gesaet biscep setl in
Here the blessed P. the apostle occupied the bishopric

(ASC A35)
(46) on hiera dagum Hengest & Horsa ... gesohton Bretene...
    In their day H. & H. ... came to B...
    (ASC 449)

ADVERB OF PLACE

(47) bar se Columba getimbrade mynster there that C. built a monastery. (ASC A565)

INDIRECT OBJECT

(48) To þam Lucius Bretene kyning sende stafas
to him L. king of B. sent letters (ASC A16?)

SIMPLE

(49) & simle he feaht & ever he fought (ASC A597)

OTHER PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES

(50) wip þone here se cyning friþ nam
    with the host the king made peace (ASC A876)

(51) from Offan kyninge Hygebryht waes gecoren
    by O. king H. was appointed (ASC A785)

THUS

(52) þus hie waeron genemnde
    thus they were named (ASC A891)

The Relation of Length of PC to Inversion

There is one generalization relating the length of the head and the likelihood of inversion that has been cited (e.g. Dahlstedt), namely that short heads occur with inversion more frequently than long heads (where short/long refer to the number of words in the head). While my data confirm this generalization, I do not believe it was a part of the grammar of OE, i.e., length of head was not a part of the OE inversion rule.
The perception of inversion after short heads is biased by the regularity of inversion after ba and ne, which are deviant heads in that they invert even personal pronoun subjects. In addition, our perception is colored by the regularity of inversion in correlative clauses, most of which have monosyllabic heads, and by the fact that monosyllabic adverbs in general are numerous in OE. Especially common are monosyllabic adverbs of place and time (nu now; baer there; her here; as well as ba then) all of which are frequently preposed. It is this overrepresentation of short preposed adverbs that has led to false notions about the relationship between the length of the preposed constituent and the occurrence of inversion.

Further, not all monosyllabic heads trigger inversion at higher rates than longer heads. For instance, the A Ms. has 292 instances of preposed her "here, at this time." Of these, 105 instances are followed by inversion (36%). This is a lower rate of inversion than longer temporal adverb phrases exhibit --- (71%). Locative adverb phrases and single word locative heads (baer) trigger inversion in the A Ms. at similar rates in spite of the differences in length of the PC: 100% for phrasal locatives and 94% for single word heads. Thus, length of head cannot always predict when inversion occurs.

Still, one could argue that there was once (perhaps in pre-OE) a rule inverting the subject and verb after monosyllabic (or short) heads and that the remnants of this rule can be
seen in the across the board inversions after *ba* and *ne* (and to a lesser extent *nu*). It could further be argued that inversion subsequently spread to longer heads. I will return later to this problem of the origin of inversion after *ba* and *ne*.

It is true that some long heads trigger inversion less frequently than short heads. This situation is partly the result of there being few cases of inversion after preposed subordinate clauses and the so-called "long conjunctive adverbs" (Dahlstedt's term) and also less inversion after *ba* + Adv than after *ba* alone. However, I do not believe it is the length of the PC that causes the less frequent inversion.

I suggest that a preposed subordinate clause does not affect the order of the following clause because it is outside of the clause in which inversion occurs. Every head commonly triggering inversion is in the same clause as the inversion. For instance, in all but a few anomalous correlative clauses, there is a correlative adverb in both the subordinate clause and the main clause.

(53) *ba* geascade se cyng *baet* hie up on hergad foron, *ba*
when learned the king that they had gone harrying
sende he his fird aegâer ge of West Seaxum ge of Mercum
then sent he his levies both from W and from M.

(ASC A 911.8)

Thus, the preposed constituent triggering inversion is not the
subordinate clause, but the preposed adverb of the main clause.

Long conjunctive adverbs (e.g., certainly, surely, truely) do not trigger inversion either. One possible reason is because they are S modifiers (in Jackendoff's (1972) view, subject-oriented modifiers, cf., also the discussion in Chapter 4 below) rather than modifiers of the verb, equivalent to: it is certain that..., it is sure that .... The behavior of these adverbs vis-a-vis inversion might be construed as evidence that the "closeness" of the adverb to the verb was once a factor in determining whether or not inversion took place.

In fact, I do not believe inversion was directly tied up with the closeness of the adverb to the verb. I believe that the lack of inversion after these adverbs is due not to their distance from the verb but to the fact that in all likelihood they were stressed. Their stress follows from their semantic content (their inherent emphasis) and their use in the highest S. I will make clear later just what PC stress has to do with inversion.

By the OE period, it is difficult to form a hierarchy of inversion based on the closeness of the adverb head and the verb. (Dahlstedt arrived at the same conclusion for his data). Part of the problem lies in the fact that synonymous heads do not necessarily trigger inversion at the same rates. Thus, be triggers inversion at a much higher rate than the supposedly synonymous after that.
Furthermore, adverbs of different classes, which are likely to have correspondingly different relationships with the verb, sometimes exhibit inverting behavior more similar to each other than to other members of their own class. One example of this is the similarity between nu now and ne, the negative particle. Ne, as the chief indicator of negation, is surely intimately connected to the verb and, we might postulate, is frequently followed by inversion for that reason (ne sometimes inverts even pronoun subjects). Nu, a temporal adverb, is presumably less intimately related to the verb than ne. Unless it is stressed, it is certainly not as integral to the meaning of the clause as the negation. Yet, the inversion behavior of nu is more like that of ne than of such temporal adverbs as in the same year or after that, etc., for nu, like ne, sometimes inverts pronoun subjects.

I cite here further examples of differences and similarities in inverting behavior among various adverb types from the A Ms. Temporal and locative adverb phrases, both of which are frequent in the Chronicle, have an interesting difference in inverting effect. Out of 30 instances of preposed locatives (single word and phrasal) all but two (94%) are followed by inversion. Out of 110 instances of single and phrasal preposed temporal adverbs (excluding ba and her clauses) 71% (78) are followed by inversion. Out of 13 instances of preposed indirect objects, all are pronominal and 10 (76%) are followed by inversion. Thematic heads (excluding her and ba)
account for 99% (126) of all inversions, all except 2 instances of ne. Though non-thematic PC's in other prose are followed by inversion, such inversions are always outnumbered by inversions after thematic PC's. Thus, thematicity of the PC more than the semantic class of adverb is correlated with the occurrence of inversion. However, it should be noted that in the OE data, thematicity is to some extent correlated with adverb type. The locative and temporal adverbs of OE prose are usually thematic. On the other hand manner adverbs (e.g., simle continuously) are more likely to be non-thematic. Further, it should be emphasized that we have to do only with a tendency for thematic PC's to trigger inversion. It should be remembered that, for example, 29% of the thematic preposed temporal adverb phrases are not followed by inversion.

Finally, the behavior of ba + Adv. could also be cited as evidence that the length of the head has to do with the inversion rule. The argument is that while ba always triggers inversion, the combination ba + Adv. occurs both with VS and SV orders.

VS: (54) Ond ba sona aefer baem on þys gere for se here of Wirheale...
And then soon after that in this year went the host from W...
(ASC A 895.1)

SV: (55) ba sona eft Gode Fultomiendum he meahte geseon then soon afterwards, by God's help, he could see
(ASC A 797)

(56) ba þy ilcan geare Ealhere mid Cantwarum & Huda mid S. gefuhton...
then in that same year E. with the C. and H. with the S. fought (ASC A 853)

However, I believe that this contrast is caused not by the longer length of *ba + Adv. but by an overlap in the domain of two parts of the OE inversion rule. One part inverts all subjects after *ba; the other inverts a subject after all preposed constituents except *ba and ne only if the subject meets certain prerequisites for inversion which will be defined below. With the head *ba + Adv. there was an apparent variability as to which of the two parts of the rule applied. Hence, sometimes this head is treated like *ba and sometimes like other heads.

My conclusion then is this: In OE narrative prose of the years 891-1000 the inversion rule is not tied to the length of the head. If the length of the head was ever a part of the inversion rule it was so in the pre-OE period. Similarly, any relation between inversion and the degree of intimacy between the head and the verb has largely been grammaticized, such that one type of adverb (e.g., *neu) may trigger inversion more like an adverb of a different type (e.g., *ne) than like other adverbs of its own class (e.g., *ba or phrasal temporal adverbs).

Further, synonymous or near synonymous heads (presumably having the same degree of intimacy) triggered disparate frequencies of inversion (the exception to this being the lack of inversion after the long conjunctive adverbs). As we will see, a constraint not based on the length of the head or on the connection of the head and the verb controls inversion in OE.
However, we must postulate the obligatory application of inversion in a few circumstances and in each of these a specific head must be mentioned in the rule: after *ba*, in the main clause of a pair of correlative clauses and after existential / presentative there (to be discussed below).

**THE VERB IN OE INVERTED SS**

Next we turn to a discussion of the verb in XVS and SVO Ss. Specifically, we ask the question: did OE have a rule inverting some verbs as opposed to other verbs?

The Parker Ms. has a diverse list of verbs occurring in inverted Ss. There are action verbs and stative verbs; transitive and intransitive verbs; active and passive verbs; simple and complex verbs, consisting of an auxiliary and an infinitive. Some examples of these verb types follow:

**ACTION VERB / STATIVE VERB:**

(57) Her cuom AElle on Breten lond.
    Here came A to B land. (ASC A477)

(58) *ba* saeton hie *bone* winter aet Cwatbrycge
    then remained they at C the winter (ASC A896.21)

**TRANSITIVE/INTRANSITIVE**

(59) Her nom Beorhtric cyning Offan dohtor
    Eadburge
    Here took B king 0's daughter E. (ASC A787)

(60) Her for se ilca here innan Mierce to
    Snotengaham.
    Here went the same host into M to S
    (ASC A868)
PASSIVE

(61) Her wearp Ceolwulf his rices besciered.  
Here was C of his kindom deprived  
(ASC A821)

(62) & þy ilcan geare waes gecored AEþelheard  
abbud to bisc  
& in that same year was appointed A abbot to  
bishop  
(ASC A790)

COMPOUND VERB

(63) Nu sceal beon aefre on Ii abbod & na biscop  
& þan  
Now shall be ever on I. abbot and not bishop  
& to him  
skulon beon under deodde ealle Scotta  
biscopas...  
shall be subject all Scottish bishops.  
(ASC A565)

A study of the verbs occurring in OE inverted Ss makes it  
even more difficult to apply Bean's new/consecutive event cat­  
egories to the inverted verbs that we find. It is true that  
the Chronicle is filled with action verbs; it is, after all,  
mostly a tale of people and what they did. For this reason  
many inverted Ss do signify new events, new happenings. How­  
ever, it is misleading to focus on these verbs to the exclu­  
sion of inverted verbs which appear to have nothing to do with  
new/consecutive events. For example,

(64) From frymþe middangeardes oþ þis gear waeron  
agan  
From the beginning of the world to this year  
were
Compound verbs appear to function in inverted Ss in the same way as simple verbs. Generally, however, the parts of the compound are separated, with the auxiliary occurring before the subject and the participle or infinitive at the end. This Ms. shows 24 separated inverted verbs and 6 unseparated inverted verbs.

**SEPARATED AUX. + INFINITIVE/PARTICIPLE**

(66) þær wearþ se cyning Bagseg ofslaegen
there was the king B slain (ASC A871.13)

(67) æfter was þæt lond nemned Natan leaga on
Cerdicesford
after was that land called N. as far as C.

(ASC A508)

**UNSEPARATED AUX. + INFINITIVE/PARTICIPLE**

(68) Her waes gehadod Beorn mod bisc to Hrofes ceastre
Here was consecrated B bishop to H.

(ASC A802)

(69) & waes todaeled in foreweardum Danieles dagum in tua
& was divided in the early days of D. into two
discira WestSeaxna lond
dioceses the W. S. land (ASC A709)

No differences in the types of heads used with these compound verbs and those used with simple verbs are evident.
In regard to the verb, SVO clauses show the same characteristics as XVS clauses do. The same verbs readily occur in both orders. Compound verbs in SVO order are usually unseparated, however; this Ms. has 17 unseparated and 6 separated compound verbs in SVO order.

**UNSEPARATED**

(70) & wunderleca naedran waeron gesewene on S u J )
Seaxna lond
& strange adders were seen in S.S. land

*(ASC A773)*

**SEPARATED**

(71) Her Ceadwalla ongan aefter rice winnan
Here C. began for the kingdom to contend

*(ASC A685)*

My analysis of the semantic content of the verbs in XVS and XSV order points to a strong tendency to use XVS order with presentative and existential verbs. Hence, *appear, come,* and existential *be* very often, but not always, have XVS order.

**VS:**

(72) Her oþiewde read Cristed mael on hefenum
aefter sunnan setlgonge
Here appeared a red cross in the sky after sun set

*(ASC A773)*

(73) Her waes ðaet micle fugla wael.
Here was that great mortality of birds.

*(ASC A671)*

**SV:**

(74) Her cometa se steorra hiene oþiewde
Here the comet star itself showed *(ASC A729)*
A synod was at C.

Some distinctions between the OE and the Modern English rules of inversion should be noted. First, in Modern English semi-inversion is controlled by the particular choice of head, but not by the form of the verb, i.e., whether the verb is simple or compound. Hence, the rule describing semi-inversion must mention which kind of head occurs, but need not mention the form of the verb. Depending upon which head is used semi-inversion may or may not be obligatory. In OE the rule describing semi-inversion need not mention the particular head, other than to say that one occurs, but it must mention the presence of an auxiliary. The rule optionally applies whenever an auxiliary is present.

Second, the class of verbs that occurs in full inversion and the class in semi-inversion clauses only partially overlap in Modern English, as we saw in Chapter 1. In fact, the class of verbs commonly used in full inversion clauses is quite small. In OE, however, the two classes overlap completely. Full inversion is not confined to presentative verbs, as these examples readily show.

(76) Her swealt Herodus from his selfum ofsticod
    Here died H. by himself stabbed. (ASC A3)

(77) Her prowade Scoe Albanus mr.
    Here suffered martyrdom St. A, the martyr
    (ASC A283)

To summarize, we can answer the question posed above whether OE inversion applied to a specific type of verb. The
answer is an unqualified no. Inversion applies to verbs of varying semantic categories and of varying syntactic and morphological forms. However, an inverted verb differs from a verb in non-inverted order by virtue of its markedness. And since markedness and contrastiveness in word order are related to stress, an inverted verb surely had the potential for being more stressed than a non-inverted verb.

We now turn to the role of the subject in inverted Ss since neither the head nor the verb can predict when inversion occurs. In the next section we ask the question: what (if any) are the constraints on subjects occurring in inverted as opposed to non-inverted clauses?

**THE SUBJECT IN INVERTED CLAUSES**

One potential constraint has already been dismissed as illusory—the definite subject constraint. With the single exception of the existential *there*-Ss, which in the Parker Ms. have only indefinite subjects, definite and indefinite subjects alike occur in inverted clauses.

**DEFINITE SUBJECT:**

(78) þaes ymb xiii niht gefeaht AEþered cyning 14 days later fought A. king (ASC A871)

(79) Her cuom se here to Readingum on West Seaxe Here came the host to R. in WS. (ASC A871)

**INDEFINITE SUBJECT:**

(80) þaer was ungemetlic wael geslaegen Norþanhyymbra there was a very great slaughter of Northumbrians (ASC A867)
Yet another potential constraint is rhythmic and pertains to the length of the subject. Is inversion constrained by the length of the subject alone or by the relative lengths of the subject and the preposed head? As noted above in the critique of Dahlstedt, rhythm alone is not very helpful in describing or explaining OE inversion. However, we do find some variations in the frequency of inversion that correlate with the length of the subject.

The Parker Chronicle contains 150 inverted clauses (excluding negative clauses) with a single word head (usually monosyllabic) and a single word or minimally modified (article or numeral) subject. Contrasting with this, there are only 37 inverted clauses with a single word head and a longer subject. When we consider complex (phrasal) heads and single word subjects we find 57 inverted clauses compared to 44 inverted clauses with complex heads and long subjects. However, these statistics are misleading. In particular, the group of inverted Ss having single word heads and single word subjects is highly inflated by inverted ba + V + Pronoun Subject clauses, by the propensity for single word (proper name) subjects during the entire Chronicle, and by the frequent occurrence of the subject se here the host.

But a similar situation is encountered when one excludes ba clauses and considers other single word heads and subjects of varying lengths. For example, between the years 1-601 there
are 73 instances of clauses beginning with monosyllabic adverbs her, par, and mu. Pronoun subjects were not frequent during these years, so will not inflate the SV category for short subjects. The following head-subject combinations are found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SV ORDER</th>
<th>SV ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short intro. + short S + V</td>
<td>Short intro. + long S + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 instances</td>
<td>36 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS ORDER</td>
<td>VS ORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short intro + V + short S</td>
<td>Short intro + V + long S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 instances</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results suggest that rhythm was certainly not an inviolable factor in the inversion rule. However, even without the influence of ba clauses, we see that long subjects are inverted less often than short subjects after short PC's. Thus, short PC inversions tend to be balanced; long PC inversions show no such tendency. But again, the most we can speak of are tendencies toward certain rhythmic patterns. In these regards rhythm appears to play a similar role in both OE and Modern English. Certain rhythmic patterns are preferred, but rhythm alone falls short of providing a description of inversion.

One constraint on inverted subjects that does exist has already been referred to several times—a pronoun subject constraint. This constraint says that in all inverted clauses except those with preposed ba and ne the subject must be other than a personal pronoun. Clauses with personal pronoun subjects generally have SV order even when another constituent
is preposed.

(82) þa eft æfter þam on þam ilcan geare ... he het a
then afterwards in the same year ... he had
timbran þa burg æt Wiginga mere.
built the fortress at W. (ASC A921.2)

(83) by ilcan geare hie sealdon anum unwisum cyninges
in the same year they gave to a foolish king the
Miercna rice to haldanne.
government of the kingdom of M. (ASC A874.6)

(84) þar he rested mid manegum halgum.
there he rests with many holy men (ASC A565.11)

To improve upon the description of OE inversion we have to
turn to an analysis of the discourse environment of the inver­
sions and the thematicity of the subject. It is here that we
can see the factors that control most of OE inversion. First,
however, a few remarks about thematicity and topicality are in
order.

As noted in Chapter 1, thematicity pertains to the distinc­
tion between old/new, known/unknown information while topical­
ity pertains to what is being talked about in the discourse.
In Modern English the constraints on full inversion can be des­
cribed in terms either of topicality or of thematicity of the
subject. In general (with the exceptions noted in Chapter 1),
full inversions have athematic, atopical subjects.

Subjects which are thematic and/or are previous topics
(previously introduced into the discourse) generally are invert­
ed only when the subject is out of the reader's/ hearer's mind
--- at a considerable though unquantified "distance" away from the reintroduction by inversion. In this section we will look at OE inversions to see whether and how thematicity and/or topicality of the subject controls the occurrence of inversion.

Since the relation of thematicity and topicality to various syntactic rules conceivably can change over time, it is not necessary to assume OE inversion was constrained by these factors or that it was constrained in the same way. An investigation of what constraints did exist requires a fine analysis of the discourse environments and functions of inverted Ss in OE.

First, it is necessary to reiterate that OE is an SV language and that XVS order is a marked order: it is less frequent and more constrained. SV order has a well-established purpose—it is the order of thematic subjects and hence it is also the order of clauses with pronominal subjects, as these are generally thematic. SVO order can also be used with athematic subjects.

XVS order contrasts with SVX. From the fact that XVS is a contrastive marked order we can infer that the constituents moved out of unmarked position in the S were especially emphatic, in particular, the subject and the verb. But we can go further than saying XVS is the order of heightened emphasis, for we can define the conditions under which emphasis by inversion was allowed and in so doing we can establish what was emphatic.
Let us exclude from this discussion inversions with *ba* (or *ba* + another adverb) and *ne* heads. (For discussion of *ba* and *ba* + adverb see p.135). We have already seen that there is a syntactic basis for putting these inversions in a class by themselves, namely, they invert pronoun subjects. In addition, inversion after *ba* in main clauses is obligatory. There is no *a priori* reason to assume (as is the case in every other study of OE that I am aware of) that all inversions functioned in the same way. We will see that *ba* and *ne* inversions in fact did function differently from other inversions.

Consider the following short discourses:

(87) Her Wulfred aercebisc mid bledsunge þæs papan Leon
Here W. archbishop with the blessing of Pope L.

hwearf eft to his agnum biscardome; & þe geare gehergade
returned to his bishopdom; & in that year harried

Ecgbræıt cyning on West Walas from easteweardum of weste wearde.
E, king in WW from east to west (ASC A 813)

(88) Her Ceorl aldormon gefeaht wiþ hæþene men mid Defena
Here C. aldorman fought against the heathen men
with the men of D

scire æt Wicganbeorge & þeer micel wæl geslogon &
at W & there made great slaughter &

sige namon; & þe lican geare AEþelstan cyning & Ealchere
won the victory & in that same year A king and E.
dux micelne here ofsligon aet Sondmic on Cent...
& by
a great host destroyed at S on C & in
ilcan geare cuom feorde healfhund scipa on Temesemutan
that same year came 350 ships on the T... (ASC 851)

(89) Her for se here up on long Maese feor on Fronclond
Here went the host up along the M. far into F
& þæer saet an gear & by ilcan geare for AElfred
& sat one year & in that same year went A.
cyning mid scipum ut on sae.
kıng with ships out to sea. (ASC A882)

In these examples the inverted S (Underlined) introduces an
athematic subject into the discourse.

Each of these athematic subjects is a potential new topic.
In some cases the athematic subjects become the new topic
(88) and (89). In other cases, the inverted subject does not
become the new topic, for example (87) where the inverted S
ends the discourse and in the following examples where the
topic does not shift after the inverted S, i.e., the old topic
is continued in the third S.

(90) On þyssum geare waes se king Henri on Cristes tyde
In this year was the king H. at Christmas
aet Dunestaple & þæer comen þes eorles sandermen
at D. & there came messengers from the earl
of Angeow to him & þeonen he ferde to W...
of A. to him & thence he went to W... (ASC E1123)

(91) & Rodberd archb & Ulf b gewendon ut aet AEstgeate..
Robert archbishop & U. went out by the East gate
& weard him þær on anon unwraeste scipe & ferde him
& was to him (Robert) an unseaworthy ship & he went
on an ofer sae & forlet his pallium.
oversea & forsook his pallium. (ASC E1052.57)

This type of inversion exists in Modern English, too, along with inversions introducing a potential topic that becomes the new topic after the inversion, as in (91a):

(91a) In this year king Henry was at D. over Christmas.
There came some messengers from the eorl.
They stayed with the king & eventually joined him in battle against the eorl.

As far as I can see, there was no way in OE for the hearer/reader to tell what the topic of the S following the inversion will be: the new one or the continuation of the old. This particular ambiguity remains in Modern English.

Instances of inversion where the subject becomes the new topic I call topic shift inversions. Inversions introducing potential but unrealized new topics I call (potential) topic introduction inversions or athematic subject inversions when I want to distinguish them from topic shift.

Unlike the above examples, in the following discourses the XVS clauses do not introduce an athematic subject into the discourse.

(91b) þaes ymb iii niht AEbered cyning & AElfred
4 days afterward A. king & A.

his broðor þær micle fierd to Readingum
his brother there great levies to R.
gelaeddon &
led &
wip ðone here ge fuhton & ðaer waes micel
with the host fought & there was
wael geslaegen on gehwæþre hond& AEþelwulf
made great slaughter on either side & A.
aldomon weard ofslaegen & ða Deniscan ahton
ealdorman was slain & the Danes had
wael stowe gewald; & ðaes ymþ iii niht
possession of the place of slaughter & 4 days
afterward
gefeah AEbered cyning & AElfred his broþur wip
fought A. king & A his brother against
alne ðone here on AEcesdune
all the host at A. (ASC A 871.4)
(91c) ...ðaes ðpres ðone maestan dael hie geridon &
him
of the others the greater part they reduced to
to gecirdon buton þam cyninge AElfrede & he
submission except king A. & he
lytle werede unieþelice aeþer wudum for &
with a small company with difficulty through
woods went &
on morfaestenum; & ðaes iican wintra waes
in inaccessible places in marshes & that same win-
ter was
Inwaæres broþur & Healfdenes on West Seaxum
a brother of I & H in Wessex
on Defenascire mid xxii scipum & hiene mon
in D. with 23 ships & he was
In these passages the two occurrences of the underlined subject appear to be separated by an *intervening topic*. That is, there has been a *switch* in the topic since the first mention of the subject and hence I call these *topic switch inversions*. Thus, in (91c) the topic is *Ælfræd*, then switches to *bropur of I & II* and then switches back to *Ælfræd*. This topic switch use of inversion is quite different from the use of inversion found in Modern English, for in Modern English the subject of a full inversion is generally one that is out of the reader/speaker's mind, i.e., is a first mention subject or is at least at a greater discourse distance from its prior mention than the subjects of inversions (91b) and (91c).

OE presents two special difficulties regarding the determination of topic switch inversion. One is that many of the switches are so rapid that it is difficult to determine whether or not a new intervening topic occurs and the other is that topics are often introduced and then switched so rapidly that it is difficult to determine whether a topic has been established *prior* to the *intervening* topic. In other words, given the clause sequence $S_1V, S_2V, VS_1$ it is difficult to determine the topicality of $S_1$ and $S_2$. This is especially a problem in the early
Chronicles. Consider the following passages:

(92) Æaes ymb xiii niht gefeaht AEbered cyning & AElfred
14 days later fought A. king & A.

his brōber wib þone here aet Basengum. Þar Þar
his brother against the host at B. There the
Denescan sige namon & Æaes ymb ii monah gefeaht
Danes won & 2 months later fought

Æbered cyning & AElfred his brōber wib þone here
aet Meretune
A. king & A. his brother against the host at M.

(ASC A871.19)

(93) Her Cenwalh gefeaht in Eastron on Posentesbyrg &
Here C fought at Easter at P. &
gehergeade Wulfhere Pending of AEscesdune &
Cuþred
harried W. son of P as far as A & C.
Cuichelming & Coenbryht cyning on anum geare
son of C & C king in one year died

forþferdun & on Wiht gehergade Wulfhere Pending
& on W. harried W. son of P.

(ASC 661)

(94) waes Haesten þa þaeer cumen mid his herge, þe aer
aet
had H. then there come with his host, which
before

Middetune saet & eac se micla here waes þa þaeer to
at M was & also the great host had then there
cumen, þe aer on Limene mūpan saet aet Apuldre;
haefde
come which before on the mouth of the L sat at A;
had
Haesten aer gewroht þæt geweorc aet Beamfleote
H. before built that fort at B. (ASC 894.35)

In these passages just one main clause separates the inverted clause from a prior clause with the same subject. These passages have at least intervening potential topics or secondary topics occurring in the subject position, a position strongly associated with the topic.

For now I will use the term topic switch to refer to both inversion types (91b) - (92b) and (92) - (94). This will circumvent the problem of having to ascertain whether and when an OE reader / writer would find the intervening material disparate and/or well-established enough to constitute a break in the old topic. It is most difficult to apply the Modern English rule for topic determination (in the Kantor sense): a topic occurs in two or more adjacent or near adjacent clauses. If this rule were strictly adhered to, much of OE discourse would have no topics. However, I use the term topic slightly differently than it has been applied to Modern English. In particular, topic can refer to what one S, as well as 2 or more Ss, is about. This change is necessitated by the fact that some sub-paragraph discourse units in the Chronicle appear to be just one clause in length. For example, the intervening S in (93) (about C & C) seems to be a sub-paragraph discourse unit by itself and seems to cause a complete though brief break in the topic Wulfhere.

According to this analysis, then, a topic switch inversion could have the form: \( S_1V, S_2V, VS_1 \) where the first instance
of topics $S_1$ and $S_2$ occurs in just one clause each. Thus, the term **topic switch inversion** is used here both for inversions of what in Modern English could be called **established topics** (AEbered & AElfred in (91b) and AElfred in (91c)) and of less established but highly potential topics (A & A, Wulfere, and Haesten in (92) - (94). The use of **topic switch** to refer to the inversion of **interrupted potential** topics pertains to **potential topics** which were the **subjects** before the interruption, since the subject position is most clearly associated with a high degree of potential or established topicality.

The chief point of the term **topic switch inversion** is that an inversion of a very recently mentioned and/or well-defined but **interrupted** subject/topic occurs to some degree and the problem of determining whether the inversions are interrupted by new/or potential topics is a problem of categorizing the data regarding topicality. The categorization system is important and I hope to refine it in the future. However, disagreement with my categorization of the data is, as we will see below, fortunately not a serious problem because OE also had (topical) **subject shifted subject inversions**, a category to which inversions (92) to (94) belong regardless of the status of the intervening material. Whether topic switch type (91b) and (91c) (rapid switches) occurs seems to depend on the type and semantic content of the prose. The early Chronicles tend toward minimal development of topics, and brief topic interruptions of totally new material.
In general I use the term topic switch only if there is just one primary or secondary topic that intervenes between the two occurrences of another topic. When more than one topic intervenes I call the inversion a recent mention subject inversion. However, in cases where more than one potential or established topic intervenes but the intervening clauses are very short and the total interruption relatively brief I bend my rule slightly and call these topic switch inversions also. In these cases (cf., ASC 871.8) the term topic switch best describes the overall structure of the discourse. In this chapter all topic switches of the type in (92 to 94) where the topic interruptions are relatively brief, are pointed out, since these differ most strikingly from the Modern English uses of inversion.

Still another type of OE inversion is indicated in the next passages:

(95) se eorl innon Normandig aefter þison mid þam cynge the duke of N. after this with the king of France & mid eallon þan þe hi gegaderian mihton of F. & with all that they gather could went ferdon towards O. where the king W. was & þohtan hine inne to besittanne & swa foran od hi and thought to besiege him & so went until they coman to Lungeuile. Þaer weard se cyng of France came to L. There was the king of F.
through intrigue compelled... (ASC E1094)

(96) þa to midde sumeran ferde se cyng ut to Pefensesae
Then at mid summer went the king out to P.
mid eall his fyrde togeanes his broder & his þaeer abad
with all his levies to oppose his brother & for him
ac on mang þison com se earl Rotbert up aet Portesmuð an...
there waited. But meanwhile came duke R.
(his brother) at P. (ASC E1101.9)

(97) and he worhte þa bone man mid his handum and him on
and he made then man with his hands and into him
ableow sawle; forði is se man betera.
blew a soul; therefore is man better...
(AH 16.12)

(98) þa þis cuð waes to þam oðrum scipon þaer se cyng waes
When it was known to the other ships where the king was
hu þa oðre geferdon. waes þa swilc hit eall raedleas
how the other fare was then as if everything
waere & ferde se cyng him ham...
was in confusion & went the king home...
(ASC E 1009.20)

(99) Þises geares wurdon sehte se cyng of Englande

This year were reconciled the king of E
& se
and the
of France & aefter heora sehte acordedan ealles paes
king of F. & after their reconciliation came to agreement
cynges Henriges agene maen wid hine innan Normandige...
all king H.'s own subjects with him in N.
Syddan hereaefter saette se cyng Henrig his castelas...

(ASC E1120.1)

In these passages a noun occurs in a non-nominative case
(or in a subordinate clause) in one clause and in the immediate­
ately following (or in the case of (98) a near adjacent) clause is the subject of an inverted clause. Notice that in
3 instances the non-nominative noun is a pronoun and yet reap­
ppears as an inverted full noun in the following clause
(96), (98), and (99).

One way to explain these inversions (following Kantor)
would be to say that these clause positions do not adequately
define a noun as a potential topic and hence the inversion is
really a kind of topic introduction inversion. This argument
would then force us to view the subject of these inversions as
atopical even though all the subjects occur in the prior
clause. However, such an analysis does not seem plausible
given the cases where non-nominative pronouns occur, for a
noun has to be well-defined before pronominalization can
occur (cf., Kantor, 1977). In addition, it is also implausible
that a direct object (as in (97)) would not be considered sufficiently defined, in the Kantor sense, to be a potential topic.

Now, if we could show with certainty that a non-nomina­tive NP is topical and yet is subsequently an inverted subject, then we have clear proof that OE inversion was not restricted to atopic subjects. Interestingly enough, we do find instances where the non-nominative NP is surely topical and is subsequently inverted:

(100) ða geornde se eorl eft grîdes & grîsla... ða wyrnde him
then required the eorl again protection & hostages...then were refused to him
mann ðera gîsla & sceawed him mann v. nihta grid ð ut
the hostages & was given to him 5 days safe conduct out
of lande to farenne & gewende ða Godwine eorl...
of the country & went then B eorl... (E1048.74)

(101) ða amang ðison ða weard Godwine eorl gewarnod & gewende
Meanwhile was G. eorl warned and sailed
him ða inot Pefenessea & weard ð waeder swide to P. & was the weather so
strang ð ða eorlas ne mihton gewitan hwet Godwine
stormy that the eorls could not find out what to G.
edorl gefaren haefde & gewende ða Godwine eorl
ut agean (ASC E 1052.10)
Notice that in (99) the inverted subject probably is topical also. The King of England in $S_1$ is pronominalized to him in the second S and in the third S is inverted. However, the topic of the first S is a conjoined subject.

We have here instances where the inverted subjects definitely can be considered topical. These instances are not numerous, but that they exist at all is significant. Moreover, we find such instances in sources other than the ASC. I give two examples from the Manual of Astronomy which also show inversion of a topical subject.

(102) Pis is þaes monan gear; ac his monad is mare þe is þonne.
This is the moon's year; but his month is greater that is when
he gecyrd niwe fram þaere sunnan...On þam monde synd
he (moon) returns new from the sun...In the month are
getealde nigon & twentig daga & twelf tida.
þis is se reckoned 29 days & 12 hours. This is the
monelica monad & hyg gear is þe he underyrne ealle þa
lunar month & his year is when he (moon) runs under all
twelf tunglan. On sumum geare byd se mona twelf sidon geniwod...
the 12 signs. In some years becomes the moon
The topic here is the moon. In the clauses of the above passage this topic moon is continued via the following: S1: a genitive; S2: a genitive and the subject of a subordinate clause; S3: Ø; S4: an adjective (lunar); and S5: a genitive and the subject of a subordinate clause. Yet in S6 moon is an inverted subject.

(103) ne byd he naefre niwe ge-teald, þeah de he habbe he (the moon) never new is reckoned although he have 
þreoo & twentig tida aer þan de he became to þam 3 & 20 hours before he comes to the 
aefenne be he onge-scopen waes. Be þysum is (oft) evening on which he was made. Of this is often mycel ymb-spraec, þonne þa laewedan willad habban much discourse when the unlearned will have þone monan be þam þe hi hine ge-seod, & þa the moon as they him see & the 
gelaeredan hine healdad be þisum fore-saadan learned him estimate by this aforesaid ge-sceade. Hwilon byd se mona ontend ofdaere reason. Sometimes is the moon lighted of the 
sunnan on daeg...
sun by day....

Again the topic moon occurs in a non-nominative case in the next to the last S and is inverted in the last S.
It is important to realize that the criteria for subject-shifted topical subject inversions used here are very rigid and conservative. As Kantor (1976) points out, uninterrupted topics can occur in near-adjacent rather than only in adjacent Ss, although I consider here only adjacent S topics. If the criteria for what was topical (but subject shifted) in OE were less rigid, we could find a few more examples of topical shift inversions. However, I believe that when dealing with ancient languages it is better to err on the conservative side rather than on the liberal side in defining one's terms. In the case at hand, I prefer to speak of topical subject inversions only when I believe the inverted subject can indisputably be regarded as topical.

In sum we have observed inverted subjects that are clearly atopical (just like those in Modern English); that are topic switched and/or recently mentioned (thematic); and that are topical. It would appear that there is no way of explaining the functions of all these inversions in terms of topicality or thematicity. I believe, however, that we can describe and explain OE inversion in terms of relative thematicity and especially in terms of the correlate of relative thematicity: relative stress. I now turn to the interrelated problems of describing the function of OE inversion and explaining the occurrence and restrictions on the occurrence of inversion.
We might view thematicity as a continuum at the one end of which are the clearly athematic nouns, such as first mention in a discourse nouns, and at the other end are the clearly topical nouns, such as the pronominalized subject of a S. In between are nouns of varying degrees of thematicity; some are recently mentioned, but not definitely topical; some are recently mentioned but not pronominalizable; some have been introduced before but are probably forgotten by the reader/hearer. As one moves along the continuum from the athematic end to the thematic end the amount of stress a noun receives (at least in non-contrastive, unmarked environments) decreases.

Hence, an athematic NP subject being introduced into the discourse for the first time probably always receives more stress than a non-contrastive pronominal subject. In such a way thematicity and the likelihood of emphasis are inextricably interrelated.

In the preceding examples of OE inversion we saw a range of degrees of thematicity of the inverted subject. However, one generalization we can make is that in all of them the inverted subject is different from the subject of the immediately preceding main clause; in other words the inverted subjects in the above examples are, at the minimum, switched subjects. Subject switch clauses, as opposed to clauses with non-switched subjects (e.g., many pronoun subject clauses) are precisely those clauses in which the subject is a likely or at least a possible candidate for stress. Hence, I suggest
that the function of inversion in these clauses is to stress the subject. Further I suggest that there was a constraint on OE inversion (of the type under discussion here) specifying that the subject of an inverted clause must be stressed. Thus, OE inversion differs from Modern English inversion in that OE inversion stressed the subject while Modern English inversion stresses the topic (i.e., introduces a topic). This is why OE inversions may have topical subjects while Modern English inversions may not. Later we will see that OE sometimes did invert non-subject-shifted subjects and occasionally even personal pronouns. However, I will show that these are infrequent marked inversions which are frequently explainable in terms of special artistic/stylistic effects.

I now turn to a discussion of the relative frequency of the various types of OE inversion. If the proposed hypothesis that inversion stressed the subject is correct, then we could expect to find that inversion occurs most frequently in discourse environments where the subject is most likely to receive the primary stress in the clause and that inversion would occur less frequently in environments in which stress on the subject is less likely and stress on other constituents is more likely. In fact, this is exactly what we find when we look at the relative frequencies of inversion in several works of OE prose³.

³Of the OE prose that I have investigated the early years of the ASC are the most difficult to discuss in terms of units of discourse. This is because the entries are too short to have been uninfluenced by the content of preceding entries (the entries were written centuries after the entry date);
yet, entry initial Ss, mostly beginning with her, can be
inverted regardless of what precedes just as throughout the
later years of the A Chronicle and in the C and E Chronicles.
Thus in a description of the discourse environment of inver-
sions of the early Chronicle it is necessary to note that the
inversion most often occurs in a different year's entry from
the previous occurrence of the noun in question.

I have considered here 150 inversions from the A Ms.,
excluding all inversions with entry initial her, which as
discourse initial clauses are less constrained. Of these,
there are 15 instances (10%) of rapid topic switch type of
inversion. Most notable are the repeated switches of the
entry for the year 871 and the consecutive switches of the
year 894 (line 35ff.). In addition there are 14 (19%) instan-
ces of inversion where the subject is recently mentioned
(thematic) but not in the previous clause: e.g., 885.1 and
886.2 (with a new year intervening). And there are 2 examples
of inversion of a subject that appeared in a non-nominative
clause in the prior S (823, 894.46).

Three percent of these 150 inversions are non-subject
shifted and will be discussed later. This means that (115)
77% of the inversions of the A Ms. have first mention subjects.
However, the A Chronicle is unique among OE prose for the way
in which line after line, historical figures are rapidly intro-
duced and then dismissed. Therefore, for a more accurate and
representative sample of the relative frequencies of inversion
types we must turn to other OE prose.

Here I will only summarize the relative frequencies of
inversion in several other OE sources. Examples and details of
these inversions are given in the discussions of each work in the second part of this chapter.

The following figures exclude there-clauses, ba/bonne clauses, discourse initial her clauses and negative clauses. I also distinguish topic switch examples (such as those in (92) - (94) where the nouns in question are all nominative from examples (such as (95)-(99)) where a noun appears in a non-nominative case in one clause and in the next clause is inverted. It can be argued that these fall under the topic switch or subject switch category; however, I separate them for clarity. The remaining categories that are distinguished are: subject switch (where the inverted subject is clearly topical); and recent mention inversions, where the inverted subject appeared recently in the discourse (and therefore is thematic), but not in the preceding clause or as a switched topic. Previous mention inversions have subjects that are thematic, but occurred relatively far away in the discourse and probably are out of the reader's mind.

In the "Voyages of Othere and Wulfstan" from the Orosius of 19 inversions 2 (11%) are topic switches, one inverted subject is previously mentioned, one is recently mentioned and 15 (79%) of the inversions have first mention subjects.

In the C Ms. of the ASC, there are 67 relevant inversions. This includes 1 instance of a subject shift inversion and 1 instance of an inverted non-subject-shifted noun. There are no topic switch examples like those of (92) to (94). All other inverted subjects are first mention: 62 (93%).

In the Manual of Astronomy are 60 inversions. These include 9 instances of Topic Switch (15%), two instances of subject shift of the type in (103), and there is one recent mention inversion. Excluding these and the non-subject-shifted inversions that I will discuss later, there are 42 first mention subject inversions (70%), a relatively low percentage.
Finally, we look at the frequency of inversion types in one of Aelfric's homilies: "In Die Pentecosten." Out of 24 inversions there is one example of rapid topic switch, one instance where the inverted subject appeared in a non-nom­inative case in the prior S (as a direct object), 3 instances of recently mentioned inverted subjects, 2 instances of the inversion of one member of an immediately preceding con­joined subject and 2 instances of subject switches between the main clause and the subordinate clause. In all, only 54% (13) of inverted subjects are first mention.

In sum, there are substantial differences in the relative frequency of the inversion types among the various prose works. It is interesting to note the types of prose having the most topic and subject switch inversions and inversion of recent mention subjects. Aelfric's homily is written in a highly artistic and intricate prose style and in addition is meant to be recited as a sermon. The Manual of Astronomy is a work of expository prose intended to instruct the reader in astronomy. Perhaps, both of these types of prose would have special need to make clear, and hence stress, the subject of the clause---one for oratorical style and one for clarity of explanation.

From this summary of OE inversions we can see that, as one would predict from the hypothesis that inversion stresses the subject, inversion most frequently occurs with subjects introduced into the discourse for the first time. Inversion to switch topics and to switch subjects are next in frequency.
and the inversion of non-subject shifted subjects occurs, as we will see, in a few quite specific instances.

THE RELATION OF SUBORDINATE AND MAIN CLAUSE SUBJECTS

My data offer few opportunities to investigate the effect on main clause inversions of the content of subordinate clauses. This is because most subordinate clauses occurring in the data are members of correlative pairs in which the main clause subject is inverted after a fronted correlative adverb. There are only rare instances in my data where a subordinate clause intervenes between an inverted subject and prior occurrence of the subject (i.e., a subject switch by means of an intervening subordinate clause) or where a subject of a S-final subordinate clause is inverted in the following main clause (the inversion of an adjacent subject). One such instance occurs at the end of (102) above. Other relevant examples are noted in my descriptions of the individual prose selections.

Emphasis on the subject and the thematicity of the subject are less a concern of subordinate clauses than they are of main clauses (Vennemann, 1971). Therefore it stands to reason that a non-contrastive subject in an unmarked subordinate clause will not receive high stress in the S. This is especially true when the subject of the subordinate clause is pronominal and topical as in the second to the last S of passage (102). As we have seen, OE had a fairly liberal inversion rule in that inversion of the subject (and hence emphasis on the subject) could occur even when the subject was in a variety of positions in the preceding clause, including object position—a relatively emphatic position. Thus, I argue that if inversion (and reemphasis) of a subject could occasionally occur under these circumstances, then it could also occasionally occur when the prior mention of the subject was as the subject of a subordinate clause. In the case of (102) I believe that the S stress falls on the main clause subject his year in the second to the last S, not on the subject of the subordinate clause, he. The final S reintroduces the moon as the shifted subject.

We are now in a position to explain why inversion is so common after thematic fronting. In OE fronting of thematic constituents was very common—more common than in Modern English. Therefore I believe that the fronting of thematic constituents in general resulted in lower stress on the PC than in Modern English. The contrast between OE and Modern English,
I believe, is especially relevant to fronted constituents such as indirect and direct objects, which in Modern English are stressed but which in OE were likely to have been less emphatic than their modern counterparts. If OE preposed thematic constituents were as a whole not highly stressed, clauses with such PC's placed primary stress elsewhere in the clause. A prime candidate for this stress was the subject. For example, when an indirect or direct object is thematic, the subject is likely to be stressed. When the PC is thematic in Ss with intransitive verbs, the subject is again likely to be stressed. Thus inversion, as a means of stressing the subject, was frequent after thematic PC's. Conversely, it was less frequent after non-thematic PC's because non-thematic PC's are more likely to be stressed themselves. Non-thematic PC's are preposed for reasons of emphasis rather than for reasons of thematicity.

However, it is not necessary to suppose that in every inverted clause the subject received primary stress. For example in (102) from MOA it is likely that the last clause places primary stress on the rhematic constituents 12 times new. Yet, by inverting the subject moon, the author reestablishes moon as the subject and gives it greater stress than a non-inverted subject would have.

To summarize this section, I offer the following hierarchy of inversion in OE:

1. Atopical, first mention subjects.
2. Previous mention subjects: thematic but out of the reader's mind

3. Recent mention subjects: thematic, but not topic switched, i.e., not the next to the last topic

3a. In non-nominative case of immediately preceding clause

4. Topic switch: subjects were the next to the last topic

4a. The subject was a potential topic occurring as the subject of its clause

4b. The subject was an unambiguous next to the last established topic

5. Topical subjects: subject shifted

6. Topical subject: nominal: no subject shift

7. Topical subjects: personal pronoun subject

(Number seven contains personal pronouns only. Other pronouns, e.g., demonstratives, one and indefinite relatives can be more readily stressed and are inverted in OE).

As one goes from top to bottom in the hierarchy the subjects become increasingly thematic and increasingly less likely to be stressed. The hierarchy from top to bottom shows roughly decreasing frequency of inversion in OE. It should be noted that my data show more # 6 and # 7 inversions than #5 inversions. However, inversion types # 6 and # 7 have multiple sources. Among the sources I have been able to identify are: non-subject shifted inversions in syntactically parallel Ss, in conjoined subject/non-conjoined subject alternations (see
p. 139, in environments where Ss have different subject quantifiers and in other environments where the inversions are in some way "explainable". Further, a very conservative definition of the subject shift environment (i.e. a conservative definition of what is a topic in OE) also has kept inversion type # 5 a small category. As I noted previously, this conservative definition of what constitutes an uninterrupted topic in OE inflates the category topic switch at the expense of the category subject switch. In Modern English full inversions generally have type # 1 subjects.

**PRONOUNS IN OE DISCOURSE**

As a subject shift system the OE inversion system is incomplete compared to, say, a switch reference system (cf. Jacobsen, 1967). With almost all heads pronoun subjects cannot be inverted. Therefore, these subjects cannot participate in the subject shift system and they cannot show a switched subject by inversion.

Interestingly enough, however, pronoun subjects too exhibit a form of subject switching which enables them to adhere to their SVO order constraint while referentially shifting subjects. The following discourses contain certain examples of pronominal subject switch:

(104) þæs ymb ii monæ gefeæht AEþeræd cyning & AElfred
d&
2 months later fought A. king & A.

his brorur wiþ þone here aet Meretune & hie waerun on
his brother against the host at M. & they (the host) were in
tuaem gefylcium & hie butu gefliemdon...
two divisions & they (A & A) put both to flight.

(ASC A871.23)

(105) by ilcan sumera betwix hlafmaessan & middum sumera
that same summer between Lammas & midsummer
se here braec ðone friþ of Hamtune... & fuhton on þa
the host broke the peace of H. & besieged the
burg ealne daeg & þohton þæt hie hie sceolden abrecan;
fortress all day and thought that they it should take by storm;
ac hie þeah awerede þæt folc þe þær binnan waes ðþ
but they defended it the people inside until
him mara fultum to com & hie forleton þa þa burg
aid came & they (the Danes) gave up the fortress
(ASC A921.5)

(106) Se cyng het hi (Hengest & Horsa) feohtan agien Pihtas
The king ordered them to fight against the P.
& hi swa dydan & sige haefdon swa hwar swa hi comon.
& they (H & H) so did and victory had wherever they came.
Hi ða sende to Angle & heton heom sendan mare fultum...
They (H&H) then sent to the A. & ordered them to send more aid...

Hy ða sendan heom mare fultum.

They (Angles) then sent them more aid.

(ASC 449)

Pronoun subjects, in addition to referring to the subject of a prior sentence, often refer to a noun in an oblique case, usually an object. There are 10 passages of some length in the Parker Ms. where a series of clauses with pronoun subjects are arranged in a pattern such that each subject refers not to the prior subject but to either a new subject or to the subject of the main clause two Ss back.

This curious use of pronouns has previously been termed ambiguous and regarded as proof that OE writers were still in an awkward stage of literary skill (Mitchell, 1968). However, when viewed within their own discourse system, these passages are not ambiguous and each of these discourses is constructed in precisely the same way. Hence, I believe we should entertain the possibility that these passages represent a hybridization of the topical subject SVO order and inversion that is used with pronoun subjects having grammaticized (obligatory) SV order.

UNITS OF DISCOURSE IN OE

XVS order is commonly found in entry initial clauses, i.e., the first clause after a new year is entered, regardless of the subject of the last clause of the prior year's entry. Apparently, each year's entry was regarded as a discrete unit of discourse. The discreteness of each year's entry is also
indicated by the fact that pronouns never refer to antecedent nouns located in a different year's entry.

Paragraphs also were evidently discrete discourse units. Paragraph initial clauses may be XVS Ss having the same subject as the last S of the previous paragraph. Again, pronouns never occur in different paragraphs than their antecedents.

**VSO ORDER**

There are 22 instances of the minor order VSO (inversion but no fronting) in the Parker Ms. Most of these follow the same rules of occurrence as XVS clauses and appear to be an infrequent, possibly stylistic, variant of XVS.

(107) & feng Beorhtwal to þam biscdome
& succeeded B. to the bishopdome (ASC 690)

(108) haefde se cyning his fierd on tu tonumen.
had the king his levies in two divided.
(ASC 894.15)

(109) & waes se cyng þa þider weardes on faere...
& was the king then thither on his way...
(ASC 894.20)

The fact that numerous instances of such V/1 clauses occur in the entry for the year 894, a vivid account of one of King Alfred's battles against the invading Danes, suggests that V/1 was a stylistic variant.

**EXCEPTIONAL XVS CLAUSES**

Excluding þa and ne clauses, there are two types of exceptional XVS clauses, i.e., inversions that are unexpected in terms of the proposed analysis of the function of inversion.
One kind of exceptional clause contains the inversion of a pronoun subject after zero preposing or a preposed constituent other than *ba* or *ne*. This exception occurs only once in the Parker Ms. and will be discussed in greater detail later. It should be noted that this is not a subject switched pronoun, but a topical pronoun.

(110) *haefdon hi hiora onfangen aer Haesten to Beamfleote come...*  
*had they for them stood sponsors before H to B. came*  
*ASC 894.47*

In this particular case, the exceptional clause is found amid a whole series of V/I clauses and thus may be stylistically motivated.

The other type of exceptional clause is slightly more frequent in the Parker Ms., with 4 instances. This clause inverts a subject that is also the subject of the prior clause.

(111) *Her Wulfheard aldorman gefeaht aet Hamtune wiþ xxxiii*  
*Here W. aldorman fought at H. with 33 ship's companies & there made great slaughter & won the victory;*  
*þy geare forþferde Wulfheard...*  
*& that year died W.*  
*ASC A837*

(112) *þa feng AElfred AEþelwulfing his broþur to Wesseaxna*  
*then succeeded A son of A his brother to WS*
rice; & þaes ymb anne monaþ gefeaht ÆElfred

cyning wip

throne; & one month later fought A king against

alne þone here...

all the host...

(ASC 871A.30)

(113a) Pa aefter þam þa giet þaes ilcan haerfestes
gegadorode

Then after that the same autumn gathered

micel here hine of East Englum aegþer ge þaes
landheres

a great host from EE both those native forces
ge þara wicinga þe hie him to fultume
aspanken haefdon

& pirates whom they to their aid had persuaded

& þohton þaet hie sceoldon gewrecan hira

teonum & foron

& they thought that they should avenge their

injuries

to Maeldune & ymb saeton þa burg & fuhton þaer

on oþ

& went to M. & surrounded the fort & fought

there until

þam burg warum com mara fultum to utan to helpe &
to the fort had come more aid from without to

help &

forlet se here þa burg...

abandoned the host the fort...

(ASC A921.48)
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(113b) He (AEbelwulf cyning) þa swa dyde & mid fierde for
He then so did & with his levies went
ofor Mierce on NorþWalas & hie him alle gehiersume
over M. into N. & they made them all obedient
dydon & þy ilcan geare sende AEbelwulf cyning AElfred
to him & in that same year sent A.king A.

his sunu to Rome
his son to Rome (ASC A853)

Although it is not immediately evident in the first two examples, this type of inversion appears to be used to achieve specific stylistic/ artistic effects in some of its occurrences. For example, in (113a) the VS clause reintroduces the subject noun after a series of subject-deleted clauses. In addition, in the whole paragraph in which the above passage is located there are 7 V/I clauses out of a total of 10 main clauses. Later, we will encounter several other exceptions that also appear to be motivated by these same two factors—- a reintroduction of the antecedent of numerous deletions or pronominalizations and structural (syntactic) symmetry. In highly artistic OE prose
we will encounter sequences of between two and four consecutive clauses with identical syntactic structure having a marked rhythmic effect. Example (113b) is a variant of another common exceptional inversion type: the inversion of one member of a previously occurring conjoined subject. The inverted member is reintroduced into the discourse as a subject/topic in its own right. In (113b) the subject of the third S (AEbelwulf) is reintroduced as the sole subject after being incorporated into a plural subject in the prior S.

It is possible that the other two unexpected inversions above are motivated by the semantic content of the passages. In each case the subject of the inverted clause may be stressed more than the normal topical subject because the author wants to emphasize the unexpectedness of what the subject did: that Wulfheard died just when he was having such great success against the invading enemy and that within a month of assuming the throne Alfred was already taking on the entire host. I suggest that non-subject shifted inversions in OE may have been used similarly to cleft Ss in Modern English; and one month later it was King Alfred who fought against all the host.... Cleft sentences, which apparently did not occur in their
modern form in OE, can occur with a topical subject when the subject is stressed as in (113c):

(113c) Then F.D.R., who was originator of the modern relationship between government and the individual, became president. Roosevelt was the first president to realize that the social services being provided by the federal government were inadequate. And it was Roosevelt who urged Congress to pass the first legislation against harmful environmental practices.

This is precisely the function that I am suggesting for the inversions (111) to (112).

THERE CLAUSES AND NEGATIVE CLAUSES

Let us now turn to an examination of how there Ss and negative Ss fit into the discourse system of OE. It has been observed previously (e.g., Breivik, 1977) that the use of there in OE and the use of there in Modern English do not always coincide. Below are some Ss in which the use of there differs in OE and Modern English.

Following others, I use there to mean locative there and there\textsubscript{2} to mean existential/presentative there.

ABSENCE OF THERE IN OE WHEN REQUIRED IN MODERN ENGLISH

(114) Nu sceal beon aefre on Ii abbod. 
Now shall be ever on Ii an abbot. (ASC A565)
(115) Her micel waelfill waes aet Woddesbeorge.
Here great slaughter was at W. (ASC A592)

(116) & senoþ waes aet Clofeshoo
& a synod was at C. (ASC A822)

PRESENCE OF THERE WHERE IT DOES NOT OCCUR IN MODERN ENGLISH

(117) Eac þæer leornode on þære ylcan scole se æделa
Also there learned at that same school
Gregorious
G. (Aelfric, Lives of Saints, cited in Brevik, p. 343)

In the following Ss, however, the use of there in Old and Modern English is the same:

(118) þæer weart micel gefeohht
there was a great battle (ASC A800)

(119) þæer waeron Frisam mid
there were F. with (him) (ASC A885.21)

(120) þæer weart monig mon ofslaegen
there were many men slain (ASC A853.10)

In OE both there1 and there2 frequently occur in clause initial position followed by inversions. There1 however, is much more mobile and does not require inversion.

(121) & þone here þæer metton on þam geweorce
& the host there met in the fortification
(ASC A868.6)

(122) & saeton þæer an geard
& remained there one year
(123) & his se cyning ðæer onfeng æt fulwihte
& to him the king there stood sponsor at
baptism  (ASC A 878.25)

Both kinds of there can invert following ba or ne:

(124) ne wearþ ðæer forþon an Bret to lafe
there was not one Briton left. (ASC A491)

(125) ðæ laeg ðæer an micel ae up in þæt land
then lay there a great river up in that land
(Or. 248.20)

(126) ne bið ðæer naenig ealo gebrown mid ðærum
there was no ale brewed among the E.
(Or. 254.7)

When there is used in the same clauses in both Old and
Modern English, it appears to function identically. In such
Ss there is used as a marker of the existential S. However,
unlike Modern English OE existential clauses did not require a
there or inversion. There does not occur unless no other
constituent including the subject occupied the position before
the verb, hence existential Ss of the type (116).

Even in early OE (e.g., Orosius) there could be used in
addition to another preposed constituent.

(127) On þæum dagum ðæer waeron two cwena...
In that day there were two queens...
(Or. 46.36, also cited in
Breivik, p. 340)

Existential inverted Ss with or without there differ in
one important way from other inverted OE Ss. Since existen-
tial Ss assert the existence of something or someone, an
athematic subject is required. A subject-shifted subject is not "new enough" for an existential S, since the referent of the subject is already known to exist. In other words, existential Ss have a greater minimal discourse distance requirement than other types of OE inverted clauses.

In sum, there was obligatorily inserted in clause initial position when no other constituent was preposed and was optionally inserted when another constituent was preposed, regardless of the semantic nature of the verb (cf. (117)). The primary function of there was as a marker of an existential S, a S asserting the existence or presence of something or someone. It appears, from (117), that there could transform even a S with a non-existential/presentative verb into a S having existential meaning. We will see that this hypothesis is confirmed by the data on there from other sources of OE.

Inversion in Ss headed by the negative particle ne is very common in OE:

VS: (128) ne com se here oft or eall ute of þæm setum...
the host didn't come all out of those camps
(ASC A894.17)

(129) Naefde se here...Angelcyn ealles for swide gebrocod
the host had not the English people utterly crushed
(ASC A897.5)

SV: (130) forþæm hie ðaer sittan ne mehton
because they there remain could not
(ASC A895)

Inversion of personal pronoun subjects after ne is inconsistent
but occurs throughout the OE period. Ne appears to have inverting behavior between that of ba and that of other preposed heads. However, there is a tendency not to invert the subject when the subject is a personal pronoun (cf., 130). This tendency is evident in much of OE literature and as a result, ba and bonne are the only heads which are totally insensitive to the subject in regard to inversion.

THE ROLE OF PA IN THE OE SYSTEM OF INVERSION

In this chapter I have analyzed inversion in the earliest section of the ASC. I have found that there is one general constraint delimiting the occurrence of nearly all inversions and that this constraint has to do with emphasis on the subject.

However, except to say that it is outside the subject shift/topic shift system, I have not discussed the role of ba + VS in OE. Pa (and the apparently synonymous bonne) is the head most often triggering inversion in all styles of OE prose. Some (e.g. Foster, 1975) believe that ba was quite meaningless --- a marker of consecutive action and not much more. I tend to agree with this view, for it is difficult to see how an adverb used so frequently and in so many different environments could have much semantic content.

Inversion after ba is almost totally insensitive to the thematicity of the subject. The inverted subjects frequently are pronominal or nominal with no subject shift. When ba occurs in combination with another adverb (e.g., ba to foran Xpres 'then before Christmas'; ba aefter bam paes 'then after that'), the subject does have a role in determining the
occurrence of inversion. Namely, pronounal subjects are
never inverted, although nominal subjects with no subject
shift can be. I have suggested that this is the result of a
grammaticalization of variability in the application of the OE
inversion rule. When  ba + another adverb occurred, the
structural description for both ba inversion and common
(PC other than ba) inversion was met. Under these circum­
cstances variability as to which type of inversion was allowed
could have arisen. It is not surprising that the sequence
*ba + adverb + V +Pro S was NOT allowed since the uninverted
Adv + Pro S of this sequence was analagous to the obligatory
straight order of # Adv + Pro S.On the other hand, ba +
Adv. + V. + Nominal S was similar to the sequence # Adv +
V + Nom S (no subject shift), an allowable inversion. Thus, it
is not surprising that this ba inversion was also allowed.

The first problem with ba clauses is in determining what
was stressed. This problem is especially difficult in the
numerous ba clauses with pronominal subjects. One possibility
is that ba was stressed, emphasizing the consecutive nature of
the clause (And then...). Another possibility is that the
verb was stressed (or at least relatively more stressed than
the subject). A third possibility is that the subject was
stressed sometimes (presumably when athematic) and otherwise
the stress was elsewhere. There is no independent way of deter­
mining the location of the stress. I believe that ba
clauses generally stressed the consecutiveness of a verb, and
since consecutiveness entails an action or a resultant state
the verb probably was stressed. Evidence for this view
comes from the consistently inseparable ba + V pattern (i.e.,
no constituent comes between ba and the V), such that ba and
the V function as a unit. On the other hand, when another
constituent intervened, ba + V no longer function as a unit
and exhibit less inversion, particularly with pronominal
subjects. The proposed stress pattern would clearly contrast
with that of other inversions in which primary stress would
fall on an athematic or subject-shifted subject.

However, in those ba/bonne clauses which have presentative/
existential verbs and first mention subjects, the presentative
character surely signaled that the subject was to be stressed.
For example:

(131) þonne is an port.
    then is a port
    (Or. 252.4)

(132) þa waes him on þaet baecbord Denamearc
    Then was on his left D.    (Or. 252.19)

In sum, I suggest that the stress in ba clauses was variable;
usually on the verb except where primary stress on some other
constituent, such as the subject, is unambiguously indicated.

PART 2: A SURVEY OF OTHER OE LITERATURE

In this section the proposed hypotheses are tested
against the data of other OE prose works. In the first part I
examine a section of Orosius, a piece of narrative prose
approximately cotemporaneous with the A. Chronicle, and the C
Ms. of the ASC, an example of late OE narrative prose. In the
second part I compare inversion in narrative prose with inversion in other, non-narrative, types of prose.

OROSIUS

The Orosius is a translation by King Alfred of a Latin original. From a linguistic point of view the most interesting part of the Orosius is a section describing the Voyages of Othere and Wulfstan, a tale not translated and apparently told firsthand to Alfred. It is this part of the Orosius that we will mostly be concerned with here.

In this passage there are 51 instances of inversion and inversion is as common here as it was in the Parker Ms. Inversion with *ba* regardless of the subject is frequent (9 instances); however, *ba* is now matched in popularity by *bonne* which also translates as 'then' and functions exactly like *ba*. There are no exceptional inversions of either type.

There are numerous instances of the fronting of locative prepositional phrases with subsequent inversion both in the Voyages and in the rest of the Orosius.

(133) wið suðan þone Sciringes-heal fyld sryde mycel sae up

to the south of S. flows a very great sea up

(Or. 252.12)

(134) on þæm landum eardodon Engle

in that land live the E. (Or. 252.23)

(135) on aelcere byrig bið cyningc.

in every town is a king (Or. 254.5)

Since many of these fronted prepositional phrases move
the reader along from one sight to the next, one country to another, they often have the function of getting rid of the old topic and introducing a new one. This is quite different from the use of temporal preposings in the Chronicle in which often the same PC is repeated in several consecutive clauses. The results are some very modern-looking inversions, which are of course, only a small subset of all possible OE inversions.

There is one phenomenon in the Orosius that we have not yet discussed: inversion in subordinate clauses. Inversion in subordinate clauses is quite rare throughout OE. In fact, the SVO order is a distinguishing characteristic of the subordinate clause in correlative clauses. Occasionally, however, we do meet with inversion in subordinate clauses, such as in this relative clause and that complement.

(136) þara waeron syx stael-hrana.
    of which were six decoy reindeer (Or. 250.7)

(137) þæt þær sceal aelcer gedeodes man beon for-
     baerned
    that there shall men of all languages be
     burned (Or. 254.38)

Examples of topic switch inversions are found in 254.31 and 250.37. Inversion of prior mention subjects (1 instance) and of recent mention subjects (1 instance) are insignificant.

In sum, our hypothesis concerning the nature and use of inversion in OE is fully supported by the data from the Voyages.
THE C MS. OF THE ASC

The C Ms. contains 83 instances of inversion, 33 with preposed ba, 4 with preposed her and the rest with the same types of adverbial heads encountered in the early Chronicle. There are also 5 instances of verb-first clauses. In short, there is no change in the preposed heads either in kind or in relative frequency. Nor is there a change in the verbs used in inverted clauses. In particular, there is no narrowing of the semantic types of verbs permitted in VS clauses. There is one instance each of an inversion of a clearly topical but subject shifted subject (C1041) and of an inverted non-subject-shifted subject (C1045.3).

In short, this late OE Ms. gives no indication of any changes in inversion in narrative prose during the years 890-1066.

NON-NARRATIVE PROSE

In this section I compare the use of inversion in narrative prose and in non-narrative prose, including expository prose, the prose of wills and official documents and highly artistic prose.

WILLS AND DOCUMENTS

The wills and documents collected in Harmer (1914) are representative of early OE (9th and 10th century) prose. We might expect the language to be closer to that of spoken OE than the polished prose of Aelfric or even the prose of Alfred. This collection also affords a look into dialect differences, since there are 7 Kentish documents, 1 Mercian, 1 Northumbrian
and West Saxon documents having Kentish and Mercian influence.

I give here a passage from one of the documents to show the style of writing:

(138) & gif mine broðar aerfeweard gestrionen ðe londes
& if my brothers have an heir capable of holding
weordæ sie, þonne ann ic ðem londes. Gif hie ne gestrionen
land, then give I the land to him. If they have
ode him sylfum aelles hweat sele, æfter hiora
no heir or if anything happens to him, after their
dege ann ic his Freodomunde gif he donne lifes bid.
day give I it to F. if he is alive.
(Wills, 4.12)

This simple discourse style of the wills is not conducive to a wide variety of preposings and inversions. The inversions that occur are generally headed by ba, nu, bonne and inversions of the main clauses of if...then sequences and with subjunctive verbs.

The inversion of the first person pronouns ic and we after nu is common.

(139) Nu hebbe ic hi hamet.
Now have I them taken (Wills, 29.18)
(140) & nu willað heo gesellan inn to Cristes circan...
& now desire we to give them to Christ Church...
(Wills, 12.9)
Hence, *nu* in these cases behaves like *ne*, sometimes inverting the personal pronoun and sometimes not inverting it. We can find this variation after *nu* also in the *Orosius*. Since I will be looking at these inversions of personal pronouns in some detail later, I will not discuss them further here.

Other anomalous occurrences of inversion follow:

**VS with a thematic 3rd sg. pronoun:**

(141) *Wes hit becueden.*

> Was it bequeathed. (Wills, 10.3)

**VS in subordinate clauses:**

(142) *þa waeron we on gemote æt Swinbeorgum þa...*

> when we were assembled at S then... (Wills, 16.19)

(143) *þa gehyrde we nu manegu yrfegeflity...*

> when heard we now of many suits... (Wills, 16.30)

There are also several instances of main clauses in correlative pairs with inversion, but without correlative conjunctions, as in the next to the last clause of (138).

In sum, these samples of unartistic prose show less frequent and less diverse inversions, less thematic preposing, such as that of locative and temporal adverbs, and more inversion following a relatively small core of fronted adverbs, ones that very possibly were common in the spoken language too. There are no cases of non-pronominal thematic nouns being inverted but there are some instances of anomalous pronominal subject inversions. No differences in dialects are discernable. I conclude that less formal discourse differs in the kinds of PC's and in the frequency of inversion.
Next we examine an expository work sometimes attributed to AElfric, the Manual of Astronomy. The Manual is intended for educating a layperson in the principles of astronomy, and is an example of late OE prose.

Expository prose clearly uses inversion almost as frequently as narrative prose. In this work there are 83 instances of inversion. We find the full range of thematic and emphatic preposings, including some not encountered in the ASC, such as eft ever; the manner adverb bicce thickly; be concerning; and hwilon sometimes. Inversion following thematic fronting is common and often sounds very modern, as in the Orosius.

(144) On ðam norðran daele wunan^ eall manh-cynn...
In the north part dwell all mankind. (MOA 12.29)

(145) On ða healfe þe heo scind þaer byd daeg.
On the half where she shines there is day.
(MOA 2.26)

(146) On þam faece synd ge-tealde feuwer & twentig tida
In that space are reckoned 24 hours. (MOA 3.7)

We also find some good examples of how inversion switches the topic. For example, the initial topic here is God:

(147) þa geseah God þ þ leocht waes good, & todaelde þ leocht
Then saw God that that light was good and he separated the light
faram þam þeostrum & het þ leocht daeg & þa þeostro from the darkness, and called the light day & the darkness
niht, & waes þa ge teald aefen and merien to
anum daege
night, & was then reckoned evening & morning as
one day.

On þam oprum daege ge-sceop God heofenan...
On the second day God made the heaven...

(MOA. 1.11)

Again the initial topic (or potential topic) is God:

(148) On þam þriddan daege ge-scop se aelmihtiga
God sae &
On the third day made the Almighty God the
sea &
eordan, & ealle eordlice spryttinga. Þa þry
dagas
earth & all earthly germs. Those three days
wearon butan sunnan, & monan, & steorrum &
eallum tidum
were without the sun & the moon & stars at
all times
ge-licere waegan mid leohhte & þeostrum apenede.
served with light & darkness of like weight.

On þam feordan daege scop God twa miccle leohht...
On the fourth day made God the two great lights

(MOA 2.6)

There are nine instances of V/1 clauses, a relatively large
number but certainly not enough to signal a language change.

Some interesting features of this data are listed here.

1. Inversion in subordinate clauses occurs 3 times, all
   inversions with athematic subjects.
(149) ðone hatad laewede menn carles-waen
which call untaught men carles-wain
(MOA 16.5)

(150) Nu miht ðu understandan ðe laessan ymbgang
haefða se mann ðe...
Now might you understand that a less circuit
has a man who...
(MOA 8.7)

2. Inversion with preposed predicate adjectives occurs 3
times; all subjects are athematic.

(151) Middan-eard is ge-haten eall ðe binnan ðam
firmamentum is.
The world is called all that within the
firmament is
(MOA 10.9)

There are two instances of inversion of non-subject shifted
subjects. The first instance may well be regular: a correla-
ative swa...swa clause in which the main clause of the second
S has the same subject as the main clause of the prior S.

(152) Swa lengra daeg swa byð se niwa mona ufor
ge-sewen
The longer is the day that the new moon above
appears
swa scyrtra daeg swa byð se niwa mona nyder gesewn
the shorter is the day that the new moon beneath
appears
(MOA 14.28)

This passage has two possible explanations. The swa...swa
correlative, like the ba...ba and gif...bonne correlatives
may obligatorily invert the main clause subject. Or, this pas-
sage has inversion for stylistic reasons, namely, syntactic
symmetry.

The second instance of a non-subject shifted subject
inversion provides good evidence that this type of inversion is at least sometimes used for artistic purposes.

(153) On ðam iglande haefð se laengsta daeg on geare twelf
On that island has the longest day in the year 12
tida....On ðam earde þe is gehaten Alexandria haefð se
hours....In the land that is called A.
has the
laengsta daeg feowertyne tida. On Italia, þaet is
longest day 14 hours. In I. which is
Romana rice, haefð se lengsta daeg fiftyne tida. On
the Roman empire, has the longest day 15 hours. In
Engla lande haefð se lengsta daeg seofontyne tida.
E. has the longest day 17 hours. (MOA 12.3)

Here we have 4 consecutive Ss having the same structure and displaying a high degree of syntactic symmetry.

Examples of the various types of inversion are as follows:
Topic switch: 1.11, 2.6, 2.9, 2.26, 2.27, 11, 22, 11, 28, 12.3, and 18.26. Subject Switch: 8.16 and 14.24. Unlike any other piece of OE prose that I have examined, MOA shows that the topic/subject switch use of inversion could constitute almost as much as one-fourth of all inversions after PC's other than ba. Hence, these are highly significant uses of inversion. Their lower rate of occurrence in other prose is probably due
to the combined effects of semantic content and style.

AELFRIC'S HOMILIES

Aelfric's Homilies (late OE) allow us to study the effects of polished prose and the effects of rhetorical style (the homilies were meant to be recited as sermons) on inversions. They are a combination of direct address and narrative. I give here the data from "In Die Sco Pentecosten" with some examples from other homilies.

In this homily of 289 lines there are 46 instances of inversion, including 23 headed by *be* or *bonne*. In general, we find more anomalous clauses, i.e., contrary to the norm we have found in the data of narrative prose. In particular, we find a relatively large number of V/I clauses: 6 instances.

(154) and waes gesewen Gods wuldor...
and was seen God's glory... (AH 312.10)

(155) Com ãa se dege...
Came then the thane... (AH 316.25)

(156) Namon ãa to raed ðaet...
Resolved then (they) that... (AH 316.23)

The last example is quite extraordinary, as it is a non-conjoined V/I clause without an expressed subject.

As we noted previously this homily has a relatively low percentage of inversions with first mention subjects --54%.

Passages 316.25 and 324.32 contain inversions of a subject which was a conjoined subject of the prior S; passage 326.4 inverts a subject that occurs as a direct object of the prior S; and there are three instances of inverted subjects that are
recently mentioned (thematic) and two that were previously mentioned. There are also two interesting examples of subject switches between main and subordinate clauses, with inversion in the subordinate clause.

(157) He (Holy Ghost) worhte hine to psalm-wyrhtan
he made him to be a psalmist.
Amos hatte hryder-hyrde, þone awende se
Halga Gast to maerum witegan.
There was a cow-herd called Amos whom turned
the HG to a great prophet.
Petrus waes fiscere, þone awende se ylca
Godes Gast to apostole.
Peter was a fisherman whom turned the same
Spirit of God to an apostle. (AH 322.34-324.1)

These inversions are rare, first because subordinate clause inversions are rare in OE (at least in my data) and second because the inverted subject is switched rather than first mention as in other subordinate clause inversions.

There are 3 particularly interesting inversions that should be noted. The first is an instance where inversion applies to a subject which is referentially the same as the prior subject but which has a different surface noun.

(158) Eft on ðre bodunge gelyfdon fif ðysend wera
on Crist
Again at another preaching believed 5,000 men
in Christ
and wearð eall swo geleaffulle menigu swa
anmod swilce hi...
Probably, the addition of the quantifier *all* results in a stressed subject. The second inversion also has to do with a quantifier: inversion occurs when there is a switch in the quantifier, but not the noun.

(159) and waeron siďdan swa fela gereord swa ġaera wyrhtena & were afterwards as many languages as there were workmen waes. Nu eft on disum daege...wurdon ealle gereord Now again on this day...were *all* languages anlaehte and gedwaere united and concordant (AH 318.23)

Modern English too can invert when just a quantifier has been changed.

(160) Just a few years ago there were no problems in dealing with Iran; now there are many.

However, this is the first OE example of this in my data.

The final notable inversion appears to be another case of a stylistic inversion. After a long string of pronominal references to an NP, the original NP is reintroduced in an inverted clause that summarizes the point of the discourse. The original noun occurs 12 lines away from the reintroduced one.
(161) Ealle þas þing doð se Halga Gast...
All these things does the Holy Ghost
(AH 322.29)

One matter that needs to be further explored, mostly in non-narrative prose, is the occurrence of inversion in dialogue discourses. Some brief comments are given here. OE frequently prefaces verbs of saying with þa.

(162) þa cwæð Petrus...
then said P (AH 316.26)

In long quoted discourses, the use of inversion appears not to be exceptional. However, I have two instances of brief quotes in which the subject of the quote is immediately repeated as the subject of a following inverted clause.

(163) He cwæð, "Geweorde Leocht", and þærrihte waes-leocht
He said "Let there be light" & immediately was light geworden. He cwæð eft, "Geweorde heofen," and made. He said again "Let there be heaven" and þærrihte waes heofen geworht...
immediately was heaven made... (AH 14.35-16.1)

There is no reason not to believe that the subjects of the inversions here are stressed, but there may be other generalizations about inversion in quoted/nonquoted discourse alternations that can be made. However, conclusions must be postponed until a comprehensive study of prose types containing extensive dialogue can be made.
Chapter II Summary

In this chapter I have looked at OE inversions drawn from a number of authors and literary styles. It was found that the occurrence of inversion in OE differs significantly from inversion in Modern English both in regard to the particular constituents that can occur in inversions and in regard to the discourse environments in which the inversions can occur. From this I have concluded that the function of inversion in OE differed from the function of Modern English inversion. In particular, I suggest that OE inversion was used to stress the subject; thus stress on the subject, rather than thematicity or topicality, controlled the occurrence of inversion in OE.

In the remaining chapters I turn to the problem of when and how and why the function of inversion changed into its modern form. I approach this problem through an investigation of inversions in increasingly more recent data—data from Transition English in Chapter III and data from Middle English in Chapter IV and from Early Modern English in Chapter V.
CHAPTER III

TRANSITION ENGLISH

In this chapter I look at inversion in the transitional period between Old and Middle English, which covers the years from the Norman Conquest of England in 1066 to the time of Chaucer in 1370. Unfortunately, there is relatively little English prose from this span of time, for French became the language of the court and French and Latin the languages of educated people. Hence, I am forced to rely heavily on non-narrative prose for my data after the Peterborough Chronicle ends in the year 1154.

The early part of this period will be represented by the Peterborough Chronicle; the mid part by the Ancrene Riwle (ca. 1200) and the OE Homilies (12th and 13th centuries); and late transition English by the prose of Richard Rolle. Divided by dialects we have West Saxon represented by the OE Homilies (with some Midland influence) and the Ancrene Riwle; Midland (Mercian) represented by the Peterborough Chronicle; and Northumbrian by Richard Rolle.

In this chapter I will attempt to ascertain what, if any, changes in inversion occurred during the period of transition English. Thus I will mainly be concerned with comparing inversion in OE and transition English. I will proceed
roughly chronologically, beginning with the Peterborough Chronicle.

**THE PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE, LAUD OR E MS.**
(written ca. 1122 and thereafter until 1154)

In this Ms. between the entries dated 1067 and 1154 we find a total of 431 inverted clauses, 83 of which are headed by _the_ and 6 of which are negative. Excluding _the_ and _ne_ clauses there are a total of 342 clauses of the type that were in OE constrained as to their subjects. Here I will discuss preposing in inverted clauses.

**PREPOSING OF CONSTITUENTS**

In this Ms. we find a full range of preposed constituents followed by inversion: temporal and locative single and phrasal adverbs, direct objects, indirect objects, prepositional phrases of various types, partitive genitives, _thus_, predicate adjectives, _also_, and _meanwhile_. Two manner adverbs appear as heads in combination with _thus_. The most notable change in the types of preposings triggering inversion is inversion after a subordinate clause in 5 instances. In OE inversion after a subordinate clause did not occur at all in my data. Some examples of inversion in the E Ms. follow:

(1) Þurh þis weard se castel þa agyfen...
   Through this was the castle then surrounded.
   (ASC E 1095.54)

(2) þus earmilice weard eall þ folc swengt...
   Thus pitiably were all the people duped.
   (ASC E 1128.29)
Moreover was over all England a great earthquake.
(ASC E 1089.3)

ac on mang þison com se eorl Rotbert...
& meanwhile came eorl R...
(ASC E 1101.11)

While the king W out of E. was went
se cyng of Scotlande hider into Englum...
kings M. of S thither into E.
(ASC E 1091.26)

Soon after the king had south gone went
se eorlanre nihte ut of Bebbaburh...
the eorl one night out of B...
(ASC E 1095.34)

While the archbishop was out of the land gave
the king
done biscoprice of B to the queen's chancellor.
(ASC E 1123.67)

It would appear from the data of this Ms. that the only change
between OE and Transition English regarding the category of
preposed constituents triggering inversion is a slight expa-
sion of this category. There appears to be somewhat less
resistance to inversion after a subordinate clause when no
other constituent in the main clause is preposed. Other than
this, preposing and inversion operate the same way as in OE.
In particular, *ba* still regularly inverts the subject whether full noun or pronoun. Examples of *ba* in combination with another adverb are fewer than in the Parker Chronicle. The reason for this change appears to be a decrease in the use of pleonastic *ba*, i.e., *ba* occurring in combination with synonymous adverbs such as *after that* and with temporal adverbs such as *in that year, in this same year* (which themselves occur less frequently).

It is important to note that personal pronouns still are inverted only when *ba* immediately precedes the verb, as in *siddan ba* "afterwards". This is unchanged from OE.

(8) *siddan ba nam he bes kynges wifes swuster of France to wife.*

Afterwards took he the half sister of the queen of F. to wife.  

(ASC E 1127.21)

(9) *ba hwire ba sende he his writ aefter bone abb Ernulf of B.*

In the meantime he sent his writ to abbot E. of B.  

(ASC E 1114.21)

When the preposed constituent does not contain *ba*, XSV order occurs with pronominal subjects. As in OE, XSV order also occurs with a wide variety of preposed constituents.

There are 3 instances of inversion in a subordinate clause.

(10) *for bat ilc gear warth be king ded*  

for that very year was the king dead. (ASC E 1135.6)

(11) *...for dig him waes betaeh *be castel to healdene.*  

for to him was entrusted the castel for keeping.  

(ASC E 1087.75)
(12) for agenes him risen sona þa ricemen þe waeron swikes
     for against him rose soon the great men who
       were traitors.                     (ASC E1135.19)

In the first two examples the subject is atopical, though
recently mentioned. The subject of the third S is athematic
and the verb is presentative, as in a number of subordinate
clause inversions that we encountered before.

THE VERB IN INVERTED CLAUSES

As in OE, we find in this Ms. a wide variety of inverted
verbs. There are active and passive inverted verbs; stative
and action verbs; presentative and non-presentative verbs and
simple and compound verbs.

Passive:

(13) Þus waes se mynstre of Burch forbaernd.
     Thus was the monastery of B. burned. (ASC E1070.56)

Presentative:

(14) On þa ilca tyma com an legat of Rome...
     At the same time came a legate from R.
     (ASC E 1123.40)

Non-presentative:

(15) þaer aefter forðferde se king Alexander of
     Scotlande
     Thereafter died king A. of S. (ASC E 1124.36)

Stative:

(16) On þisum geare to Nativity waes se cyng
     Heanrig on Westmynster...
     This year Christmas spent king H. at W.
     (ASC E1102.1)
Compound verbs can be either separated or unseparated. There is a strong tendency to reserve full inversion with compound verbs for first mention subjects. All eight compound verbs with full inversion have first mention subjects. The verb see is especially frequent in these clauses.

(17) & to ðam Pentecosten waes gesewn innan Barrucscire
& on P. was seen in a village in B.
aet anan tune blod weallan of eorðan
blood welling from the earth  (ASC E 1100.4)

(18) On þa night þe on morgen waes Cena Dni...
wasron
On the eve of C. were
ge sewen twegen monan on þære heofonan...
seen two moons in the sky  (ASC E 1106.20)

There is a weaker tendency to reserve semi-inversion for atopical but recently mentioned subjects. Twelve semi-inverted subjects are recently mentioned; seven are first mention subjects and two are relatively semantically empty subjects: many others and men. A recent mention (topic switch) semi-inversion follows:

(19) On mang þam þe se cyng þone castel besaet
While the king the castle besieged
com se eorl Rotbert of Normandig on sce
Michaels
came duke R of N on St. M's
maesse aefen uppon þone cyng mid his fyrde
eve against the king with his levies.
& mid him Rotbert de Baelesme & Willelm eorl
& with him R. B.  & W
of Moretoin & ealle þa þe mid heom woldan
of M. & all their supporters

Ac seo streonge & se sige weard þaes cynges
But the strength & the victory were the kings.

Daer weard se eorl of Normandig gefangen...
There was the duke of N. taken prisoner...

(ASC E 1106.31)

I believe these tendencies are the result of differences
in markedness and hence emphasis between subjects in full
inversion and subjects in semi-inversion clauses. First
mention subjects are relatively more marked in full inver­
sion clauses than they would be in semi-inversion clauses,
where part of the verb still follows the subject.

The Laud Ms. exhibits no differences in the kinds of
verbs occurring with þa clauses and the verbs occurring with
other inversions. Nor is there any sign of a narrowing of
the semantic content of verbs occurring in inversions. The
following examples show clearly that inversions are still not
restricted to presentative verbs;

(20) þis & te othre foruuardes þet hi makeden

suoren to
This & the other agreements that they made
swore to

halden þe king & te eorl & þe b & te eorles &
rice men alle.
hold the king & the eorl & the b. & the eorles
& all great men. (ASC E 1140.77)
(21) Sithen þer efet sahtleden þe king & Randolf eorl at Stanford.
Afterwards reconciled the king & R. at S.
(ASC E 1140.39)

THE SUBJECT OF INVERTED CLAUSES

As in OE in the Laud Ms. the subject plays a crucial role in determining whether inversion occurs. Ninety-eight and one-half percent of nominal subjects in inverted clauses with heads other than þæ or þe are at least either shifted subjects or shifted topics. The following are typical of the many topic shift/introduction inversions in the E Ms.

(22) Her on þisum geaxe wurdon saehte Franca cyng & Willelm
In this year came to agreement the king of F. & W.
Englalandes cyng. ac hit heold litle hwile, & Þes
England's king but it held little time & this
gears forbarn Lunden burh anre nihte.
year burned London one night. (ASC E1077.1)

(23) & se arceb Turstein of Eoferwic þyder ferde...
Him wif
& Archbishop T of E. thither went...
him
cwæd se cyng aelces gean fares to Englalande & he (T)
forbade the king any return to E. & he (T)
þus his arcebrices þaernode...
thus his archbishopric lost... (ASC E1119.21)
We see in this Ms. a strong tendency to use XSV order with recently mentioned (thematic), although not necessarily topical, subjects.

(24) Disum þus gedone se cyng ferde to Winceastre...
þa waeron
This thus done the king went to W.... then was
unasecgendlice aenie men hu mycel þaer waes
gegaderod
untold wealth there gathered
on golde & on seolfre...Se cyng dyde þa swa his faeder
in gold & in silver.... The king did then as his father
him bebead...
him commanded...
(ASC E1086.138)

In addition, we find that there is a strong tendency for subjects to have SV order if they occur in a non-nominative case in the prior S.

(25) Her se eorl Walþ eof gridede wiþ bone cyng & þaes on
Here eorl W. made peace with the king & that
lengten se cyng let hergian ælle þa mynstra...
spring the king had plundered all the monaster-
ies...
(ASC E1070.1)

The percentage of exceptional (non subject-shifted) nominal inversions is approximately 1.5% compared to 1% in the Parker Ms. Out of a total of 342 inversions with heads other than þa or no there are 6 instances of inversions with nominal subjects that are not subject shifted. In addition,
there are 5 instances of exceptional inversions with pronominal subjects. I give here a complete list of these occurrences involving pronominal subjects:

(26) ṭaέwaethere fuhtten hi noht
nevertheless fought they not (ASC El140.72)

(27) ac iedon ealle samodlice to þone kyng...
& went all in a body to the king (ASC El123.22)

(28) & hatte he S Willilm
& he is called St. W. (ASC El137.87)

(29) siddan ward he munec on Clunni
afterwards he became a monk at C (ASC El127.34)

(30) & com he & Eadgar aedeling...
& came he & E. prince... (ASC El069.6)

Sentence (26) inverts a negative clause without ne. In this stage in the history of English, omission of ne is rare; later it becomes the norm. Sentence (27) involves the inversion of a referentially thematic pronoun with a quantifier change (from the bishops to all (the bishops)). As we have seen earlier, this type of inverted clause may be a common one. Sentence (28) inverts a clearly emphatic pronoun—the writer in this S finally reveals the identity of the antecedent of he. Sentence (29) inverts a pronoun after the head siddan. However, the instances of siddan ba + VS that surround this clause clearly indicate that this clause is not the norm. Sentence (30) is most difficult to explain, the most obvious explanation being an ellipsis of the second of two consecutive ba's. This, however, is rare.
I give now a complete list of inversions involving non-subject shifted nominal subjects.

(31) þa se cýng sume aer þære tide het on hæftnede gebringan...
The king some before that time had arrested & beodan...And þone eorl Rotbert het & ordered...& the eorl R. had se cýng to Windlesoran laedan...
The king to W. taken. (ASC E1095.56)

(32) him het se cýng þa eagan ut adon & his stiward Willelm ordered the king his eyes put out & his steward W.
hatte se waes his modrian sunu het se cýng on rode ahon.
who was his mother's sister's son ordered the king hanged. (ASC E1096.7)

(33) To Eastran waes se cýng aet Badan & to Pentecosten At Easter was the king at B. & at P aet Searbyrig fornæm þe he holde on his fundunge offer at S because he did not wish on his departure sae hird holden. Thereafter to foran August ferde se over sea to hold court. Thereafter before A went cýng offer sae...
The king over sea... (ASC E1106.23)

(34) þone let se cýng syddan sacleas fara. Syddan him let the king afterwards go unmolested.
geeode se cyng eall on Normandige waes... Thereafter conquered the king the whole of N. (ASC E1106.41)

(35) he (the king) waes aet Maerle boorge... Dises geares he was at M... This year sende se cyng... sent the king... (ASC E1110.5)

(36) Da sona ðæer æfter ðæ geaf se cyng þone abbrice an Sóon thereafter gave the king the abbacy to munec of Saeis Iohan waes gehaten þurh þæes arceb gearnunge a monk of S called John at the desire of the of Cantwarbyrig & sona ðæer æfter sende se cyng him & se archbishop of C & soon thereafter sent the king & the archceb of Cantwarburig to Rome... archbishop of C. him to R... (ASC E1114.37)

Sentences (31), (32), and (33) exhibit two consecutive clauses having the same subject, although the first two passages show intervening subordinate clause subject shifts.

In (34) the first clause with the subject the king possibly is a relative clause, which are occasionally inverted (see Ch. II). If so, then this passage is not exceptional. In (35) the inversion is a paragraph initial clause, which means that it would be at the beginning of a new discourse unit in the Parker Ms. The Laud Ms., however, shows some sporadic
instances of cross paragraph pronominalization. Thus it may be that the paragraph does not form the discrete unit in this Ms. that it does in the Parker Ms. Hence, I cite the inversion in this list.

Sentence (36) is an example of an inversion of a conjoined subject when one member of the conjunct is the subject of the previous S. We have seen the converse of this example several times, i.e., an inversion of one member of a previously conjoined subject, but (36) is the only example of its kind in my data. I would interpret the inversion here as a means of introducing the archbishop as subject and as a means of emphasizing the conjunctivity.

In short, I do not believe that the exceptional inversions in the Laud Ms. described thus far represent any linguistic change from the OE period. The percentage of increase is minimal, and it is not impossible to construe the passages with non-subject shift inversions as having semantic reasons for restressing the subject, making it clearly emphatic when it otherwise might not be so interpreted. It is interesting to note that each instance of the inversions in question has the same subject—the king. Of course, the king was a popular subject throughout the Chronicles. Yet, perhaps some of these particular actions of the king denoted in these inverted Ss are unexpected (emphatic): having a relative hanged; conquering the whole of Normandy; traveling abroad; taking a prisoner. In Modern English this emphatic topical subject + verb relationship could be expressed by means of cleft sentences.
In addition, it is interesting to observe that non-subject-shifted subject inversions, even those with non-pronominal subjects, tend to occur in bunches. Ss (31) to (36) all occur relatively close together in the Chronicle. This might be evidence that the use of these inversions varied from scribe to scribe, some scribes tending to use them much more often than others.

In any case, I do not believe there is evidence in the Laud Chronicle that the basic function of inversion was anything other than subject stress, just as in OE.

**V/1 CLAUSES**

V/1 clauses comprise 16% (55 instances) of inversions, excluding be and ne inversions, in the Peterborough Chronicle, compared to 14% in the Parker Chronicle. The majority of V/1 clauses occur after and.

(37) & ferde unarimedlice folc mid wifan & cildan to þi...  
went a countless number of people with wives & children to...  
(ASC E1096.15)

(38) & feng his sunu Lodewis to þam rice.  
succeeded his son L. to the throne.  
(ASC E1108.5)

However, some are S initial:

(39) Wes naeure gaet mare wreccehed on land  
Was never more misery in a country  
(ASC E1132.47)

(40) saeide se abbot of Clunni...  
said the abbot of C...  
(ASC E1131.32)

There are also 13 instances of verbs with no expressed subject
and no preceding conjunction, as well as one instance of \( \bar{b}a + V \) with no subject.

(41) Syddan geden heom to scipe, ferden heom to Elib, then (they) returned to their ships, went to E, betaehtan \( \bar{b}a \) eall \( \bar{b}a \) gaersume... handed over there all the treasures...

(ASC El070.36)

(42) \( \bar{b}a \) cyddon \( \bar{b}a \) his broder grid... then (they) announced that his brother peace renounced (ASC El094.3)

In the Parker Ms. there were two instances of such clauses in an especially vivid passage. Likewise, 9 of the above clauses in the Laud Ms. occur in an account of some particularly brutal attacks by the Danes on some monasteries. Hence, I conclude that throughout OE and Transition English both \#VS and \#V were stylistic variants of the more usual XVS inversion.

PRONOMINAL SUBJECT SWITCH

Pronoun subjects still freely refer to any kind of object in the preceding clause (direct, indirect, object of prepositions) or to the subject. The type of pronominal subject switching seen in the Parker Ms. can still be found, though extended shifts (i.e., more than 2 consecutive shifts via pronouns) are rare. Some examples follow:

(43) \& hi (the invaders) comon into capitulan on uppon \( \bar{b}a \) they came into the chapter against the munecas full gewepnede & \( \bar{b}a \) waeron \( \bar{b}a \) munecas swide
monks fully armed & then were the monks aferede of heom...Ac to scuton. sume urnon into terrified of them...& fled. Some ran into the cyrcean...& hi ferdon aefter heom... church...& they (the invaders) went after them. (ASC E1083.10)

(44) þa hi þær inne waeron þa com þe kinges cuen mid al
When they there were inside then came the king's queen
híre strengthe & besaet heom þeper waes inne micel
with all her forces & besieged them so that there was great
hungaer. Þa hi ne leng ne muhten þolen þa stali hi
famine. When they could no longer endure they stole
ut & flugen & hi wurthen war wid uten...
out & fled & they (the besiegers) got to know...

The fact that this use of pronoun subjects existed at least from the early OE (late 9th century) period to the middle of the 12th century is further evidence against the view that this use is merely a sign of literary naivete.

THERE-CLAUSES/EXISTENTIAL CLAUSES

The Laud Ms. contains no instances of unambiguous nonlocative there clauses. Below are examples of the types of existential Ss that do occur.
This year was a very long winter. (ASC E1111.10)

was this same day a new moon. (ASC E1099.11)

great awe was of him. (ASC E1135.11)

Negative clauses in the Laud Ms. regularly show inversion even with personal pronoun subjects.

of his exit we cannot yet say (ASC E1127.73)

it was nothing but lies. (ASC E1128.29)

One instance of negative inversion in a subordinate clause also occurs.

...for never were any martyrs so tortured as they were. (ASC E1137.20)

We now turn our attention to the OE Homilies, representative of prose written after the Peterborough Chronicle in the 12th and 13th centuries. The data is taken from the following homilies: In Dominica Palmarum, Hic Dicenda est De Propheta, De Adventu and In Die Pentecosten. The last homily is a translation from one of Aelfric's homilies and a comparison of the two versions allows interesting glimpses into the history
of English.

The prose of the homilies is quite different from that of the Chronicle. It is quite polished, a combination of oratorical prose and short passages of narrative prose (e.g., retellings of Biblical stories). I give here the data for the above homilies combined.

There are 82 instances of inversion, including 40 instances of be clauses in these homilies. The range of heads is not as large as in narrative prose. There is relatively less preposing of prepositional phrases and more preposing of single word, especially correlative, adverbs. The following preposed heads are among the most common types: alswa, also; efere, ever; al swa, just as; muchel, much; eft, again; and nu, now; as well as the correlative be...be when...then; preposed pronouns and direct objects.

(51) Muchel is us þenne neod...
     Much need is to us then... (OEH 11.1)

(52) Alswa seal þe lardeu don...
     Also shall the teacher do...(OEH 95.26)

(53) Nu is his þrowunge and his ariste ure ester tid...
     Now is his passion and his ressurrection our Eastertide (OEH 87.26)

(54) To dai is cumen þe holie tid þat me cleped advent
     Today is come the holy time that is called advent (OEH II 3.1)

Prepositional phrase preposing does occur, however, and certainly no linguistic change in this regard has occurred.
Nor is there any evidence of a narrowing in the kinds of verbs used in inverted clauses. Specifically, both presentative and decidedly non-presentative verbs, transitive verbs and active and passive verbs occur. With compound verbs, semi-inversion is still common but not obligatory.

Transitive:

(55) þis witeyede david...
This foretold David (OEH 7.13)

Passive:

(56) And wes iseyen biforan heore elche...furene tungen
And was seen before their eyes...fiery tongues.
(OEH 89.25)

Non-presentative:

(57) On þissere ifereden iemede þere apostlan admodnesse
In this fellowship obtained for the apostles their meekness
þas mihte
this power (direct object) (OEH 93.33)

There are 7 instances of V/l clauses, two of which are subjunctive, which regularly exhibit V/l order. More interesting are the relatively frequent inversions in subordinate clauses:

6 instances.

(58) alswa hefden þe giwis heore sinagoge efter moises laye
Just as had the Jews their synagogue after Moses' law (OEH 9.4)

(59) for þet com muchel light...
for there came great light...(OEH 87.20)
(60) þe hon wunet þe feder and þe sune and þe halie wherein dwell the father and the son and the holy
gast a buten ende.
ghost without end. (OEH 11.5)

All have athematic subjects. Whether or not these inversions serve stylistic purposes here, there seems to be increasingly less inhibition against using inversion in subordinate clauses when the subject is athematic since the earliest OE data, especially in non-narrative prose. If there has been a language change here (alternatively VS in subordinate clauses may simply be underrepresented in the particular prose analyzed in Chapter II), I believe it is a case of an analogical spread of inversion from main clauses to subordinate clauses in certain environments where the subject of the subordinate clause receives relatively more stress. Of the above subordinate clauses two have subjects that contrast with the subjects of the main clause and one has a presentative verb, which occasionally triggered subordinate clause inversions even in early OE. Two are in consecutive Ss with syntactic symmetry and one has a subject that ends the homily. Thus, these are all environments in which the subject of the subordinate clause might be stressed more than usual.

1However, the increased use of inversion in subordinate clauses was not sufficient to invert obligatorily a subordinate there clause in the following example:

swa þere wurhten were
as there workers were (OEH 93.25)
even though main clause there Ss are obligatorily inverted.
This clause may, however, be exceptional. My data contain few cases of subordinate there clauses, or even ambiguous there clauses. The ones that occur are inverted, as (59) above and the following show:

for tan þær waes lyt elles þe aht mycel myhton...
for then there were few else of any consequence

(ASC C1052.37)

for nis þer na steuene
for there is no voice

(SW 253.20)

þæt þær sceal aelces gedeodes man beon forbaerned
that there shall men of every language be burned

(Or. 256.38)

THE SUBJECT

Pronominal and topical subjects regularly occur in SVO order while subject/topic shifted subjects optionally have XVS order. There is one non-subject shifted inversion in the homilies. It is of a type we have seen before: the inversion of a reintroduced antecedent after a string of pronouns. The S summarizes a preceding discourse.

(62) Ealle tas þing and monige ðere duð þe haliga gast
All these things and many others doth the holy ghost

(OEH 97.21;

cf., Example (163),AH 316.26, in Chapter II)

There are 2 instances of topic switch inversions: 5.10 and 53.23. Passage (93.24) has a subject shift inversion (see discussion below) and (97.26-28) retains the 2 symmetrical switches between the main and subordinate clauses found in Aelfric's original homily "In Die Pentecosten" (cf., Chapter II, example (158)).
Most other inversions have first mention subjects.

It is most interesting to compare "In Die Pentecosten" with Aelfric's original, for the translator made several changes in the Ms. Among these changes are two alterations that cause two of Aelfric's 3 non-subject shifted inversions to become shifted, i.e., to follow the more usual subject/topic shift requirements for inversion. First, Aelfric's clause:

(63) and weard eall swo geleaf fulle menigu...
    and became all the believing men... (AH 316)

the subject of which (except for the quantifier) repeats the subject of the preceding clause (five thousand men) is changed to:

(64) ha iweorden alle þos ilefede men...
    Then became all the believing men... (OEH 91.20)

Here, the ha makes inversion the norm. Second, to Aelfric's passage (AH 318.23) with the consecutive subjects languages ((160) in Chapter II), a parenthetic clause was added:

(65) þet were two hunmanna
    there were 200 men

The S was added between the two Ss with the same subjects, and thus the later passage shows shifted subjects in addition to the quantifier change.

(66) and þeddan were swa felen spechen swa þere wurhten
    and afterwards were as many languages as there workers
    weren, þet weren two hunmanna. Nu eft on þisse deie
were, there were 200 men. Now again on this day
were all languages again received... (OEH 93.24)

One possible interpretation of this change is that the reader (translator) did not understand or did not agree with Aelfric's use of inversion in these environments and thus he "corrected" the passages to make the inversions more "normal".  

^An interesting phenomenon in the homilies is the use of double subjects, for example:

and efere to þam setteres die heo comen þa iudiesce folc
and ever on Saturday they come the Jewish people

(0EH 9.6)

Here the subject is shifted from that of the preceding main clause but is recently mentioned. This double subject also occurs in SVO order:

alle þa ileafulle iudeisce men þe...heo were iclipet synagogue...
all the believing Jewish men who...they were called synagogue...

(0EH 9.10)

Whether clauses of these types provided a mechanism of change will be discussed in Chapter IV. Double objects also occurred (cf., ASC E1095.37)

ANCRENE RIWLE AND SAWLES WARDE

The Ancrene Riwle (Nun's Rule) was written ca. 1200 (some say 1250) and intended as a manual of proper behavior for nuns. The Sawles Warde (Soul's Ward) has been ascribed to the same unknown author and is an allegorical treatise.

Neither of these works gives any indication of changes in the use of inversion and both exhibit many of the same types of inversion as the OE Homilies. However, these works are of interest for their many examples of negative Ss and
it clauses, so I will summarize the data from them.

The data from the Ancrene Riwle are drawn from 20 pages (39-59) which I selected for the number of inversions that occur (20) and the data from the Sawles Warde are drawn from the first six pages. This section contains 24 inversions, 14 of which are negative inversions. Neither prose style is conducive to a high frequency of inversion, as pronoun subjects are common and the variety of preposed constituents is low.

Nonetheless, the data of these prose pieces confirm our hypothesis that there is little change in the use of inversion between Old and Transition English and little substantive difference in inversion between different styles of prose.

Inversion is less frequent in these pieces and more likely to be headed by a relatively small core of adverbs such as alswa, likewise; thus, yet; nu; and benne than in narrative prose. My combined data from these two works include a dialogue tag switch inversion: said X, said Y, said X in SW 349.32; two inversions of previously mentioned subjects; and the inversion of a recently mentioned subject sight (AR 43.20) which is the topic of the entire discourse unit, but which is only one of several sub-discourse-unit topics. The AR contains one instance of a subject switch inversion of a clearly topical subject:

(67) Be hwite limped aricht to hwit meiden had & to the white (cross) is appropriate to white and
clennesse is much pine wel for to halden.
Pine is
unstained maiden purity which requires much
pain to preserve. Pain is
ihwer idon to under stonded purch cros. Bus bi
always to be understood by the cross. Thus be-
tacned hwit cros...
tokens the white cross... (AR 40-41)

All other inversions have first mention subjects. The AR in
particular confirms the spread of inversion to subordinate
clauses having athematic subjects.

Existential clauses are of 3 kinds: SV; there_2 clauses;
and inversion without there_2.

SV:

(68) Ach twa beoð bi mong alle
But two are among all (AR 1.13)

(69) þreo crosses beoð
three crosses are (AR 40.5)

There_2:

(70) beoð þer me maye seo to ow.
Let there be a third person present (AR 55.15)

(71) for nis þer na steuene
for there is no voice (SW 253.20)

VS:

(72) forte breoke þis hus...is moni þeof a buten
for to break this house...is many a thief about
(SW 247.12)

(73) Ach nu is sum wummon þe...
But now is a woman who... (AR 49.17)
It is clear in (70) and (71) that the function of there₂ is as a marker of an existential S, not just a means of maintaining V/2 order.

The many negative clauses of the *Sawles Warde* are interesting for the high frequency of inversions of both pronominal subjects and of subjects in subordinate clauses.

\[(74)\] for ne mahte in eorde na cwic þinge hit polien for on earth no living thing could endure it (SW 251.3)

\[(75)\] for þah neauer nere nan ðer pine... for though never were any other pain... (SW 253.7)

(But, for example, SV in SW 251.6). Examples like (74) and (75) are relatively rare in my data. We have seen one other example in (50) (this chapter).

The *Sawles Warde* also contains several examples of negative subordinate clause inversion of pronominal subjects, also rare in my data (But SV in 251.34, for example):

\[(76)\] for of al his strengde ne drede we nawiht for of all his strength we have not any dread (SW 255.8)

\[(77)\] þat þurh unweotenesse ne nei ha nawt sunegin that through ignorance she may not sin (SW 255.33)

These examples are further evidence of an apparent increase in inversions in subordinate clauses since OE.

However, even in negative main clauses, inversion of pronominal subjects is still variable, with the Laud Ms. and
the Ancrene Riwle and Sawles Warde showing highly consistent inversion while the Homilies often have SV order in these clauses.

**DUMMY IT**

While the constituent dummy it is not directly related to inversion, it is interesting to observe its behavior and compare this it with pronominal it. Occurrences of this it in OE are infrequent in my data, so I have delayed discussing it until Transition English, where it occurs more often. Some examples of it-clauses in OE follow:

(78) ac hit naes na swa.  
    but it was not so  
    (ASC C1053.6)

(79) Hit is ge cyndelic  
    it is natural that...  
    (MOA 15.11)

(80) Ac hit gelamp...  
    But it happened...  
    (Wills 16.4)

(81) Ac hit ne synd na steorran...  
    But it is not stars...  
    (MOA 15.20)

We observe in these clauses that where hit occurs, it behaves just as we would expect pronominal hit to behave. Specifically, hit occurs in SV order in affirmative clauses and in the two negative clauses. However, hit does not always occur where we would expect it to occur from the standpoint of Modern English.

(82) him swa getimode...  
    to him so (it) happened  
    (AH 10)

(83) Earfodlic is to atellanne...  
    Heartbreaking (it) is to tell...  
    (ASC C156.9)
In the affirmative main clauses with *hit* it appears that *hit* serves the purpose of maintaining V/2 order, as is suggested in Haiman (1974). This impression is furthered by the existence of (82) and (83), where *hit* is omitted when another fronted constituent occurs. However, in negative and subordinate clauses, *hit* does not appear to exist for reasons of maintaining V/2 order.

(84) Ḟa hit swa gelamp... when it so occurred... (Wills 16.10)

(85) ne was hit noht buton laesunge it was nothing but lies (ASC Ell28.29)

Since the negative particle *ne* and the subordinate adverb *ba* may be clause-initial, V/2 order would be maintained even without *hit*. As these clauses stand they are V/3 (XSV & SXV) not V/2. In these clauses *hit* behaves like any other personal pronoun, maintaining SVO order when after *ba* 'when' and optionally in negative clauses.

Thus, the data suggest that if *hit* ever was used only to maintain V/2 order, it was no longer exclusively used for such a purpose by the OE period. Instead, dummy *hit* has been placed in the personal pronoun category at least in regard to the inversion rule. The data also give credence to Bolinger's (1977b) treatment of dummy *it* and pronominal *it* as being intimately related. In sum, while dummy *hit* was not consistently used (cf., Wahlen, 1925) there is evidence that when *hit* was used it has a function beyond maintaining V/2 order. Often *hit* also does maintain V/2 order, but other times it does not.
The data from Transition English fully support these conclusions. In SVO order dummy *it* is found where otherwise the *S* would be *V/l*.

(86) hit itimode...
    it happened...
    (OEH 93.18)

(87) ac hit weard þam cynge cud þet...
    but it became to the king known that...
    (ASC E1087.53)

When another constituent is fronted *hit* may be deleted:

(88) Mid þan is itacned þat...
    By this is denoted that...
    (OEH 101.8)

(89) Eac weard on Ispanie þ...
    Also was in Spain that...
    (ASC E1086.123)

However, *hit* may also co-occur with another fronted constituent, both in main and in subordinate clauses.

(90) Swa swa hit was þa...
    So it was then...
    (ASC E1086.18)

(91) ful hit is to seggen...
    foul it is to say...
    (AR 67)

(92) hwited...hwa hit beo þ is icumen for swich hit learn...who it is that has come for such it
    mei beon þ...
    may be that...
    (AR 53)

The inversion rule treats *hit* like a personal pronoun; that is, *hit* occurs in SV order except after *þa/benne* and *ne*, where inversion may apply.

(93) ah ne bihoued hit nawt þat...
    it behooves not that...
    (SW 247.10)
The only exception is in Sawles Warde, where an inversion occurs after a preposed constituent other than be or ne.

Stylistically motivated inversion may also apply to clause initial hit resulting in V/l hit clause.

There clauses have several parallels to it clauses.

As we saw in Chapter 2 baer, like hit, often occurs in clause initial position, with no other fronted constituent. But baer can and often occurs along with other fronted constituents. The inversion rule treats baer, the same as baer, inverting both after ne and ba. Like hit, baer clearly had a function in OE besides that of maintaining V/2 order. This is clear from clauses with non-initial baer (such as those in Chapter II and (70) and (71) above) and from the occurrence of baer in subjunctive clauses, which are V/1 in their unmarked form.

There is one distinction in my data between hit clauses and baer clauses. Existential V/l clauses without baer are more common than V/l clauses which (from the standpoint of Modern English) have a deleted hit. Apparently, existential V/l clauses were a popular stylistic variant of existential V/2 clauses, at least in some prose.
period, the prose of Richard Rolle ca. 1340. It is in this prose that, for the first time, we find some substantial changes.

**RICHARD ROLLE**

Rolle wrote in the Northumbrian (northern) dialect, a dialect which was innovative compared to the more conservative southern dialects. For instance, Northumbrian shows case losses earlier than other dialects.

Rolle's prose is religious: an English Psalter, Meditations, Epistles and other short pieces have been examined here. What is interesting about the Psalter, besides the dialect, is that Rolle explicitly vows to write in the popular language, but also "like Latin".

"In this work I seek no strange English, but lightest and commonest and such that is most like unto the Latin, so that they who do not know Latin, by the English may come to many Latin words." (Allen, 1931, p. 7, translation mine)

I am not certain whether Rolle is saying that he writes in the everyday language with a Latin vocabulary or whether he writes as closely to Latin as possible without violating English syntax. We do know that Rolle wrote the Psalter for a young woman recluse who most likely did not know Latin (p. 1). The language problem is of interest in interpreting the Rolle data.

It is immediately obvious, when looking at Rolle's prose that Rolle's inversion is substantially different from what we have come to expect. Of the 20 inversions I have studied (inversion is infrequent in this prose) 13 follow the expected
patterns. The most common heads are: ban, banne, bere in, and prepositional phrases. However, there are 7 instances (35%) of inversion of personal pronoun subjects after heads other than ban/banne. For example:

(98) Verrayly es he my salvacioun.
    Verrily is he my salvation (RR 16.4)

(99) ...that a mysel art þou lyckere þan a clene man
    ...that a leper art thou more like than a clean man (RR 21.67)

(100) Swa sulde we do...
    So should we do... (RR 55.20)

(101) so lyghtly sal þou come...
    so lightly shall thou come... (RR 65.129)

Five of these seven instances have either first or second person pronoun subjects. These 35% personal pronoun inversions represent a major change from the inversions of OE and TE that we have examined so far. The interpretation of their occurrence in Rolle is difficult: are these the innovation of the Northumbrian dialect? Is Rolle faithfully reproducing the language of the common people? And why the predominance of first and second person pronouns? We will return to these questions later after looking at Early Middle English inversions.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have examined instances of inversion from the period of Transition English in order to determine whether the change to the modern form of inversion occurred during this period. I have concluded that Transition English prose shows no significant differences from OE prose. The first major
change, the frequent inversion of personal pronoun subjects in Richard Rolle, does not occur until the Middle English period is approached in the 14th century. However, the extent to which signs of the impending change are evident in late Transition English dialects besides Northumbrian is yet an open question. The problem may never be adequately solved, as prose data from the late transition period is more scarce than from any other period of extant English prose.
In Chapter III we found that with the exception of Rolle, Transition English inversion did not substantially differ from OE inversion, at least in the rather limited data available. Inversion throughout most of the period shared some characteristics with inversion in Modern English: the prohibition against pronominal subjects in most full inversions and the use of inversion for topic shift. On the other hand OE and TE inversion differed from Modern English in the range of verbs allowed in full inversions, in the absence of clear distinctions between semi-inversion and full inversion, in the frequent employment of subject switch inversions and in the general frequency with which inversion was used. We expect to see changes in those aspects of inversion still unlike Modern English in the period between Transition and Modern English. And we might not expect changes in an aspect of OE inversion that is already like Modern English. However, such an unexpected change is exactly what we find in Early Middle English with the introduction of personal pronoun subject inversions.

In this chapter I discuss inversion in Early Middle English prose. I regard as Early Middle English (EME) the prose of the years 1390-1425. In the EME period English
prose was just beginning to reappear after years of the pre-
dominance of French and Latin prose and of the popularity of
verse over prose. I will treat one work of expository prose
by Chaucer, Treatise on the Astrolabe; one sometimes attrib-
buted to Chaucer, Equatorie of Planets; and the English ver-
sion of Mandeville's Travels, originally written in French.
I will briefly compare these works to the prose of some of-
official documents collected in Chambers and Daunt (1931) and to
the very formal prose of Chaucer's translation of Boethius.

CHAUKER: TREATISE ON THE ASTROLABE AND EQUATORIE OF PLANETS

Chaucer's Treatise on the Astrolabe (TA), written ca. 1391
for his son, is a description of the use of an astrolabe, an
instrument to determine the position of the planets. The
treatise includes a series of problems that Chaucer has worked
through and is thus an early workbook in astronomy. The Equa-
torie of Planets (EP) is often, but not universally, attri-
buted to Chaucer and is believed to have been written ca. 1392.
It describes the equatorie, a "geometric device for calcu-
lating the position of the planets in relation to one another"
(Fisher, 1977, p.937). The text may be based on a Latin text.
I will present here the complete data on inversion from these
two sources.

There are a total of 213 main clause inversions in the
two works combined, 81 of which are semi-inversion and 12 of
which are there₂ clauses. There are in addition 29 inversions
in subordinate clauses.
The most striking aspect of Chaucer's inversion is that, even more than in Rolle, personal pronoun subjects are inverted in environments where they were never before in OE or in TE inverted. Some examples with full and semi-inversion follow:

FULL INVERSION:

(1) as wel consider I your bisi prayer... (TA.P.4.33)
(2) And thus knowe I this conclusioun. (TA.II.1.5)
(3) yit sein thei that thilke planete is lyke to him... (TA.II.4.23)
(4) Now hastow the visage of this precios equatorie. (EP 191)
(5) And fro thennes is she meridional... (EP 676)

SEMI-INVERSION:

(6) This cercle wole I clepe the Lymbe of myn equatorie... (EP 25)
(7) And in the same manere shal it be devyded in mynutis... (EP 200)
(8) And so forth, day be day, shaltow descende in the meridional lyne... (EP 648)
(9) And with this swerd shal I slen envie. (TA 68)
(10) This tretis divided in 5 parties wole I shewe... (TA.P.28)

These inversions of personal pronoun subjects are in addition to inversion of pronoun subjects after EME tho and thanne, cognates of OE ba and banne, where inversion of personal pronoun subjects occurred in the earliest data. 1
Than is also usually followed by inversion in Chaucer. However, in Mandeville's Travels (MT) inversion after than is inconsistent and never attains the frequency of inversion after tho or thanne. (OED gives OE bane as the source of ME thanne and than.)

(11) thanne hastow a brod Rewle... (TA.II.13.1)
(12) Tho wolde I wyte the same nyht folwynge the howr of the nyht. (TA.II.3.41)
(13) Tho turnede I myn astrolabie... (TA.II.3.21)
(14) Thanne shaltow sette the fix point of thy compass... (EP 155)

Excluding tho/thanne/than environments these data have 52 instances of personal pronoun subject inversion in main clauses and 8 instances in subordinate clauses. This is 18.5% of the total main and subordinate clause inversions and clearly takes inversion of personal pronoun subjects out of the exception category.

To show how inversion in its newly changed form functioned I will discuss the heads used in EME inversion, the verbs permitted to invert and finally the subjects and discourse environments of inversions.

**PREPOSING IN EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH**

The preposing of S constituents plays an even more important role in EME inversion than it did in OE, for the Chaucer data show no instances of V/l inversions.

Fronted constituents are: prepositional phrases; other single word adverbs (well; there; thus; yit, "yet"; so; now;
therefore; nevertheless); direct objects; as well as the very common tho, than and thanne. Inversion in the main clauses of correlative clauses still occurs in yif... than and whan... than correlative pairs.

PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES:

(15) And in this manner maistow wyrke... (TA.II.40.72)
(16) Next the cercle of the dayes folweth the Cercle of the names of the Monthes. (TA.I.10.1)
(17) And in the zodiak ben the 12 signes that han names of bestes (TA.I.21.54)

SINGLE WORD ADVERBS:

(18) Now hastow the heyhte of thy pol... (TA.II.23.33)
(19) Thus seyn some auctours... (TA.II.39.31)
(20) So dwelleth ther but 1 devisioun... (EP 87)

DIRECT OBJECT:

(21) This cercle wole I clepe the Lymbe of myn equatorie (EP 25)
(22) The same conclusioun say I by the centre of any strerre fix by nyht (TA.II.3.74)

CORRELATIVES:

(23) And yif the verrey motus of the mone be more than 6 signes fro the verrey mot of Caput, than shaltow the verrey motus... (EP 614)
(24) ...whan any sterre fix is passed the lyne méridional, than byginneth it to descende...
(TA.II.13.9)

Further, out of 12 different heads preceding semi-inverted main clauses, 9 of those heads are also found with full
inversions. Hence full and semi-inversions appear not to be
distinguished by the type of head. Nor does the type of head
appear to determine the occurrence of pronominal subject inver-
sions. In these data 5 of the 7 heads occurring with full
inversion pronominal subjects occur also with full inversion
non-pronominal subjects. Four of the 10 heads occurring with
semi-inversion of pronominal subjects also occur with semi-in-
version and full inversion of non-pronominal subjects. Four
of the 6 heads not occurring with inversion of non-pronominal
subjects are instances of heads that occur rarely in the data
(natethless in general, as verrily, so forth and first). 2

2 Except where specified, the figures in this section
exclude clauses with the heads the, thanne and than.

Hence, I do not take the single occurrence of these
with pronoun subjects as evidence that the head determines
when pronoun subject inversion occurs. The other three heads
(direct object, there1, and therefore) in these data occur only
with inverted pronominal subjects, but elsewhere in EME (e.g.,
MT) occur with non-pronominal inverted subjects. Thus, we
are dealing in these cases only with the limitations of the
Chaucer data. Some examples of heads with both pronominal
and non-pronominal subjects are given.

THUS:

(25) Thus may thine instrument last perpetuel (EP 42)
(26) And thus knowe I this conclusioun (TA II 1.15)
YIT:

(27) yit sein they that thilke planete... (TA II 4.26)
(28) yit sein these astrologiens that... (TA II 4.31)

PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE:

(29) by that same proporcioun is every quarter of thine astrolabie devyded (TA I 7.3)
(30) and by this conclusioun maystow take ensample (TA I21.68)

NOW:

(31) And now is my sonne gon to reste. (TA II 12.29)
(32) Now hastow the visage of this precios equatorie. (EP 191)

WEL:

(33) as wel considere I thy bisi preyere... (TA P.4)
(34) For wel wot every astrologien that... (TA P.77)

Inversion after tho and thanne is almost as regular as in OE. The EP contains one instance (out of 26) of thanne not followed by inversion.

(35) And thanne the ark bytwixe medios motus... and the verrey motus...is cleped the equacion...

(EP 376)

There are no such instances in TA, but several occur in MT and will be discussed later.

As in OE fronting is not always followed by inversion and as a result the contrast XSV/XVS remains. Many heads occur in these data with inverted and non-inverted subjects and thus we can say for certain that the head does not determine whether
or not inversion occurs. These heads include: whereas, prepositional phrases, evermo, nathless, therefore, direct objects, and thus.

In addition, there are heads occurring several times in the data that never occur with inversion: sothly (in soth), subordinate clauses with no other preposing, and most subordinators with no other preposing (e.g., that, for). Sothly (8 instances) is cognate with OE sodlice, which also was always followed by SV order. Subordinate clauses in OE were generally followed by SV order, although in Transition English instances of inversion after subordinate clauses increased slightly. Since V/I order was stylistically important in TE, perhaps inversion in main clauses following subordinate clauses could also be attributed to V/I stylistic inversions rather than to a broadening of the class heads triggering inversion.

3 I digress here to suggest an explanation for the continued lack of inversion after long conjunctive adverbs. Jackendoff (cited in Lightfoot, 1979, p. 94) believes that the reason for the lack of inversion after PC's like certainly, evidently, is that these are speaker-oriented S adverbs. Inversion, he argues, introduces a semantic factor which is incompatible with S adverbs. I suggest that these adverbs are not followed by inversion for reasons of stress. These adverbs in general have moderately heavy and fairly uniform stress (little variance in the degree of stress in most cases). I noted in Ch. II that this fact alone would tend to preclude inversion after these adverbs in OE; OE inversion stressed the subject while these adverbs themselves are stressed. I believe, in addition, that Ss with these adverbs tend to
stress the predicate rather than the subject, another reason for non-inverted order in OE. Later in this chapter, I suggest that one function of EME inversion was to show a higher degree of stress on the PC than is indicated by fronting alone. If these adverbs were fairly uniformly stressed, then in Middle English there was no reason to invert the clause to show this stress on one of these adverbs.

Turning to Modern English, the observation that these adverbs are stressed explains also why the following S is bad:

*Evidently, never will they go camping again.

When both evidently and never are preposed, Evidently takes stress away from never, which, as the PC of a semi-inverted S, requires heavy primary stress (cf. Chapter I).

Questions containing these adverbs improve when heavy (unambiguous) stress is put on the adverb.

? Will Frank probably go?

? Will you probably be going tomorrow? but

* What has Charley evidently discovered? (Lightfoot, p. 93)

The last S is bad even with heavy stress on evidently. I suggest this is because evidently, for semantic reasons, generally cannot be heavily stressed. Its semantic content simply precludes heavy stress. I believe that the problem with a S such as:

*did Frank probably beat all his opponents

(ibid.)

is that one cannot tell what is being questioned. It almost appears that one is questioning two things at once: the adverb and the verb. The S improves when heavy stress is placed on one constituent, indicating unambiguously what is being questioned.

Finally, I suggest that in Modern English the requirement that the PC in a semi-inverted clause have heavy primary stress precludes semi-inversion after long conjunctive adverbs in
non-interrogative Ss. Usually, Ss headed by these adverbs have stress both on the adverb and on some other constituent, precluding semi-inversion.

Certainly, John will find that one!
If the -ly adverb can be enhanced and thus more heavily stressed than usual, a semi-inverted S improves.

? Most certainly will John be pleased with that.
* Certainly will John be pleased with that.

In sum I suggest here that inversion after "long conjunctive adverbs" may have been blocked for reasons of stress throughout the history of English. However, the manner in which the stress of the adverb interferes with inversion is different in each stage. In OE the adverb has too much stress; in Middle English the adverb has obvious stress (even without taking part in the degree of stress indicating alternation XSV/XVS.) In Modern English, these adverbs have too much stress in some cases and too little stress in other cases.

Finally, my data show an absence of inversion after most (but not all) subordinators. In EME inversion in subordinate clauses is much more common than in OE but in the majority of instances there is preposing within the subordinate clause.

(36) for Latyn né kanstow yit but smal, my litel sone.
(TA P. 30)

(37) And God wot that in alle this langages and in many mo han thise conclusiouns ben suffissantly lerned...
(TA P. 40)

(38) And nota that in the same maner maistow wyrke any latitude septentional...
(TA II. 40. 43)

However, there are three types of subordinators that can be directly followed by inversion: relative pronouns and where (which functions as a relative) and as (wel as).
(39) But natheles suffise to the thise trewe conclusiouns in Englissh as wel as suffisith to thise clerkes Grekes thise same conclusiouns in Greke...

(40) Tak than a large compaso... and set the... point over the middel... on which middel shal be nayled a plate...

(41) and wheras endith this remenaunt mak a mark in the lymbe.

We should ask why these inversions occur after subordinators in EME while most other inversions have a PC in addition to the subordinator.

First, let us consider some similar inversions in OE and TE.

(42) þone hatað laewede menn carles-waen which call unlearned men C. (MÖA 16.5)

(43) on þam fleod fugelas in which fly birds (MOA 17.4)

(44) swa swa waes Pharao as was P. (AH 312.21)

(45) alswa hefden þe gleis heore sinagoge as have the Jews their synagogue (OEH 9.4)

(46) alswa is nu iclepet al cristen folc as are now called all Christian folk (OEH 9.12)

(47) for þet com muchel liht for came great light (OEH 87.20)

From these examples we see that OE and TE also had inversion after relatives and as and occasionally other subordinators such as for (bet). It is true that OE inversion was in general
somewhat freer than EME inversion in regard to the occurrence of a PC. OE, but not EME, had V/I inversions with no PC, for example. Still, as and the relatives seem to be the most common subordinators preceding inversions. I briefly present here some possible explanations for these inversions.

Unlike most other means of subordination, relativization involves fronting within the subordinate clause. Thus, while the relative pronoun is also the subordinator, the requirement that the inversion be preceded by a fronted constituent is readily satisfied. Thus, relative clause inversion may have originated through the analogy of the fronting involved in relativization and the fronting involved with inversion in general.

As inversions, on the other hand, may have their origin in the fact that swa (alswa) was both an adverb ('so') and a conjunction. Speakers accustomed to using inversion after adverbial swa would likely have less difficulty accepting inversion after the homonymous conjunctive swa than after a subordinator which was not also an adverb. However, many adverbs in OE and TE were also conjunctions, a fact which is readily observed in OE correlative clauses. In fact, the clause in (49) is part of a correlative pair, though an anomalous pair in that the subordinate clause has inversion. What seems to distinguish swa from other homonymous adverbs/conjunctions is that it more often occurs without main clause correlative partners, as in (48) and (50). The subordinate swa clause is often tacked on after the main clause. It is in these instances that
some adverb/conjunction ambiguity might have arisen and that inversion after adverbial *swa* could have influenced the word order after conjunctive *swa*.

Finally, turning to (47) it should be noted that this inversion is a presentative. Since presentatives, with their heavy subject stress, were strongly associated with inversion in OE, perhaps this association influenced the word order of presentatives even in subordinate clauses with no PC.

In EME the rather rigid requirement that inversions be preceded by the fronting of some constituent within the clause generally blocked inversion after subordinators, as in (47), and V/1 clauses in general. However, relative clauses again had intra-clausal fronting. In addition, relative clauses in EME often (but not always as MT shows) contain both the relative pronoun and the relativized noun (*cf.* (40)). Since both of these constituents are fronted within their own clause in the relativization process, it is possible that these clauses could be interpreted as containing a fronted constituent (the undeleted relativized NP) in addition to the marker of subordination (the relative word). Hence, they could be seen as having the same structural description as, for example,

(48) And nota that the middel poyn of this plate...
    wole I calle Centre Aryn.  

which has both a subordinator and a PC. This would explain the occurrence of inversion in relative clauses without benefit of another preposed constituent. However, this alone would not
explain why in MT there are two instances of inversion after relative where with no other proposed constituent.

(49) Also on þat oþer syde...is a chirche where was wont to be the cave of the lyoun. (MT 63.22)

(50) And the forpartie of the heed...is...in the chirche of seynt Silvestre, where ben Nonnes of an hundred ordres... (MT 72.2)

Another instance of relative clause where contains in addition there.

(51) At a cost of þat see...is the mount of the Moabytes where þere is a cave þat men clepen karua. (MT 66.26)

In Modern English inversion in subordinate clauses generally follows the same rules as inversion in main clauses (cf. Hooper and Thompson, 1973 and Bolinger, 1977a). PC's are required, but relative pronoun fronting satisfies this requirement, as in: The front wall, on which were two expensive paintings, was painted blue.

Next we come to heads that in the Chaucer data are not followed by inversion but about which I reserve judgment due to the limitations of the data: also (3 instances) and fortherover (1 instance). These two heads occur only with SV order in the Chaucer data and in the Mandeville data (which has one instance of also). It could be that inversion does not occur after these heads at all; however, other adverbs of these kinds do trigger inversion in EME (e.g., natheless, therefore, as verrily, and thus).

In general, it is apparent that little substantive change
has taken place in the relation between the head and subsequent inversion. In particular, I note the absence of inversion after the "long conjunctive adverb" sothly, as in OE; the high rate of inversion after tho and thanne in Chaucer, as in OE; and the obligatory inversion after there. As in OE, it is difficult to relate frequency of inversion to the type of head, with the exception of the heads not permitting inversion. Now, for example, always is followed by inversion in the Chaucer data. Now inverts even more regularly than it did in OE, because the inversion is unrestricted by the choice of subject (pronoun or non-pronominal noun). However, examples from Chaucer's Boece and MT show that inversion after now is not obligatory.

(52) But now thou mayst wel seen to what ende I am komen...
    (B.IV.226)

(53) ...but now the ymage scheweth but litill
    (MT 82.24)

(54) Now I have told you a party of here lawe...
    (MT 92.4)

On the other hand other adverbs similar to now are not so regularly followed by inversion, e.g., there, wit, than (in MT). Thus, we can not readily identify a class of adverbs in EME that usually invert the subject, say the class of monosyllabic time adverbs. While tho and now (as well as the disyllabic thanne) usually invert, than often occurs with SV order.

We should note that the range of non-thematic PC's followed by inversion has increased somewhat. For instance,
Chaucer uses inversion after such PC's as wel (2 instances), yet "yet" (5 instances), evermo, nonetheless in general, as verrily, ek in process of time, day by day. Eight (66%) of the inversions with these PC's have pronominal, thematic or topical subjects. I suggest that the reason for this high percentage of low stress subjects with non-thematic heads is that non-thematic heads are more likely to be stressed themselves than are thematic heads. The more the head was stressed, the less stress was put on the subject. The above figures are evidence for the claim I will make that EME pronoun subject inversions stressed the PC.

One generalization about EME we can make is that the language has become more V/2 by virtually eliminating V/1 order and by allowing inversion of pronominal subjects. This is not to say, however, that English has become as V/2 as a language like French was, for inversion is by no means automatic. V/3 order is still very common, especially with pronoun subjects.

THE VERB OF INVERTED CLAUSES

EME inversions occur with a wide range of verbs: action and stative verbs, active and passive, presentative and non-presentative, simple and compound verbs, verbs of various tenses, and transitive and intransitive verbs.

ACTION/STATIVE VERBS:

(55) and so doth the sonne. (TA.II.13.10)

(56) But nonetheless thus lith thin instrument (EP 340)
ACTIVE/PASSIVE:

(57) This tretis...wole I shewe the... (TA P.28)
(58) And God wot that in alle this langages and in many mo han thise conclusiouns ben suffissantly lerned... (TA p.40)

PRESENTATIVE/NON-PRESENTATIVE:

(59) Than folwen the names of the Halidayes in the Kalender... (TA I.11.1)
(60) So maistow knowe in the same lyne the heiest cours... (TA II.13.6)

SIMPLE/COMPOUND:

(61) Tho leide I my label over the degree of the sonne... (TA II.3.51)
(62) An in the same manere shal it be devyded in mynutis... (EP 200)

VARIOUS TENSES:

(63) This cercle wole I clepe the Lymbe of myn equatorie... (EP 25)
(64) Therfor have I geven the a suffisaunt astralahie (TA P.9)

TRANSITIVE/INTRANSITIVE:

(65) Tho drow I the verrey motus of Cauda... (EP 727)
(66) Thus may thin instrument laste perpetuel (EP 42)

There are, in short, no changes in the classes of verbs in inverted clauses.

Existential be, however, is obligatorily inverted.

There are no more instances of SVO order with existential be
(as in the OE a synod was: senob waes). Further, all instances of there$_2$ in my data are followed by full, not semi-inversion, and the majority of existential verbs other than be also show full inversion.

NO THERE$_2$:

(67) in hem may ben mo smale facciouns. 
       (EP 4)

(68) Under the compas of thilke degres ben writen  
       the names of the 12 signes... (TA I.8.1)

THERE$_2$:

(69) Over thwart this forside longe lyne there  
       crosseth hym another lyne of the same lengthe... 
       (TA I.5.1)

(70) Next this folwyth the Cercle of the Dayes...  
       (TA I.9.1)

(71) Thus ben ther 6 degrees of the zodiak on that  
       side of this lyne... (TA I.21.43)

Chaucer sometimes inverts there$_2$ after preposed constituents, as in (71). In OE this was common only after be and bonne. Other examples of this inversion are:

(72) Thanne is ther a large Pyn...that goth thorow  
       the hole... (TA I.14.1)

(73) Next thise azymutz under the cercle of Cancer  
       ben ther 12 devysiouns embelif... (TA I.20.1)

This inversion is not found in the narrative prose of MT, e.g.,

(74) Abouten Grece here ben many Iles... (MT 10.9)

and thus may be a characteristic of a conversational or at least less formal style.
More interesting is the persistent use of *there* with decidedly non-existential/non-presentative verbs:

(75) There varieth but lite...
\[= \text{(There is little variation) (TA II 15.6)}\]

(76) This chapter is so general ever in on that there nedith no mor declaration. \[= \text{(TA II 2.12) (i.e., there is no need for more declaration)}\]

(77) I conjecte that there laketh I not nere what...
\[= \text{(BIV. 28) (= that there is lack for me not= there is no lack for me)}\]

(78) I nas nat deceived...that ther ne fayleth somewhat...
\[= \text{(BVI.36) (= that there was no failure)}\]

I believe that these examples are further evidence that, as suggested in Chapter II, *there* was used as a marker of an existential clause. Further, *there* could be used to transform non-existential verbs into existential ones, as in these examples. This is, I believe, the origin of the existential meaning of, e.g., *rule* in *There ruled a king* or of *preach* in the EME example cited in Breivik from the poem *Piers Plowman*:

(79) There preched a pardonere as he a prest were...
\[= \text{(Piers Plowman, p.20, cited in Breivik, 1977, p.343)}\]

To return to the discussion of verbs, both separated (semi) and unseparated (full) inversion of compound verbs occurs, as in OE. There are some increasingly strong tendencies relating the subject and the occurrence of semi- or full
inversion which will be discussed below. Here I note that the auxiliaries of compound tenses, when semi-inverted, have developed popular contractions with the inverted subject: 
hastow 'has thou'; shaltow 'shall thou'; maistow 'may thou'; etc.

In sum, the choice of verb does not in general dictate whether or not inversion occurs, as in OE. However, as we will see, there is a definite trend for the choice of verb to determine whether full inversion or semi-inversion occurs.

THE SUBJECT OF EME INVERTED CLAUSES

As we noted above it is in the subject of inverted clauses that the major change between OE and EME occurs, namely, the inversion of personal pronoun subjects. Inversion of first and second person pronoun subjects was especially common, but such inversion was not obligatory, as the following Ss show:

(80) ...by experience I wot wel that... (TA II 3.76)
(81) ...and at the arising of the sonne I fond the seconde degree of Aries... (TA II 12.8)
(82) ...and in direct of the hed of Cancer thou shalt...make a litel hole thorw the epicicle.

(EP 220)
(83) Now for the composicioun of the epicicle... thou shalt make... (EP 195)

Moreover, personal pronouns are not the only thematic inverted subjects in EME, for topical non-pronominal nouns are also inverted at a rate above the exception category. In TA, for example, there are 3 clear cases where an inverted subject is
not subject-shifted out of 30 inversions of nouns (other than those with *tho/thanne* heads), a 10% rate.

(84) Al be it so that fro the equinoxial may the *declinacion or the latitude* of any body celestial be rikned... And right so may the *latitude or the declinacion* of any body celestial ...be rekned fro the ecliptik lyne... (TA II 17.37)

(85)... they sayn that the planete is falling fro the assendent. Yit sein thise astrologiens (=they) that... (TA II 4.30)

(86) For *they* sayn that every signe is departed in 3 evene parties... and thilke porcioun they clepe a Face... yit say some *folk (=they)* so that the planete aryse... (TA II 4.60)

Combined with pronominal subjects, we have a total of 28% of inversions in TA with either pronouns or subjects that are not shifted or both. In addition, we have 3 clear cases in TA where an inverted subject of a subordinate clause is the same as an adjacent main clause subject, a situation not found in earlier English.

(87)... suffise to the this trewe *conclusiouns* in English as wel as suffisith thise noble clerkes Grekes thise same *conclusiouns* (TA P.33)

(88) And God wot that in alle this langages and in many mo han this *conclusiouns* ben suffisantly lerned... (TA P.40)

(89)... al the nygt longe til the sonne arise. Now riseth the sonne that Sonday by the morwe... (TA II 12.35)

Thus we observe that the occurrence of inversion in general is
less constrained by the topicality or prior occurrence (thematicity) of the subject than in OE.

Now let us look more closely at the pronominal inverted subjects. We saw in Chapter II that OE lacked a general rule inverting personal pronoun subjects even in environments where the pronoun subject might be stressed, such as the subject shift environments of (92) to (94) in Chapter II. Hence, one possible change could be the introduction of inversion of pronoun subjects when the subject is shifted, i.e., different from the previous main clause subject. However, this is not the change indicated in the data. In TA, for example, excluding inversions after tho/thanne 15 inverted pronouns are subject shifted (referring to constituents other than the prior subject), while 22 are not subject shifted, i.e., they have the same referent or are the same pronoun as the prior main clause subject. For example,

(90) And fro the end of thilde 3 signes she is septentrional...til she come mid wey betwix Capud and Cauda. And fro thennes is she meridional...

(EP 676)

(91) Litell Lowys my sone I have perceived well...thine abilite to lerne sciences...and as wel considere I thy bisi preyere...

(TA p.1)

(92) Tho leide I rewle over this forseide day and fond the point...And thus knowe I this conclusioun.

(TA II 1.5)

The results of the changes in inversion are the following: First and foremost the OE constraint on inversion no longer
applies. It is no longer the case that inversion is almost always limited at the minimum to subject-shifted non-pronominal subjects, i.e., subjects that are likely to be stressed. In EME inversion applies frequently to non-subject shifted subjects, topical subjects and pronominal subjects, subjects that are likely to receive relatively less stress. Related to this, there are only two environments where the inversion obligatorily is sensitive to the topicality of the subject: existential clauses and there clauses. These clauses are prevented from having topical subjects for semantic reasons.

Inversion still occurs in the environments where it did in OE: topic and subject-switch environments and inversions of subjects that occur in non-nominative cases of the prior clause or are recently mentioned. For example:

(93) for in this plate shollen ben perced alle the centris of this equatorie, and ek in proces of tyme may this plate be turned... (EP 37)

(94) And in þat same gardyn seynt Peter deniedoure lord thryes. Afterward was oure lord lad forth before the Bisschoppes. (MT 9.3)

In fact these inversion types seem to occur at approximately the same rate as in OE when one considers only nominal subjects: the 22% (11 of 51) inversions of nominal subjects in Chaucer which are recent mention (thematic)or closer can be compared with the 27% of MOA (but 4% (26 out of 569) in MT compared with 19% in the A Chronicle). One way of describing the change in inversion is that the frequent inversion of pronominal subjects and
non-subject shifted nominal subjects has been introduced. We can speculate that we are dealing with a change in which initially something was added to the language rather than one in which something that already exists was changed. What has been added is the frequent occurrence of inversions of subjects that normally are on the lowest end of the stress scale, i.e., inversions where we might guess that a constituent other than the subject is stressed. I will return later to the problem of describing the nature and mechanisms of this change.

In addition to inversions after preposed constituents there are in these data 29 instances of fronting with SV order in main clauses. SV order, as we noted above, always occurs after sothly, and in correlative main clauses if the main clause lacks a fronted correlative adverb, e.g.,

(95) But natheles yif thow myshappe in this case I shal tech... the a remedie.  (EP 299)

Eight of the XSV clauses follow sothly, 3 are in subordinate clauses (which still tend toward SV order although VS order increases in my data) and 5 have nominal subjects, of which 2 are thematic. All other subjects (in all 13) in XSV order are pronominal. Hence, even with the inversion of pronominal subjects, XSV order still is strongly associated with pronominal subjects. This matter will be discussed again for MT.

Negative clauses in Chaucer are not inverted either with pronominal or non-pronominal subjects.

Non-pronominal subjects:

(96) But sothly the spaces bytwixe the hole ne shal
nat be devided...

(EP 170)

(97) ne lettere E ne servyth nat but for to shewe...

(EP 479)

(98) For lettere D ne servyth of nothyng ellis...

(EP 476)

Pronominal Subject:

(99) and also that it be nat filed...

(EP 205)

We can see that _ne _still occurs, but its occurrence was probably already quite variable in spoken OE while still preserved in the more conservative written language. The following examples attest to this inconsistency, for none of these early 15th century Ss have _ne _(cf. also (99):

(100) and I forsake never _be._

(MK 8)

(101) nevertheless she would not leeryn hir pride...

(MK 9)

(102) _pat she myght not heryn hir song._

(MK 15)

By the time of Malory (mid 15th century), _ne _had almost totally disappeared.

The widely cited "loss of inversion" after the fronted negative must be explained. I give here a brief description of the real nature of this change in inversion after negatives as suggested by my data. In OE simple negation _ne_ was frequently (but not always) followed by inversion while _ne_ + _ne_ , a conjunctive _ne_ plus a verbal particle _ne_ , was generally found with straight order. Jacobsson (1951, p. 18) attributes the lack of inversion with _ne_ + _ne_ to the fact that there was "no need to shift _ne_ + verb in front of the subject, there
being already a conjunctive _ne_ to indicate the negative import of the sentence." I point out, however, that OE did not in general have inversion after conjunctions; thus, straight order after conjunctive _ne_ is expected on the basis of the absence of a proper preposed constituent for inversion.

Turning to EME, consider the following negative clauses:

(103) Ne I trowe nat... (BIV 162)

as opposed to:

(104) I ne trowe nat... (BIV 1.12)

(105) ne I ne avauntede me never... (BIV 221)

(106) ne lettere E ne servyth nat but for to shewe...
    (EP 479)

(107) ne never nas yit day that myhte put me owt ot the sothnesse of that sentence. (Nas = ne + was) (BVI.16)

(108) But yit ne myhte nat al his hye power torne the woodnesse of this wikked Nero. (BVI.27)

_Ne_ in (103) is S initial, but it follows a negative S. _Ne_ in (105) is a conjunction and _ne_ in (106) is both a conjunction and follows a negative S. _Ss_ (107) and (108) show inversion.

The environments in which SV order is found after fronted _ne_ are all environments in which fronted _ne_ is a conjunction meaning _nor_ or _and not_, while non-fronted _ne_ or _ne_ followed by inversion (as in passage (104)) is part of a simple negation.
Since inversion did not occur after conjunctions alone (e.g., after *and* or *but*) in EME inversion does not occur after fronted *ne* in EME when it means *nor*. Notice that in (107) inversion does occur when an additional negative besides conjunction *ne* (i.e., *never*) is fronted, just as this hypothesis predicts. Likewise in (108) where *vit* is fronted and the *ne* also appears to be a simple negation, inversion occurs. Thus, it is inaccurate to describe the difference between OE and EME as a loss of inversion after negatives. Middle English shows not a loss of inversion after *ne*, but the gradual loss of *ne* as an optionally fronted particle of simple negation. Eventually, fronted *ne* came to be used strictly as a conjunction and was later supplanted by *nor*. Inversion after *nor* did not become obligatory until the Modern English period, when *nor* VS order fell in line with other inversions having heavy stress on the PC (see Chapter V). Simple negation *ne* was supplanted by S *ne V nat* and finally by *nat* (Modern English *not*) alone. *Nat* was never fronted and thus was never associated with inversion. Hence, the real problems are how and why *nat* came to be added to *ne* and came eventually to supplant *ne*, while fronted *ne* became conjunctive only. However, these matters cannot be treated here.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE SUBJECT AND FULL OR SEMI-INVERSION

Now we turn to the important question: what was the function of inversion in EME? To answer this question, we must first discuss the relationship between the subject and the
occurrence of inversion.

In spite of the fact that the EME inversion rule does not appear to be constrained as to the type of subject it inverts, we do find strong tendencies relating inversion to subject type.

First we note a relation between first mention subjects and inversion in existential and there clauses. Such clauses are semantically incapable of occurring with thematic/topical subjects. Further they are very common in EME narrative prose. By EME inverted clauses had become the only existential clauses, as SVO order for existentials no longer occurs. In TA, of a total of 153 inverted main clauses (including tho/thanne clauses) 24 are existential and/or there clauses (16%). In the narrative prose of MT this percentage is much higher. Thus, even after topical/thematic subjects were capable of being inverted, a strong association between athematic subjects and the occurrence of inversion can be found.

Second, the distinction between the occurrence of full inversion and the occurrence of semi-inversion is also related to the subject. Full inversion tends to occur with athematic non-pronominal subjects: 60% in Chaucer do, 31 of 52 full inversions. Semi-inversion occurs relatively more frequently with pronominal, topical or recently mentioned (thematic) subjects: 76% in Chaucer do, 31 of 41 semi-inversion clauses. For example, the following compound verbs occur in full inversion (i.e., are unseparated) in TA: is marked, are written, are compassed, is imagined.
(109) Upon this forseid plate ben compassed certein cercles...

(110) Amiddes this celestial zodiak is ymagined a lyne...

All these unseparated verbs are in existential clauses and all have athematic subjects. There are in the TA 6 such instances.

In addition, consider the following clauses from EP:

(111) in hem may be mo small fractions. (EP 4)

(112) In middes of this nayl that fastnyth the harre and the label togedere ther mot be a smal prikke that he dep. (EP 252)

Again both Ss have unseparated compound verbs and athematic subjects. Again both are existential.

Full inversion, at this stage of the language, cannot be limited to athematic subjects, because semi-inversion can occur only when an auxiliary occurs. Since the auxiliary do did not yet occur, only verbs with compond tenses and/or modals can be separated. Also, full inversion is certainly not limited to existential verbs. Hence, in contrast to the above Ss we find:

(113) and as wel considere I thy bisi preyere...
(with pronominal subject) (TA P4)

(114) For wel wot every astrologien... (TA P77)
(non-existential verb)

(115) Now riseth the sonne... (TAII 12.35)
(existential verb, but recently mentioned subject)

The point is that we can only speak of a tendency for full inversion clauses to have existential verbs and athematic
subjects. But the strength of that tendency is manifest in the total absence in my data of an unseparated compound inverted verb with a pronominal subject.

Semi-inversion, on the other hand, tends to have pronominal, thematic (recently mentioned) and topical subjects and nonexistential verbs. Speaking first of non-pronominal subjects, there are just 4 (8%, i.e., 4 out of 51 instances of full inversion) instances in TA and EP, where full inversion of non-topical but recently mentioned subjects occurs. This is opposed to 85% (7 out of 8 nominal subject semi-inversions) for semi-inversion. For example, (115) follows the clause:

\[(115a) \ldots \text{til the sonne arise.}\]

In the MT data 15% of semi-inversion subjects are recently mentioned (10 of 66) whereas only 4% of full inversion subjects (11 of 279 instances, excluding clauses with simple existential be) are recently mentioned. Concerning pronominal subjects, wherever possible (i.e., whenever an auxiliary occurs) they are semi-inverted. In the TA data semi-inversion occurs 3 times with recently mentioned non-pronominal subjects and 2 times with new non-pronominal subjects (Recent Mention: P40; II 17.25; II 31.6; Athematic and new: 7.3; II 16.4). In EP semi-inversion occurs twice with non-pronominal subjects and both are recently mentioned:

\[(116) \text{and ek in proces of tyme may this plate be turned abowte.}\]

\[(\text{plate is in a prepositional phrase of the prior clause}) \quad (\text{EP 40})\]
Instances of semi-inversion with pronominal subjects are very numerous in both TA and EP.

In sum, while we can no longer speak of an inversion rule constrained by the thematicity or emphasis of the subject, it is evident in this data (and in the MT data) that thematicity and hence stress did enter into the occurrence of inversion. Thus, we can speak of certain tendencies that relate the occurrence of inversion and the thematicity of the subject.

First mention non-pronominal subjects tend to occur at (or towards) the end of a clause, a relatively emphatic position in the clause. Recently mentioned or previously mentioned (thematic) or pronominal subjects tend to occur in clause central position, an inherently less emphatic position in the clause. A result of these two tendencies is a third tendency: a tendency for a functional distinction between semi-inversion and full inversion. The distinction is apparent only when a compound verb occurs, but still, the tendency is there. The functional distinction is based on relative emphasis on the subject, with full inversion placing more emphasis on the subject than semi-inversion, especially when the subject ends up in clause final position.4

4 Along these same lines I offer an explanation for the following facts about OE. Pronominal subjects are inverted after ba so as to immediately follow the verb. Non-pronominal subjects
generally immediately follow the verb also. However, on occasions some other constituent comes between the verb and the non-pronominal subject, but not between the verb and the pronominal subject. The pronom subject thereby tends toward clause medial position. Some examples where the subject does not immediately follow the verb are given here:

\[ \text{pā for mid him & aefter him swa micel folc swa naefre} \]
\[ \text{then went with him & after him so many people as never} \]
\[ \text{aer ne dide siddon... before or since did... (ASC E 1128.25)} \]
\[ \text{pā uppon Eastron...waes gesewen forneah ofer eall Ḵis} \]
\[ \text{then after Easter...were seen almost over all the land swilce forneah ealle pā niht swide maeni fealdlice} \]
\[ \text{land almost all the night very large numbers of stars... (ASC E 1095.14)} \]
\[ \text{pā waeron innan pām castele Oda bs. cnihtas... then were in that castle the knights of bishop Oda... (ASC E 1087.48)} \]

If. pā occurs with a pronominal subject, however, the subject immediately follows the verb. In this way the pronoun subject, which has little stress, is kept close to the center of the clause in a position of relatively low emphasis, thereby allowing other constituents to be stressed.

**THE FUNCTIONS OF INVERSION IN EME**

In the previous section I noted the factor of relative emphasis in determining the occurrence of full or semi-inversion. In this section I discuss relative emphasis as a function of inversion in EME.

While the introduction into the discourse of athematic, emphatic subjects certainly was one function of inversion in EME, we can no longer construct an inversion rule based on the
principle of stress on the subject. Thus we must turn anew to the question of the function or functions of inversion.

First, we turn to the function of semi-inversions. We ask: If semi-inversion places relatively less stress on the subject (as these data suggest) what constituent is stressed? The two possibilities are: the verb and the preposed constituent. We observe that the infinitive form of the verb in semi-inversion clauses occupies (or at least can occupy) final position, an emphatic position, but also an unmarked position for an EME verb (i.e., following the subject). The finite verb, on the other hand, is in a marked position (before the subject) but would not usually bear important enough semantic content to be stressed. It is the preposed constituent that is both in an inherently stressed position (clause initial) and in a marked position and in addition is semantically capable of being stressed. Hence, I suggest that semi-inverted clauses in EME usually stressed the preposed constituent. This would explain the tendency for semi-inverted subjects to be pronominal and thematic. Secondarily, these clauses stressed the verb.

Full inversion clauses with existential verbs, athematic, nonpronominal subjects introduce a new subject/topic into the discourse. This appears to be a common function of full inversion verbs also when the verb is non-existential. Surely, stress is generally on the athematic subject, which also happens to be in marked position in the clause. But what about
full inversion clauses with pronominal or thematic subjects? In the absence of likely stress on the subject, we are forced to turn again to emphasis of some other constituent. The subjects in many cases do seem to be clearly unemphatic. For example, in MT full inversion occurs with the subject men, the semantic equivalent of one, in the following clause:

(118) and þere passe men the ryuer of Danubee. (= one passes) (MT 5.2)

Nor can one find special stylistic effects or environments that might explain the inversions as we could in OE. In some cases we find clear cases of emphasis on certain constituents:

(119) suffise to the thise trewe conclusiouns in English, (to the = to thee) as well as suffisith to thise noble clerkes Grekes thise same conclusiouns in Grek... (TA P 32) (a contrast of the datives)

(120) The lord of the assendent sey they that he is fortunat... (TA II 4.45) (emphasis on the fronted direct object)

(121) ...she is septentrional... til she come mid wey bytwix Capud and Cauda. And fro thennes is she meridional... (EP 676) (emphasis on the predicate adjective contrast)

One instance seems clearly to stress the verb:

(122) So hadde she. (MT. 65.24)

which is preceded by:

(122a) & þerfore sche hadde gode reward as holy
writt seyth...
Thus, the emphasis seems variable, located on the verb, on the preposed constituent or on some other constituent in the S. However, since it is the verb and the PC that are in marked position in inverted clauses (as well as the subject), most likely the verb or the PC received at the minimum secondary and most often primary stress in clauses with full inversion of low stress subjects. These constituents when inverted would receive relatively greater stress than they would in the corresponding uninverted order.

In sum, the discourse function of inversion in OE was generally expressible in terms of stress on the subject, while the discourse function of inversion in EME is in most cases expressable in terms of stress on one of three constituents: the subject, the verb, or the PC. The EME inversion rule is not subject to a stressed subject constraint. It appears that the rule optionally applies after all but a few fronted constituents as a means of emphasizing some constituent in the clause, but not necessarily the subject, although the subject is always moved to a marked position.

MANDEVILLE'S TRAVELS

Mandeville's Travels is a narrative of the travels of John Mandeville through the Middle East. The tale is now generally attributed to Jean d'Outremeuse and has been revealed as a fake, since the author never made his trip but took his information from various sources. The original is in French; hence this is
not an ideal source of linguistic data. It is, however, a sample of EME narrative prose.

I will present here the complete data for Part I of MT for the purpose of confirming our description of EME inversion in Chaucer and for elaborating on that description. The data contain a total of 630 inverted clauses. 77 of these are there\textsubscript{2} (or ambiguous there\textsubscript{1}/there\textsubscript{2} ) clauses and 66 of these are semi-inverted clauses. There are 18 instances of inversion in subordinate clauses and 194 instances of existential be.

PREPOSED CONSTITUENTS

In general the preposed constituents in MT confirm the conclusion that EME inversion was not determined by the particular head, except in the case of subordinate clause heads with no other preposed constituent, where SV order is the rule. As we have come to expect, the range of heads in narrative prose is wider than that of other types of prose. MT has a majority of prepositional phrase heads of all kinds, but mostly locative phrases. The heads do not distinguish semi-inversion from full inversion. Nor do they distinguish clauses with pronominal or thematic subject inversion. For example, the following heads occur with subsequent inversion of pronoun subjects: therefore, direct object, locative phrase, so, now, there, after, always, and thus, but there is nothing in this list to distinguish it from a list of heads followed by athematic subject inversion.

It is true, however, that athematic subject inversions
in MT are overrepresented by locative phrases. This is because so many of these clauses are existential: At X was X. Similarly, thematic non-pronominal inverted subjects are overrepresented by preceding temporal heads because of the common inversion of men + action verb in the narrative: And after go men past X. Likewise, therefore is a common head with inverted pronominal subjects because the therefore clause is so often used to refer to the action of a previously introduced NP, as in:

(123) Therefore wolde he make the temple. (MT 57.24)

In sum, while one can find tendencies for particular heads to occur with particular types of inversions, I believe these tendencies are the result of the semantic or discourse nature of the clauses and the heads. I believe there is no evidence to postulate an inversion rule that relates the subject and the preposed head in EME on grounds other than relative stress.

There are no instances of preposed tho in the MT data, but thanne and than occur frequently. There are 10 instances of thanne without subsequent inversion, all clauses with pronominal subjects. There are 8 instances of SV order following than. I will discuss reasons for this change later in this section. Here I note only that obligatory inversion after thanne is in the process of becoming optional. As might be expected, this change is reflected in inconsistent inversion after thanne from author to author. Chaucer, for example,
shows more consistent inversion than MT. Than, common only in EME, not OE, apparently was never as regularly followed by inversion as tho or thanne. Unlike thanne it shows 2 instances of SV order with non-pronominal subjects.

**THE VERB OF INVERTED CLAUSES**

In semantic content only one characteristic distinguishes inverted verbs from non-inverted verbs, namely, existential verbs are always inversed.

Semi-inversion and full inversion are distinguished to some extent by the subject. The MT data has 11 instances of unseparated inverted compound verbs. In all but one instance (69,18) the subject is athematic; none of the subjects are pronominal.

(124)...natheles þere were ordeyned withinne many mansiouns...

(MT 25.15)

(125) And under þat chirche at xxx degrees of deppness weren entered xij martires...

(MT 62.22)

(126) And in þat roche is printed the forme of his body...

(MT 41.8)

On the other hand, semi-inverted compound verbs frequently have pronominal and/or thematic subjects.

(127) And yit is the plate of gold in the thresorye of the chirche

(plate is the subject of the prior S)

(MT 11.19)

(128) And after was he enprisound of another þat wolde be Soudan...

(MT 22.35)
We have noted this same tendency in Chaucer. Clearly, in EME the subject position in semi-inverted clauses was felt more appropriate for thematic subjects than the subject position of full inversions. What distinguishes these two positions, I believe, is relative stress, with XVS order placing more stress on the subject than X Aux SV.

THE SUBJECT OF INVERTED CLAUSES

The subjects of inverted clauses are either thematic or athematic, pronominal or non-pronominal. Out of the 630 clauses in MT 16 non-pronominal subjects are clearly topical and not subject shifted (the subject of the inverted clause is the same as the subject of the prior main clause) and 45 are pronominal (excluding thanne/tho clauses). An additional 12 clauses have inversions such that an inverted subject occurs in a non-nominative case or in a subordinate clause (any case) in the prior S. (Most of these would be regarded as topical in Modern English but I use here the OE terminology for comparison purposes). Some examples are given here.

INVERSION OF NON-PRONOMINAL TOPICAL SUBJECT (NO SUBJECT SHIFT)

(130) In þat contree was Aristotle born... And at Stragers lyth Aristotle... (MT 10.18)

(131) ...he saugh iii and worschiped one

(he = Abraham)

And of þo same rescuyved Abraham the Aungeles in to his hous. (subject=Abraham)(MT 44.6)
(132) And after gon men to Belgrave...and ūere passe men a brigge... (MT 5.8)

INVERSION OF PRONOMINAL SUBJECTS

(133) And on the scherethorsday make ūei here therf bred... (MT 12.8)

(134) & ūere was he made drouken of his doughtres... (MT 67.35)

(135) For at such houre schal he despoyle the world (MT 77.4)

INVERSION OF A SUBJECT THAT OCCURRED IN A NON-NOMINATIVE CASE IN THE PRIOR S (THEMATIC SUBJECT)

(136) ...she entred in to the fuyr. And anon was the fuyre quenched and oute. (MT 46.1)

(137) Right wel aughte us for...to worshipe and preyse such an holy lord ūat brought forth such fruyt...Wel may ūat lord be called delytable... (MT 2.20)

(138) And in ūat same gardyn seynt Peter dyned oure lord thryes. Afterward was oure lord lad forth before the Bisschoppes... (MT 9.2)

The subject of inversions can be a first mention subject or a previously mentioned subject. Previously mentioned subjects that are recently mentioned, but not topical, occur more frequently with semi-inversion than with full inversion.5

5I have no way of defining precisely the term recent mention. I use it to refer to non-topical thematic nouns generally in the same paragraph as the noun in question.

As noted before, although the number of recent mention full
Inversion subjects is the same as the number of recent mention semi-inversion subjects (11 each) the percentages of occurrence differ greatly, since there are many more full inversions than semi-inversions.

Subjects are not necessarily inverted when fronting occurs. In MT there are 224 instances of fronting without subsequent inversion. Of these instances 183 (82%) have pronominal subjects. Clearly, there is a strong tendency for pronominal subjects to have SV order. In addition, 39 (17%) of the clauses with fronting but no inversion and with nominal subjects have recently mentioned subjects. Hence, a strong tendency for SVO order with recent mention and topical subjects remains, as in OE.

**COMPARISON OF THE OE AND EME INVERSION RULE**

We find in MT the same complex system of inversion that we found in Chaucer. While there are strong tendencies to use SV order for thematic and pronominal subjects, inversion may and often does occur with these subjects. Likewise, while there is a strong tendency to use semi-inversion with thematic and pronominal subjects, the incomplete auxiliary system of EME does not permit the generalization of this tendency to the status of a rule.

Let us summarize now the changes in the inversion rule since OE. One change is the apparent loss of inversion in environments where fronting has not occurred and/or where subject deletion has occurred. Another is the change in the constraint on the inversion rule. Application is no longer
blocked when the subject is non-emphatic. Instead, inversion can occur if the PC or the verb rather than the subject is emphatic. As I suggested earlier, most likely one of these three constituents had to be emphatic for inversion to occur, as these are the constituents that are moved out of normal position when inversion applies. Finally, automatic (obligatory) inversion was dying out, as can be seen in the change in inversion after thanne. While thanne obligatorily triggered inversion in OE, in EME pronominal subject inversion after thanne is usual, but no longer obligatory.

An important distinction between the inversion of the spoken language and the inversion of the written language should be noted. In the EME spoken language, it is always obvious which constituent was stressed by the inversion. In the written language there is room for ambiguity as to which constituent was stressed. If we assume, as seems reasonable, that the function of stress on the subject was preserved during the time that the function of stress on the PC or verb was being introduced, then for a time at least, inversions in some environments were likely to have been ambiguous in the written language. In particular, subject stress inversions in environments where stress on the subject is less likely to occur are open to ambiguity: subject switch and topic switch inversions, inversions of subjects that occurred in non-nominative cases of the prior S and recently mentioned inverted subjects in general. These inversions in environments where subject stress
has lower probability could be misinterpreted by a reader as being PC or verb stress inversions. The reader would be forced to guess at the intended stress, probably using relative thematicity of the constituents as a guide. However, conclusions about stress based on relative thematicity would not necessarily coincide with the location of the stress intended by the writer. I will further discuss this problem and its effect on the development of inversion in Chapter V.

THE MECHANISM OF THE CHANGE

It remains now to explain how the change to the inversion of pronominal and thematic subjects came about. The change was relatively rapid, occurring between the end of the period of Transition English (13th c.) and the time of Chaucer in the final quarter of the 14th century. The change also had dramatic results: in a relatively short time, the OE system of inversion, which had been fairly stable at least from the middle of the 9th to the 13th centuries, underwent a substantial upheaval. To explain this rapid change we have to turn to a combination of internal and external factors.  

The easy explanation would be to say that inversion of pronominal subjects spread by analogy from ba/bonne clauses to clauses with other heads. But why would such a change occur so rapidly and with so few signs in the data that a change was occurring at all? And why did other clauses become like ba/bonne clauses rather than ba/bonne clauses becoming like the majority of inverted clauses? In short, I believe the easy explanation is in this case quite inadequate.

First, we turn to a possible internal source for the change. To investigate this source we need to return to the OE data.
As I discussed in Chapter II, there were in OE two regular exceptions to the generalization that the inversion rule inverted only non-pronominal subjects; namely, after the heads *ba* and *bonne*. In addition, there was inconsistent inversion of pronominal subjects after *ne*. Pronominal subjects could also be inverted for apparent stylistic reasons, although this is infrequent in my data. The point is, that OE did not have a constraint which ruled out inversion of pronominal subjects across the board. This is important in that surely the change under discussion would have been less likely had such a constraint existed.

However, the existence of pronominal subject inversion after a few PC's does not explain why this type of inversion spread to other PC's; in particular, analogy to *ba*, *bonne*, and *ne* clauses does not explain why the change occurred. To answer this question we must examine some of the exceptions to the inversion rule in OE, especially those exceptions involving pronominal subject inversions.

As we found in Chapter II, exceptions involving nominal subjects, that is, instances of inversion of topical subjects, are often quite explainable in terms of special stylistic effects. Pronominal subjects can be inverted for obviously stylistic reason also; as for example, in passages of the ASC where an expecially exciting narrative provokes long strings of V/1 clauses. Other inversions of pronominal subjects are found in correlative pairs, for example, *swa...swa* (ASC A894.52 and OE Boethius 242).
In addition there are two OE PC's that sometimes invert pronominal subjects and sometimes do not. Ne is one of these. Ne can, and often does, invert pronominal subjects and occasionally topic nominal subjects. However, there is some variability from author to author in how regularly ne clauses are inverted. In OE, when ne does not invert, the subject is usually pronominal, but not always. For example:

Pronominal Subject/SV:

(139) hi ne dorstan nan gefeoh... they durst not fight... (ASC E1075.25)
(140)...and hi me ne gecniowon. & they me did not know (PC 28.1)
(141) heo ne geendað naefre... it ends never (AH 16.16)

Non-pronominal Subject/SV:

(142) ne naeure hethen men verse ne diden... never heathen men worse did (ASC E1137.47)

Pronominal Subject/VS:

(143) ne cunne we iett noht seggon. we cannot yet say (ASC E1127.73)
(144) ne biden hi naefre enjoyed they never (ASC E1131.27)

Non-pronominal Subject/VS:

(145) ne bair se king H. King H. did not wear (ASC E1111.1)
(146) ne com se here. the host did not come (ASC A 894.17)

Inversion after ne is found with first, second and third person.
pronoun subjects. It appears, however, that *ne* inversion is strongly influenced by the association of SV order and pronominal subjects. Thus SV order for negative clauses is common, even normal, when the subject is pronominal.

The other head with variable inversion is *nu* 'now.' *Nu* is a very common preposed constituent and occurs frequently even in prose that otherwise does not use much inversion, e.g., Boethius or Pastoral Care. In instances of *nu* and subsequent inversion of non-pronominal subjects, the regular discourse constraint of emphasis (subject/topic switch) controls the inversion. My data contain no exceptional occurrences of *nu* + inverted non-pronominal subject. With pronoun subjects, *nu* most often has SV order. However, we do find instances of *nu* + pronoun subject inversion. Consider these examples drawn from a wide variety of OE prose:

(147) *nu gife ic*...
    give I (ASC E675)

(148) *Nu bidde ic*...
    ask I (ASC E675)

(149) *Nu bidde ic*...
    ask I (AH 8.9)

(150) *Nu wille we secgan*...
    will we speak (Or. 2.56)

(151) *Nu wille we*...
    will we... (Or. 258)

(152) *Nu haebbe we gesaeð*...
    have we spoken (Or. 258)

(153) *Nu haebbe we scortlice gesaeð*...
    have we briefly spoken (Or. 244)
The obvious common element in all these examples is a first person pronoun subject. First person pronoun subjects are not always inverted after nu. In fact, the majority are not. But when inversion does occur with a pronoun subject after nu, the pronoun is usually first person.

Second person inverted pronouns are rare after nu.

However, the rarity of such inversions may well be due to limitations of the data for you subjects are quite rare in my data, except in the Homilies. There they are more frequent but occur commonly with ne/benne/ha heads and only occasionally with nu.

Also rare is the inversion of a third person subject pronoun:

(160) Nu is hit scortlice...gessaed...
      Now it has briefly been said (Or. 288)
(161) Swiche teares shedden hie...
Such tears shed they  
(OEH II.14?)
The last example is a literal translation of a Latin quote (both the original and the translation are cited in the passage) and thus may not indicate "good OE". Third person subject pronouns occur much more frequently after _nu_ than do second person pronouns. Hence, the absence of more examples such as that above may _not_ be due to data limitations in this case.

In addition to the inversion of first person pronoun subjects after _nu_, I have found unexpected pronoun subject inversions also after several other PC's.

(162) Scortlice haebbe we _nu_ gesae<i>....
Briefly have we now spoken  
(Or. 262)

(163)  <i>b</i>a wile ic <i>be</i> stande.
these things will I let stand.  
(ACS E675.28)

(164) longe habbe ich....
long have I....  
(OEH 183)

(165) <i>b</i>is have i writen....
this have I written  
(OEH 287)

(166) gif...aefter hiora dege ann ic....
if...after their day give I....(OEH 448)

(167) yet mai ich sare....
yet may I sore (dread)  
(OEH 275)

These Ss have PC's that normally are not followed by pronoun subject inversions. Again, the subjects all are first person.

Now we must ask what it is that determines the occurrence of these inversions. We can observe first that a rhythmic
factor does not appear to "cause" these inversions. There is no rhythmic means that I know of for distinguishing the first person pronouns from the third person pronouns. They are both monosyllabic and vowel length was not a factor; *ic 'I'; *we 'we'; *hi 'they'.

Second, we observe that thematicity does not control their occurrence either; in other words, topical (non-subject-shifted) pronoun subjects occur, as opposed to pronoun subject inversion only at the beginning of a discourse or in other athematic environments. Both (163) and (151) have topical pronoun subjects (two consecutive pronoun subjects). However, many instances do have atypical subjects; for example, an author's interjection of a first person subject at the beginning of a new paragraph (often in the *Orosius*).

We can observe that the common environment of all these first (and second) person pronoun subject inversions is that the clauses are in conversational discourse. Either the author is talking to the reader directly, as in the *Orosius* passages, or a third person is being quoted directly, as in the Laud Ms (e.g. (163)) or the author is speaking to a third person, as in (OEH 158). In short, these are all environments in which the OE spoken language comes through. Hence, one possibility is that inversions of personal pronoun subjects in OE occurred somewhat more freely in spoken OE than in literary prose.

Now I turn to two additional observations on the inversions in question. One is that some of these inversions are
performatives (e.g., (147) to (149)). However, many are obviously not performatives, in particular those with perfect tense verbs (e.g., (152), (153), (158), and (162)). Thus, I believe that a performative origin for these Ss would have to have occurred in a stage of the language prior to OE. By the OE period some grammaticization of inverted performatives would have occurred and the order X V Pro (first person) has already spread to non-performative Ss.

The other observation concerns the morphology of the verb. Some of the inversions in Ss (147-158, 162-167) have verbs that are indicative/subjunctive ambiguous (e.g., Isg.: wille, lsg.: haebbe). In addition, the Orosius shows the peculiar first person plural forms haebbe, wille which are more similar to the normal OE lpl. subjunctive (haebben, willen) than to the usual OE lpl. present indicative (haebbad, willad). Furthermore, except in these inversions, the Orosius uses haebbad, the usual indicative, for the first person plural of habben. Also, we can observe that may, which occurs in several of these inversions became associated with the subjunctive in English when the subjunctive conjugation was lost (as in May he be permitted to go.) as did the past tense of willan:wolde (would).

The question then is whether these facts point to a subjunctive origin of these inversions. Since the OE subjunctive regularly had an inverted subject, even when the subject was a personal pronoun, a subjunctive origin would explain the inversion of the pronoun subject in these Ss.
However, we would have to say that by the OE period the original subjunctives had become a frozen subjunctive, which had spread to environments having strictly indicative interpretations. For instance, it is difficult to think of a subjunctive interpretation for the inversions with habben. In addition, the inversion of first person pronoun subjects occurs with some morphologically unambiguous indicative verbs; for example:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Nu willad heo gesellan} \quad \text{(Wills (Kentish)}

&\quad \text{'Now desire we'} \quad \text{1.6)}

&\text{Gyt sceall ic, cwaed Orosius, manigfealdlicor sprecan...}

&\quad \text{Yet shall I, says O., more fully speak...}

&\quad \text{(Orosius, 292)}
\end{align*}\]

In sum, the inversions in question may well have their origin in some special subjunctive or performative construction. Evidence for this is found in the verb morphology; the common use of a small range of PC's, especially nu; the frequent occurrence with the verbs habben, willan, and mai and the occurrence of inversion only with first (and occasionally second) person pronouns. However, since OE shows neither solely performative nor solely subjunctive occurrences of first person pronoun subject inversions, I tentatively suggest that by the OE period this inversion had become associated with the spoken conversational language where first person subjects would be more common. In any case this inversion was a productive model for personal pronoun subject inversion, one with which French inversions could be compared, as I suggest below.
Now we must ask what function pronoun subject inversions had and why they occurred after relatively few PC's in OE. First, concerning the PC's, we most commonly observe inversion of pronoun subjects after nu and after short adverbs, and preposed direct objects. I have noted previously that nu was an especially common PC, occurring frequently in all types of prose, even in non-narrative prose with limited kinds of preposing and few inversions. I suggest, therefore, that nu was also a type of preposed adverb that could commonly have occurred in speech as well as in literature. In addition, the spoken language occasionally fronted direct objects or other adverbs. We can take this argument a step farther and observe that ne clauses and correlative clauses (which occurred almost invariably whenever a temporal or locative subordinate clause or an if clause occurred) surely can be presumed common in the spoken language too. Again, both of these clause types invert personal pronoun subjects. Finally, Foster (1975) suggests that ba + VS clauses are reflections of the oral language, originating in oral story telling. Thus, the heads that invert personal pronoun subjects are just those that might be assumed to have been common in spoken OE.

In sum, I suggest that pronoun subject ba inversions in literature mimic oral narrative style and have become firmly entrenched in literary as well as oral narrative prose. The heads ne and nu inconsistently invert pronoun subjects in written OE because they reflect borrowing between two stylistic levels of the language: they reflect the borrowing by the
literary formal language of some inversion of the spoken lan-
guage after heads which are common in both speech and writing
and in environments that reflect the spoken language, i.e.,
quotes and direct address. That more such borrowing did not
occur is probably due to the care with which OE authors tried
to write in good literary English, but that it occurred at all
is probably due to the concern of OE writers that the true
language of the English people be faithfully represented.

This distinction between the formal literary language and
the spoken language remained fairly stable throughout OE and
TE. TE, especially the Homilies, contains a goodly number of
pronoun subject inversions in quoted dialogue, but there is
nothing to suggest that the language was replacing the old con-
straints on inversion in the literary language in any sweeping
way.

What function did pronoun subject inversion play in
spoken OE? Most likely, an emphatic function, such as contrast-
ive or other special emphasis on the pronoun subject, as
Dahlstedt finds for demonstrative pronoun inversion in the
literary language (p. 82). But also such inversion could
probably have been used for emphasis on another constituent be-
sides the subject, perhaps a fronted direct object or the
verb of ta clauses and the negative and the verb of negative
clauses. These same functions were, in EME, borrowed by the
literary language.

It is unclear from the data whether these pronoun subject
inversions spread to third person pronouns or whether in spoken OE third person pronoun inversions were also common. In either case, the conclusion that EME pronoun subject inversion is a continuation of the OE first person subject inversion is supported by the fact that in EME first and second person pronouns are inverted at a rate that exceeds third person pronoun inversions. This is clearly seen in EME prose which has a low rate of pronoun subject inversions relative to the number of X Pronoun Verb instances, such as the Middle English sermons collected in Ross (1940). In these sermons the inversions that do occur overwhelmingly have first and second person pronoun subjects. In addition, already at the beginning of the EME period Chaucer contracts the second person pronoun with the preceding verb (auxiliary). This is probably the reflection of an already established speech habit. The conclusion is also supported by the fact that the frequency of inversion of personal pronoun subjects in EME exceeds the frequency of inversion of topical non-pronominal subjects. I suggest this is because topical subject inversion spread to non-pronominal subjects from pronominal subjects.

It could be that there was an intermediary stage in the development of pronoun subject inversion (or in the process of reinterpreting subjunctive/performative inversions) in which only non-topical pronoun subjects were inverted. This also would account for the predominance of first (and second?) person inverted subjects in the data since these pronouns are
more readily used in atypical environments. However, such an intermediary stage would have to have occurred before the OE period, since early OE (e.g., Orosius) contains a few instances of topical pronoun subject inversion.

I note here one other internal factor which may have played some role in the inversion changes. OE and TE, as I noted before, developed a pleonastic subject and object. My data for the OEH shows the use of this double subject in an environment where inversion could occur.

and efere to þam setteres dei heo comen þa iudeisce folc
& ever on Saturday they come the Jewish folk
(OEH 9.6)

It is not clear to me how widespread this usage was in inversion environments, especially where one subject stood before the verb and one after the verb. On the basis of my data I tentatively conclude it was not common in such environments. In addition, it is not clear which noun was felt to be added or pleonastic, or if the added subject could be on either side of the verb. Conversely, it is unclear which subject was deleted when pleonastic subjects were not acceptable, as in EME. Thus, it is difficult to evaluate what, if any, role these Ss played in the changing inversion rule. I conclude it was a minor rule, but the matter deserves further study.

Next we turn to the problem of why the dramatic changes in inversion in the literary language occurred sometime between the end of the 13th and the end of the 14th centuries. I believe that several factors may have caused the change at this time, but that language external factors were of great importance.

First, English literary prose was in a period of revival in EME. After having given way to French and Latin prose for
over a century, writers once again began writing original works in English. In addition, prose itself was being revived after years of emphasis on poetry. Thus, EME was the time of two revivals: of literary prose and of *English* literary prose. This historical break in the literary history of English caused a break in literary traditions and in the continuity of the literary language. I suggest that as a result of this break the OE/TE literary language itself was to some extent lost, along with its inherent conservatisms. When writers again began writing in English, the new literary language would include some of the recent linguistic changes (which were not evident in the literary language of TE), for there was no firmly established conservative standard literary language already in use.

Another factor of English literary history that may have played a role was the change from the religious prose of TE to the secular prose of EME. The religious prose was formal and artistic and hence probably linguistically conservative even when intended to educate the general populace during religious services. On the other hand, in Chaucer we have the prose of a father trying to explain astronomy in a manner intelligible to his small son. The latter prose had to reflect the language a young person could readily understand. Hence, this prose would be closer to the everyday language than highly artistic prose.

There are two other external factors that we must consider:
the possibility of interdialectical borrowing and the influence of French.

The EME that became England's standard dialect was a Midland (Eastern) one, the descendant of the Midland dialect in the Peterborough Chronicle. The question is, then, whether EME inversion patterns were influenced by contact with a more innovative Northumbrian dialect (such as Rolle's) or were an internal development with much the same history in each of the dialects. For the time, I leave open the question whether interdialect borrowing strengthened the position of pronoun subject inversions in southern and eastern dialects. The pronoun subject inversions in Rolle may either be innovative compared to other dialects of its time (ca. 1340) or may simply reflect the changing language at a time approximately 100 years after our last piece of southern dialect TE prose. However, in favor of the latter explanation, I know of no historical reason for hypothesizing a period of substantial contact between the Eastern Midland and the Northumbrian dialects in the 13th and 14th centuries.

The other external factor we must consider is a highly plausible one: French influence. Considering how widely used and prestigious the French language was after the Norman Conquest, it is not surprising that we would find French influence even in the syntactic system. I do not believe that French influence on inversion would be nearly so plausible without the language internal influences on inversion discussed
above. However, with the internal forces already at work in the language and with the pervasive influence of the French superstratum, we can, I believe, explain the *rapidity* of the change in inversions.

**The Influence of French on English**

V/2 order was standard in the French language of the time of the Norman Conquest and after the conquest during French occupation of England. V/2 order was achieved through, among other things, inversion after a variety of preposed constituents. Inversion after fronting was much more regular than in English. (Brunot, 1966). Furthermore, personal pronoun subjects (first, second, and third) were regularly inverted. However, usually these were deleted when inverted. Thus, there were two ways in which French inversions could have influenced English inversions. First, French inversion of personal pronouns would have corresponded to the English *ne + V + Pro.S; nu + V + Pro. S*. Hence, French may have increased the occurrence of such inversions and strengthened their position in the OE system of inversion, possibly stimulating the spread of pronoun subject inversions to third person pronouns and to clauses with other PC's. Second, consider that French Ss with deleted personal pronoun subjects looked like this:

(168) Tresq'en la mer cunquist \( \theta \) la tere altaigne.
To the sea he conquered the highland.
(Haiman's 1974 example, p. 124, from Chanson de Roland)

When literally translated into English the order is:
(169) To the sea conquered he the highland.

with inversion of the pronoun subject.

In (161) above we already saw that Latin subject deletions were sometimes translated with VS order just as in (169). However, Latin was the language of learning and of educated people, while French was the prestigious language that the common people aspired to learn. The educated translators of Latin probably kept the Latin and English syntactic systems distinct. But the imperfect French-English bilingualism of the common people could easily have caused a mixing of the French and English of such Ss as (168) and (169). English Ss might have been constructed so as to mimic the French inverted order. Hence, French was a likely influence on English while Latin, although it too had pronoun subject deletion, did not bring about the change.

However, French influence on English inversion was definitely incomplete. Consider the S:

(170) Par num d'ocire enveierai φ le men.

If I should die I will send my own son.

(Haiman's example, p. 124, from Chanson de Roland)

We saw that in TE inversions of this type, i.e., inversion after subordinate clauses with no other preposed constituent in the main clause, seem to increase in my data (from relatively rare in OE). However, in EME such inversions once again do not occur. If French influence caused the apparent increase, the quick appearance and disappearance of such inversions
would have been due to temporary and conscious attempts to "Frenchify" inversions rather than to a real linguistic change. In sum, the data suggest that PC/V stress inversion originated internally but was increased and spread via a combination of language external factors. It is highly plausible that OE ba and ne pronoun subject inversions stressed a constituent other than the subject. Another plausible internal origin for PC/V stress inversion is the reinterpretation of certain subjunctive/performative inversions (the type: Nu V I/we) as indicative nonperformative pronoun subject inversions associated with conversational OE. In any case, French inversion, which appears not to have been constrained by the nature of the subject, surely could stress (at least sometimes) a constituent other than the subject. The likely candidates were the PC and/or the verb, since these were in marked order. These French inversions influenced the occurrence of PC/V stress inversions in English.

For purposes of comparison I will here briefly summarize the occurrence of inversion in very formal EME prose, Chaucer's translation of Boethius, and in the prose of some historical documents of London of the years 1384-1425. Both of these works are valuable in a study of inversion, for they demonstrate how greatly the frequency of inversion differs from one literary style to another. Were one to study only these two sources, one would readily conclude that in EME inversion had become rare.
In Book I of Boece in 924 lines of prose, there are only 15 instances of full inversion. Three of these follow tho/thanne and the rest follow the heads: alle, now, direct object, predicate adjective, thereof, and so. In addition, there are 6 instances of semi-inversion, 5 of which have pronominal subjects. The inversions, in sum, are what we have come to expect for EME, but less frequent and with less variety of heads.

Much more frequent, on the other hand, are XSV clauses, especially with heads that we have come to associate with inversion, e.g.,

(171) But now thou mayst we seen... (B. PIV.226)
(172) And certeynly of thy desertes...thow hast seyde soth... (B.PV.47)
(173) ...for of this lytel sparke thin hete of lyf shal shyne... (B.PVI.95)

This work shows once again that inversion follows the same rules in the non-narrative and the narrative prose of one historical period. But in non-narrative prose the frequency of inversion is low and the range of heads is small.

Much the same is true of the documents of London English. Most inversions that do occur follow the heads: there, thus, therefore, preposed direct object and prepositional phrases or are in if...than clauses. However, in general inversion is infrequent. A slightly higher frequency of inversion occurs whenever passages of narrative are inserted, as, for example, in the "Appeal of Thomas Usk".

In sum, these two works show, once again, the influence
of literary style on syntax. It is impossible to ignore
the influence of style and very misleading to draw conclusions
about OE or EME syntax from one style of prose or worse yet
from one work of prose. Both Haiman (1974) and Swieczkowski
(1962) fall into this trap when they draw conclusions about
14th century inversions in prose from an analysis of the
Middle English Sermons. Haiman notes Swieczkowski's finding:
"that in Langland's poem Piers the Plowman, subject-verb
inversion after fronting takes place about half the time,
whereas in the prose sermons of the same period, under the
same conditions, subject-verb inversion occurs only one time
in four" (p. 136). Haiman regards this as evidence that
"by the fourteenth century, subject-verb inversion was break­
ing down" (ibid.).

In this chapter and in Chapters II and III I hope to have
made clear that such a conclusion about the demise of inversion
cannot be drawn on the basis of, e.g., Swieczkowski's limited
data. In fact, contrary to Haiman's conclusion, inversion at
the end of the fourteenth century was still highly frequent in
certain styles of prose. In other prose it was much less
frequent, just as it had been in similar prose throughout Old
and Transition English.

In this chapter I have discussed inversion in Early Middle
English. Next I turn to inversion in the late Middle English
and Early Modern English period in order to ascertain how and
why inversion has changed again since Early Middle English
(to its modern form) and when these changes occurred.
CHAPTER V
LATE MIDDLE ENGLISH AND EARLY MODERN ENGLISH

In this chapter I discuss inversion in Late Middle English and Early Modern English (from the mid 15th to the late 16th century). It must be emphasized that I cannot do justice to the vast amount of English literature that is encompassed by this period in this study. With the exception of Malory, instead of giving comprehensive accounts of the data of this period, I will give representative samples of inversion drawn from various authors and prose styles.

The aim of this chapter is to describe and explain some of the major trends and changes in inversions from the mid 15th century to Modern English. Thus, I will be concerned with the broad patterns and general functions of inverted order and the overall evolution of inversion. In this regard this study is distinguished from (and serves as a complement to) Jacobsson's study (Jacobsson, 1951). Jacobsson gives detailed accounts of the inverting behavior and of changes in the behavior of specific preposed heads in Early Modern English. In the present study the overall trends in inversion are described and explained.

The major changes in inversion between EME and Modern English that still must be explained, though some have been briefly discussed in Chapter IV, are: 1. the dramatic decrease
in the frequency of inversion after fronting in narrative prose;  
2. the differentiation of full inversion and semi-inversion;  
3. the narrowing of the range of verbs used in full inversions  
and 4. the loss, or at least the dramatic decrease in inversion  
after specific heads, e.g., *yet*, preposed direct objects, and  
preposed indirect objects. The discussion in the second part  
of this chapter will center on these changes.  

Part 1: Inversion in the 15th and 16th centuries  

In this part I will present the data from the 15th and 16th  
centuries separately. The data from the 15th century are drawn  
from the following sources: the *Paston Letters*, the *Book of  
Margery Kempe*, William Caxton's *Prologues and Epilogues*, and  
three chapters from Sir Thomas Malory's *The Tale of King Arthur*.  
The *Paston Letters* that I have sampled, written by members of  
the Paston family, date from the mid 15th century and are repre­  
sentative of the everyday language. The *Book of Margery Kempe*  
(Margery Kempe, c. 1373-1440), from the first half of the 15th  
century, is a chronological account of the life and religious  
convictions of Margery Kempe. Caxton (ca. 1422-91) was both a  
writer and a printer, and he has appended his original prologues  
to works he printed. Malory (mid 15th century) compiled the  
numerous stories about Arthur into English from their French  
originals.  

The *Paston Letters* and the *Prologues and Epilogues* contain  
relatively few inversions. They represent distinct prose styles;  
the PL are samples of informal, nonliterary prose, while the  
*Prologues and Epilogues* offer samples of much more formal prose.
A high frequency of pronoun subjects are common to both works. Margery Kempe also has a high proportion of pronoun subjects. Inversion, however, is relatively more frequent than in PL or Caxton, mostly due to frequent inversion after than (then). As was the case in earlier stages of English, it is the work of pure narrative prose, The Tale of King Arthur, that has the greatest proportion and diversity of inversions. Thus, I will draw heavily on this work in our discussion of inversion in the 15th century. In the following section the data from all the sources are combined. I give first the number of inversions and the number of lines of prose from which they are drawn.

My sample contains just 3 full inversions and 2 semi-inversions from PL out of 1750 lines of prose; and 7 full inversions and no semi-inversions from Caxton out of 400 lines of prose. From MK out of 1238 lines there were 12 instances of full inversion and 8 instances of semi-inversion with heads other than than. There are 26 instances of full and semi-inversion after than, 8 there clauses and 3 inversions in subordinate clauses. In Malory's tale of "Merlin" (49 pages, about 35 lines per page) there are 37 full inversions after heads other than than and 23 full inversions after than. There are 6 semi-inversions with heads other than than and 9 semi-inversions after than. There clauses are frequent: 37 instances. In the "Knight with the Two Swords", the inversions are: 36 full inversions and 15 semi-inversions with heads other than than/thanne; 4 semi-inversions and 8 full inversions after thanne/than and 30 there clauses. The total number of pages is 31. In "Torre and Pellynor" we have:
13 full inversions and 15 semi-inversions with heads other than thanne/than; 2 full inversions and 4 semi-inversions after thanne/than; and 18 there clauses. The total pages number 23. Totals for Malory are: heads other than thanne/than: full inversion 86; semi-inversion 36; heads thanne/than: full inversion, 33, semi-inversion 17; there clauses: 85. The total 15th century inversions from the above sources are: Heads other than thanne/than: full inversion 108; semi-inversion: 47; heads thanne/than: full inversion 55; semi-inversion 24; there clauses 93. In the following I will discuss the preposed heads, the inverted verbs and the inverted subjects.

Preposed constituents

In this section I will discuss the preposed constituents occurring with full and semi-inversion in the various prose styles represented by the data. I will look first at the prose of Kempe and Malory, representative of the Mid 15th century narrative prose.

In this stage of English, inversion after thanne/than alone or as part of a correlative pair still occurred, but increasingly competed with than (ne) SV order. While the ratio of than SV: than SV varied from author to author, the frequency of than SV overall has sharply increased since the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century. For instance, in the two tales, "The Knight with the Two Swords" (KTS) and "Torre and Pellynor" (TP) there are 18 instances of inversion after than (ne) and 70 instances of SV order. On the other hand inversion
after than (ne) in Chaucer was the norm: 99%. I note here also that by the mid 15th century SV order occurred both with pronominal and nominal subjects. In KTS and TP the ratio is 25 pronominal subjects: 46 nominal subjects that are inverted after than (ne). Earlier, in MT for example, than (ne) SV order was generally limited to pronominal subjects. The adverb tho (OE pa) which was almost invariably inverted still in EME (occurring in Chaucer, but not in MT) has been lost, as thanne/than supplanted it.

In the mid 15th century English had not yet developed the Modern English auxiliary do, and thus full inversion and semi-inversion were not yet completely distinct. However, we observed in Chapter IV that full inversion and semi-inversion were, in EME, already differentiated to a certain extent as to the verb and the subject. This differentiation continues in the 15th century. However, of the three key constituents in inversion (the PC, the verb and the subject) the PC shows the least differentiation between full and semi-inversion. In my sample of mid 15th century inversions, the following heads occur with semi-inversion: Time: now, so anone; Place: thydir, thereon, there, to + noun; Manner: so, thus, right so; Other: for this cause, direct object, ellis (else), and yet. Of these heads all except for this cause and ellis (which in general are infrequent) also occur with full inversion.

Nevertheless, we observe a high frequency of occurrence of locative and temporal preposed heads with full inversion. Sixty-three percent (54 of 86) of full inversion heads are
locatives or temporal adverbs, compared to 39% of semi-inversion heads in Malory. In MK the frequency of locative/temporal heads with full inversion is 50% (6 out of 12) while the frequency of locative/temporal heads with semi-inversion is 13% (1 of 8).

This is the result of two interrelated tendencies that we have observed earlier: the tendency to place atypical subjects toward the end of the clause (hence full inversion) and the tendency to use full inversion with presentative/existential verbs. Since presentative/existential verbs frequently occur with temporal or locative adverbs that serve to locate the subject in space or time, and since atypical subjects often need to be located in space or time in order to introduce them into the discourse, we can observe a strong association between temporal and locative adverbs and full inversion.

Next I turn to the types of heads that trigger inversion in the 15th century. We find inversion after manner verbs, predicate adjectives, direct objects and indirect objects, therefore, and yet, in addition to various temporal and locative adverbs and adverb phrases. Instances of inversion after a subordinate clause head or after a conjunction alone are rare (two instances in Malory of inversion after subordinators).

Thematic heads occur with both semi and full inversion. For instance:

Preposed Thematic Direct Object

Full inversion:

(1) That saw King Arthur. (Mer. 31)
(2) That know we well (Mer. 35)
Semi-inversion:

(3) That woll I holde (TP 99.25)
(4) þat wyl I not grant (MK 24)

However, there is a difference in the frequency of occurrence of thematic heads in full inversion and in semi-inversion clauses. In Malory, 74% (63 of 86) of full inversion clauses have clearly thematic heads while the rest have non-thematic heads or heads of uncertain thematicity. On the other hand 36% (13 of 36) semi-inversion clauses have clearly thematic heads and of these 4 are thematic preposed direct objects (that). In MK the relative frequencies are similar: 83% of full inversion heads are thematic (10 of 12) and 37% of semi-inversion heads are thematic (3 of 8) and of these two are thematic preposed direct objects (that).

As I noted in Chapter IV the reason that thematic PC's tend to occur in full inversion clauses is grounded in relative stress. These PC's generally have relatively low stress and therefore the subjects of these clauses frequently have relatively high stress. High stress subjects tend to occur at or towards the end of the clause, i.e., in full inversions. However, preposed direct objects, even when thematic, are in highly marked, hence stressed, position. Thus, the subjects of inversions following these objects receive somewhat lower stress than the subjects of inverted clauses headed by, say, thematic locative adverbials. This is why, I suggest, thematic direct objects are more often followed by semi-inversion than are other thematic heads. In Malory,
for example, out of 14 preposed thematic direct object heads, 6 (43%) are followed by full inversion while 8 (57%) are followed by semi-inversion.

Conversely, I have suggested that semi-inversion clauses tend to stress a constituent other than the subject, namely the PC. If this hypothesis is correct, then we would expect to find PC's that are likely to be stressed in semi-inverted clauses more often than PC's that are less likely to be stressed. Since non-thematic PC's are more likely to be stressed than thematic ones, and since 64% of semi-inverted clauses (but only 26% of full inversion clauses) have non-thematic heads, the data confirm this hypothesis.

My data contain numerous instances of fronted temporal and manner adverbs with SV order (i.e., fronting but no inversion). In addition, there are instances of fronted therefore, yet, and direct objects followed by SV order. However, preposing of a locative followed by SV order is rare in my data. When it occurs, the usual head is *there*:

(5) There I will do... (PL, 33)
(6) There Sir Kay... dud passyngely well. (KTS 76.3)

Why are locative adverbs preposed without subsequent inversion much less frequently than temporal adverbs? For the most part it is because most fronted locative adverbs occur in existential/presentative clauses where the subject is atypical and inverted for reasons of topic introduction. This has been the case throughout the history of English. The subject/topic receives more stress than the locative and hence is inverted. When the
heavy stress is on the preposed locative rather than the subject/topic, Loc SV order does occur:

(7) Nevir in thy worlde we parte... (KTS 86.7)

Preposed Constituents in Caxton and PL

While the formal language of Caxton does not present anything unexpected regarding the PC's of inverted clauses, the colloquial language of the Paston Letters is interesting for comparison with narrative prose. As we have come to expect from OE, colloquial writing contains fewer inversions than narrative prose. The ratio in my sample of PL is: XSV 41:XVS 5.

My sample contains full inversion after 3 direct objects, a correlative then (if...then) and thematic so. Of the 3 direct objects one is thematic (thys) and two are non-thematic (othere tydynges). The sample contains a wide range of thematic and non-thematic PC's that are not followed by inversion. There are 5 preposed direct objects not followed by inversion (4 non-thematic and one thematic), locative and temporal adverbs, yet, therefore, so and thus.

The fact that such a variety of preposed constituents without subsequent inversion occurs is notable. The data raise the interesting possibility that the inversions we have been observing in this chapter occurred much more frequently in literature than in the colloquial language already in the middle of the 15th century. If so, the origin of the Modern English restriction of semi-inversion to the formal language may go back this far. However, the colloquial character of Chaucer's work, which
includes numerous full and semi-inversions, suggests that semi-inversion was not a characteristic of only the formal language in EME. One possible explanation for the use of semi-inversion in the formal rather than the colloquial language is that semi-inversion serves to locate the stress of a clause. In the spoken language stress is readily located through intonation.

THE VERB OF INVERTED CLAUSES

Next we look at the verb of inverted Ss. I noted in Chapter IV that there was in EME a tendency for presentative/existential verbs to occur in full inversion clauses, and for non-presentative verbs to be in semi-inversion clauses. By the mid 15th century the association between presentative verbs and full inversion was even stronger; that is, we observe an increase in the percentage of full inversion verbs that are presentative in meaning and/or in use. Hence, out of 102 full inversion clauses in my sample, 69 are instances of presentative/existential verbs (68%). Come occurs 37 times and be occurs 14 times; other verbs include: reign, lie, begin, stand, sit, and stick.

On the other hand, out of a total of 40 semi-inversion clauses, only 5 (16%) are instances of presentative verbs. However, the verb at this point does not completely distinguish full inversions from semi-inversions; hence we find also instances of non-presentative full inversions: depart, go, know, see, ride, make and the like. It is interesting to note that two such non-presentative verbs occur only in the more archaic MK data: wend 'believe' and find. Non-presentative full inversions
are of the type:

(8) That know we well. (Mer. 35)
(9) Than toke Gryfflet his hors (Mer. 47)

The state of development of the do auxiliary comes to play an important role in inversion, and I digress now to present an alternative analysis of do development which differs significantly from those analyses previously presented (Closs, 1969; Ellegard, 1953; Engblom, 1938). Closs (1969) observes that do + infinitive originated in poetry and spread to prose in EME (Late 14th century). Since its origin is in poetry, it is plausible that a possible function of the original do + infinitive was at least partially a rhythmic one. However, contrary to previous research I suggest that when it spread to prose, where rhythm is less important, do + infinitive took on other functions. Although it has often been observed that Middle English do + infinitive occurs in unemphatic, non-contrastive clauses (e.g., Closs, p. 404), I suggest it is not unlikely that do + infinitive already in EME indicated relatively more stress on the verb than a clause without do or at least indicated unambiguous primary stress on the verb. It surely indicated less stress on the verb than it does in Modern English, but the restriction to contexts of greater verb stress is a very possible linguistic change for do + infinitive to have undergone.

Since a thorough study of the hypothesis I am advancing here would be a major undertaking, I cannot draw definitive
conclusions here. Instead, I offer some tentative evidence for
this hypothesis that S do V order stressed the V based on the data
in Ellegard (1953) and Engblom (1938).

The data from Ellegard and Engblom suggest that periphras­
tic do (S do V order) began occurring in the late 13th century,
but did not begin to occur in unambiguous strongly emphatic
environments until well into early Modern English (16th century)
(Ellegard, p. 24). Ellegard, like others, believes that the
periphrastic stage of the do auxiliary was an intermediate stage
between causative do and emphatic (Modern English) do.

The basic problem with this analysis of do development is
that it assumes the attribution of emphatic function to do
requires do be stressed, as is the case in Modern English.
I am suggesting that a plausible analysis of periphrastic do is
one which restricts do to environments where the main verb can
be stressed (actually the infinitive form of the V, since do
is still a main verb). Thus, I suggest that the late Middle
English—Early Modern English contrast S do V/SV was correlated
with the degree of main verb stress: S do V order stressed the
main verb more than SV order. Another function (or an alter­
native function) of S do V order could be that this order served
to indicate unambiguous stress on the verb.

One piece of evidence for such an analysis is the observa­
tion that by the end of the 16th century there was an "unmistak­
able tendency" to use do"mainly in connection with adverbs"
(as well as in inversions) (Engblom, p. 124).
I suggest that clauses with pre-verbal adverbs such as manner adverbs are precisely ones in which one might want to stress the main verb as well as the adverb, hence the order S Adv. V.

Further, do began early occurring in negative clauses—as in the Modern English He did not see the star. It could be argued that these negative do clauses, similarly to clauses with manner adverbs, are ones which can readily stress the main verb.

For further evidence in favor of the proposed analysis of late Middle and early Modern English do, I turn to pre-17th century instances of do in semi-inverted clauses. In particular, I suggest that one reasonable explanation for these early do semi-inversions is that do occurred when the verb rather than the PC received primary stress.

**DO-SEMI-INVERSION**

(11) his beard did I shave (Skelton (1515-1523), cited in Engblom, p. 109)

(12) this letter ye speke of neuer dyd I wryte. (ibid.)

(13) Even so do I wysshe. (Ascham, cited in Engblom, p. 116)

(14) The same day at after-none dyd master Godderyke's sune...go hup in-to hys father's guldding house.
Machyn (1550-63), cited in Engblom, p. 117)

(15) The xxx day of January did ij women ryd a-bowett London in a car. (ibid.)

(16) So doth it indeed contain. (Ascham, cited in Engblom, p. 121)

(17) Yet doo they indeed utter. (ibid.)

(18) So did I shoot him. (ibid.)

Do-full inversion

(19) The batayll of them two dyde see playnly he proude pucell... (Caxton, cited in Engblom, p. 97)

(20) But unto us dyde promyse hys sayde modre (ibid.)

I believe that the common denominator for all these early occurrences of do in semi-inverted clauses is that the main verb is relatively more important and hence more stressed than the PC. It is possible that the occurrence of do signalled this stress relationship between the fronted constituent and the verb in inverted clauses as opposed to primary stress on the PC.

Negative evidence in favor of the proposed analysis is also available; namely, I can find only rare instances of periphrastic do in clauses where verb stress is also rare, for example, in presentative full inversions. There is one such occurrence in Caxton:

Here, the order do V S may show verb stress where otherwise the reader would not expect it.

In sum, I tentatively suggest that periphrastic do, prior to the time that do became a dummy auxiliary in semi-inversion and an emphatic auxiliary elsewhere, denoted primary or enhanced stress on the main verb. Thus I suggest that S do V or PC do SV generally indicated greater stress on the main verb than the corresponding clauses without do; SV; PC aux SV. I suggest at the minimum it was used to indicate unambiguously the location of the primary stress of the clause. Evidence for this proposal is found in the fact that periphrastic do almost always occurs in clauses where primary stress on the verb is highly likely or at least very plausible.

The data of Ellegard and Engblom suggest that, at least in some authors, do had ancillary functions besides that of main verb stress. For example, do and did were sometimes used to distinguish past and present tenses where they are phonetically indistinct (e.g. eat, let).

Engblom observes (p. 111) that in some authors do forms almost take the place of simple verbs and cites as an example a page from a work by Andrew Boorde in which do is used with every verb except be and have. Yet, from the two examples given it appears that do occurs when the verb clearly has primary stress in the clause. Perhaps do functioned in Boorde as a stress indicator but not as a stress enhancer. It is possible that further study will uncover evidence of individual differences in the degree of stress on the main verb re-
quired for the occurrence of do. Thus, some authors may use periphrastic do much more freely whenever the verb is stressed while others reserve do for clauses where the verb without do would be perceived as less stressed than the author intends it to be. In any case, much more work on do development is needed, but I believe that an analysis claiming the existence of functional differences between clauses with and without do is an intriguing possibility. By the late 16th and early 17th century the function of do in semi-inverted clauses was changing from that of indicating stress on the verb to that of a dummy auxiliary that was freely insertable in clauses that stressed the PC rather than the verb. The rapid increase in the use of do inversions that has often been observed in late 16th century prose (e.g., Engblom, p. 116) accompanied this functional/ syntactic change. I will return later to the development of dummy do to describe a possible mechanism of this change to a dummy auxiliary.

THE SUBJECT OF INVERTED CLAUSES

Next we turn to an examination of the subject of inverted clauses. In Chapter IV we saw that a strong association between thematic/pronominal subjects and SV order remained along with the new pronoun subject inversion patterns. By the mid 15th century, this association was even stronger.

In my sample, out of 99 full inversions considered here, 21% (21) have pronoun subjects; 3% (3) have non-pronominal topical subjects; 6% (6) are recently mentioned subjects, and
70% (69) are first mention or "remention after a long distance" subjects. At this stage of English emphasis on the preposed constituent or on the verb is still a function of full inversion, since dummy do did not exist. Thus, we still do find full inversions of thematic nominal and pronominal subjects and of unstressed recently mentioned subjects. However, the 71% atypical subject inversions now consist almost entirely of inversions that are quite Modern in use in regard to the topicality of the subject. Many of these inversions introduce an NP for the first time; others reintroduce an NP which has been out of the discourse for a considerable distance.

On the other hand, semi-inversion occurs much more frequently with pronominal subjects. Out of 44 semi-inversions considered here, 35 (80%) have pronoun subjects.

Next we turn to the subjects of XSV clauses. It is in these clauses that the extent of the association between SV order and recent mention, not just topical and pronominal, subjects is apparent. For instance, let us consider the 308 XSV clauses of TP and KTS. With heads other than thanne/than (236 in all) 163 subjects are pronominal, 25 are clearly topical and 31 are recent mention in the discourse (219 in all).

Thanne/than clauses in OE were almost always followed by inversion and in EME were generally inverted except with pronominal subjects (when SV order could be found). In Malory, we see a further development in clauses with these heads. Out of a total of 72 than SV clauses, 25 have pronominal subjects;
21 subjects are topical and 18 are recent mention. The rest have athematic subjects. Of the 18 inverted than (ne) clauses (10 full and 8 semi-inversion), all of the semi-inversion and 7 of the full inversion clauses have pronominal, topic or recent mention subjects. Thus, the change that made thanne/then full inversion clauses sensitive to the topicality of the subject is not complete, but is clearly well under way.

Finally, we must briefly note the frequent occurrence of there clauses in mid 15th century prose (93 in my sample). There clauses at this stage have clearly athematic inverted subjects, as in earlier English. There is one instance from Malory, however, in which the speakers in a dialogue are, immediately after the end of the quote, the conjoined subject of a there clause:

(22) Than there lodged Merlion and these two knights in a woods. (KTS, 74.5)

In this instance, either the there clause is used to reestablish Merlion and the two knights as the conjoined topic, normally the function of full inversion, or we have a case of an inversion caused by preposed than. In any case the data show this to be an isolated instance of a recent mention subject in a there clause. The following Ss represent the two main types of there clauses:

(23) Also there com thydir King Uryens. (KTS 78.9) (there clause with presentative verb)

(24) Than there swore Kynge Lott. (Mer. 26) (there clause with non-presentative verb)
In these examples, *there* with or without an existential/presen-
tative verb, produces an existential/presen-
tative *S*. The
subjects of these clauses are generally first mention, more
rarely previously mentioned but non-topical. Thus, the func-
tion of mid 15th century *there* clauses was primarily as a
topic introducer *S* and only rarely as a topic switch *S* with a
subject that has already been introduced in the discourse.
Further, the use of *there* to turn clauses with non-presentative
verbs into clauses with existential/presenative meaning is con-
tinued.

In this section much of the discussion has centered on
Malory's prose. Since Malory's prose was originally written in
French, there is a danger that the inversions found in it were
influenced by the forms and functions of French inversion and
do not represent good mid 15th century English. To test the
conclusions based on the prose sampled above, I have also in-
vestigated the inversions from 60 pages of Capgrave's *Chronicle
of England* written in the mid 15th century. This section
(pp. 99-108 and 150-200) contains a total of 250 inversions
(136 full inversion; 31 full inversion after *than(ne)*; 66
semi-inversions; 16 *there* clauses; and 1 inversion in a sub-
ordinate clause) and a total of 229 XSV clauses (104 with pro-
noun subjects; 23 with topical subjects and 102 with non-topi-
cal thematic or athematic subjects).

The most important observation to be made about the data
from Capgrave is that Capgrave's inversions do not differ from
other 15th century data, including Malory's, in any significant
way. Concerning the nature of the subject, the vast majority of inversions have athematic subjects due to the nature of the Chronicle's content, just as in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, hundreds of historical figures are introduced. But the inversion of thematic and topical (pronominal and nominal) subjects in both full and semi-inversion clauses also occurs: Full inversion (PC's other than than(ne)): Pronoun subject-17 instances; thematic subject-8; topical nominal subject-2 (27 instances in all); Semi-inversion: Pronoun subject-29; thematic subject-6; topical subject-1 (36 instances in all). The verb of full inversions, as was characteristic of the other 15th century data, shows an unrestricted semantic range. However, the PC's of inverted clauses in this Chronicle, as in the other Chronicles, are mostly temporal and locative adverbs (many thematic), with a few fronted thematic direct objects, and so, thus.

In short, there is nothing in the Capgrave data to suggest that our conclusions about Early Middle English inversions based on the many inversions in Malory's prose are erroneous due to French influence.

We need now to describe the state of inversion in the 16th century. I will discuss here some inversions taken from four 16th century prose works: The Apologie of Sir Thomas More, dating from the first half of the 16th century; Roger Ascham's Toxophilus from the mid 16th century; and Richard Hakluyt's Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation; and Raphaell Holinshed's
Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, dating from the end of the 16th century (1589 and 1586, respectively). The inversions discussed here are from the first 35 pages of More, the first 23 pages of Ascham, the Letters of Dedication, Prefaces and first 30 pages of Hakluyt (70 pages in all), and the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th books of Holinshed's "History of England" as well as scattered other passages (113 pages in all).

My sample from More contains a total of 72 inversions, including 7 there clauses; 6 negative inverted clauses; 24 semi-inversions and 35 full inversions. Twenty-three clauses have fronting but no inversion. The most significant aspect of the More data is that inversion appears to be essentially unchanged from inversions of the 15th century. I give here several examples of full and semi-inversion.

Full VS:

(25) For such darkness use they purposely. (More, 5)
(26) Thus beginneth my answer. (More, 21)
(27) So useth he of courtesy if he can not slepe (More, 2)

Semi-inversion:

(28) Now have I then considered... (More, 9)
(29) here have ye heard... (More, 20)
(30) By these words wolde he look... (More, 30)

Due to the nature of the Apologie's content, almost all subjects are pronominal. Full inversion PC's are both thematic and non-thematic, with thematic PC's predominating (87%). The non-thematic PC's include the adverb well and 3 direct objects.
(However, two of these direct objects too might be considered thematic, since they are particular instances of a previous direct object, *everything*.) PC's followed by semi-inversion are also mostly thematic: 91%, all except a direct object and the manner adverb *greatly*. Inversion after preposed _than_ has merged completely with other inversions and the only remnant of the once obligatory nature of _than_ inversion is the frequency of _than_ inversions: 8 full inversions (27% of all inversions) and 7 semi-inversions (28% of all semi-inversions) compared to 2 non-inverted _than_ clauses.

Full inversion verbs have yet a wide range of semantic content. Only 2 full inversions are presentative; the others have such decidedly non-presentative verbs as: *use*, *have*, *think*, and *herd*.

The More data include two interesting _there_ clauses.

(31) then muste there the most part perishe for all that

(32) no good man can there doubt but that these doctors...

Neither of these _there_'s seems to be locative. Sentence (32) seems to mean "there can be no good man who doubts...." _There_ appears to turn _doubt_ into a presentative, as it did in Middle English, while the subject _no good man_ is fronted. Since a fronted subject in a _there_ clause is marked, the subject would presumably receive extra emphasis. The only interpretation I can give to (31) is: "then there must be a perishing of the most part..." with semi-inversion for stress on the PC _then_. 
Thus, it appears that the OE and Middle English function of *there* as a constituent that gives presentative meaning to a clause regardless of the particular verb that occurs continues in the 16th century.

These *there* clauses with non-existential verbs deserve further study. Since Modern English no longer uses such clauses, the change seems to involve the narrowing of the range of verbs in existential *there* clauses, such that the verb itself, not just the constituent *there*, denotes existence. This is the same change that affects full inversion verbs in general in the 17th and 18th centuries; thus we are probably dealing with two instances of the same change.

Negative clauses in the 16th century are inverted or non-inverted.

Inversion:

(24) So well stand I not (More, 1)
(25) This use I not (More, 5)

SV order:

(26) nor I use not... (More, 1)
(27) I se not. (More, 8)

I believe the existence of this stage in the history of English inversion provides some evidence against the negative attraction arguments of Jacobsson (1951) and Kruisinga (1932). The argument from negative attraction holds that negatives and verbs are naturally attracted to each other, such that, for example, if a negative is fronted, the verb (or part of it) will be fronted too. Hence, we have obligatory inversion in
such negative clauses as: **Never will I fly Delta again.** The same arguments have been advanced to explain OE inversion after fronted *ne* (cf., Chapter II). However, in the 16th century the negative *not* and the verb are separated when full inversion applies, as in (33) to (34). As far as I can tell, there was no rule that moved *not* closer to the verb in full inversion clauses.

Next I turn to data from the mid-16th century: Toxophilus, written by Roger Ascham (1515-1568). I briefly present here some interesting aspects of the inversion data from the first 23 pages, which includes 8 full inversions, 11 semi-inversions and 91 XSV clauses.

The most interesting aspect of Ascham's inversions is the use of *do*. Toxophilus is the first of my data sources to have *do* commonly used in semi-inversions: 5 of the 11 semi-inversions contain *do*.

(37) *yet doth he affirm*  
(Ascham, 2)

(38) *Yet long before those days do we read in the Bible...*  
(Ascham, 6)

As noted above, semi-inverted *do* clauses occurred earlier than the mid 16th century but were increasing rapidly around Ascham's time and thereafter.

Of the six full inversions, one is presentative, 3 have the verb *say* (which occurred in full inversions even after their restriction elsewhere to presentatives/existential verbs), 2 have the verb *be*, one has the verb *ought* and one the
verb knewe.

What we find at the end of the 15th century and throughout the 16th century is an increase in do semi-inversions at the same time that full inversions with low stress subjects continue in use. Thus, even within one prose work, we find apparent variability as to whether the author uses the newer do semi-inversions or the older full inversions when the subject is unstressed. I suggest that this variability is correlated with the location of the primary stress: that the orders PC doS(-stress) V and PC V S (-stress) had contrastive functions. PC do SV was used only if the verb had primary stress; if the PC had primary stress, the order was PC V S. Contrastive functions for PC do SV and PC VS would explain the observed variability and apparent randomness in the use of do semi-inversions in the 16th century. It was not yet possible to freely insert periphrastic do in inverted clauses to avoid full inversions which did not stress the subject.

I suggest that as the use of periphrastic do to stress the verb increased, the use of full inversions (without do) with primary verb stress decreased. The data analyzed here suggest that by the mid and late 16th century full inversions with low stress subjects are those which lend themselves to primary PC stress interpretations (cf., the discussions of Hakluyt & Holinshed below). In my sample from Ascham the only full inversion verb capable of occurring in a do semi-inversion is know.
This knewe Erasmus very well. (Ascham, 18)

But this S introduces an athematic subject and thus it is likely that the subject has primary stress rather than the verb. There is nothing in my Ascham sample to suggest that full inversions still could place primary stress on the verb rather than on the PC or the subject. This corroborates my suggestion that full inversion with primary verb stress was supplanted by do semi-inversion when do semi-inversion spread in the 16th century.

Next we turn to the Hakluyt data. We have seen that inversion from the first half of the 16th century appears to be undergoing some changes stemming from the spread of the auxiliary do. The end of the 16th century has been cited as the time of a major new development: the reinterpretation of do as a dummy auxiliary which could be freely inserted in semi-inversions when no other auxiliary or modal occurred. The data from Hakluyt include 30 full inversions, and 14 semi-inversions. In this particular work, most inversions are relatively modern: full inversions generally have athematic/non-pronominal subjects, while inversions that stress the PC and have pronominal subjects are all semi-inversions, including two instances with auxiliary do.

Full inversion:

(40) then followe the letters Patentes... (Hakl,27)
(41) then ariseth the first English trade... (Hakl,27)
(42) and therewith is joyned an action... (Hakl, xxvii)
Semi-inversion:

(43) Neither hath our nation bene contented...  
    (Hakl, xlv)

(44) Thus did publique securitie...cause justice...  
    to flourish  
    (Hakl, 21)

(45) Neither did our shipping...begin  
    (Hakl, lvi)

The exceptions to the generalization that full inversions now have athematic subjects are of interest. Two exceptions to the occurrence of athematic subjects with full inversions contain the verb have:

(46) Then have you a second navigation. (Hakl, xlv)

Full inversion with have lasted far into the Modern English period. Even today it is archaic, but more acceptable than non-presentative full inversions with other verbs. I believe the acceptability of this inversion is based in the coincidence of auxiliary have and main verb have. Full inversion of main verb have simply does not sound so unacceptable because we are accustomed to using the inversion of auxiliary have. Of course, on these grounds we would also expect main verb do to have been inverted longer than other verbs. As yet, I have no evidence that this is the case. Main verb do full inversion today seems less acceptable to me than have inversion.

(47a)* Then does he many creative things.

(47b)* Then did he many creative things.

The other two full inversions with thematic subjects are:

(48) Then began Reginald to usurpe the kingly authorite.  
    (Hakl, 74)
(the next to the last S had: between Reginald and O.)

(49) In the year 1187 began Reginald the sonne of G. to reigne over the islands. (Hakl, 75)
(prior S: The Mannians...sent unto the islands for Reginald and created him king).

It is my belief that the reason verbs like begin and have (both relatively unstressed main verbs) still occur in these thematic subject full inversions (rather than in do semi-inversions) is because these full inversions stressed the PC. I have suggested that semi-inversion with do was not used if the PC (or the subject) received primary stress. This appears to be the case in the Hakluyt data. Thus, I believe we have evidence that at the end of the 16th century periphrastic do had not yet completely lost its association with main verb stress even while it was being reinterpreted as a member of the new category: auxiliary. The data suggest that the categorization of do as an auxiliary preceded the reinterpretation of do as a meaningless dummy constituent. I will return later to a discussion of the loss of verb stress in do semi-inversions and thus to the creation of this dummy constituent.

Most full inversions in Hakluyt are presentative, but the verbs are not always presentative:

(50) Upon which depend sexe verie excellent...
(Hakl, xxvii)

Semi-inversion occurs in some clauses where to the modern ear it sounds rather archaic:

(51) Yet was it within so beautiful (Hakl, xlix)
However, in general the modern stage of inversion has nearly been reached.

The data from Holinshed's Chronicle confirms the conclusions about late 16th century inversion based on the Hakluyt data. My sample of Holinshed contains 26 full inversions and 68 semi-inversions including 6 with the auxiliary do.

Full inversions generally have atematic (first mention) subjects—all but 8 do. Of the 8 that are not first mention, 3 have pronominal subjects, 4 have thematic subjects, and 1 has a nominal topical subject. For example:

(52) Thus writeth Caesar (Hol, 470) (thematic subject)
(53) Unto this haven got Caesar all the ships he could get out. (Hol, 465) (topical subject)
(54) Then ran they togither more cruellie than before. (Hol, 547) (pronominal subject)
(55) Then come we...to...(pronominal subject) (Hol, 136)
(56) Now come I to the two swords (pronominal subject) (Hol, 132)

Sentence (52) is a summary statement, likely having stress on the PC. Sentence (53) very likely also stresses the PC, as got is a relatively unemphatic verb. Sentence (54) contrasts the adverbs then and before; thus again the PC is the likely location of the stress relative to the verb or subject. Sentences (55) and (56) appear to be commonly used expressions (reminiscent of the OE first person subject inversions after now) used in transitional Ss when the author is turning to a new
subject matter. Again the transitional adverb would seem to be stressed relative to the subject and the verb. Thus, once again we see that non-presentative (low subject stress) full inversions in the late 16th century are highly plausible candidates for PC stress. The Ss with the order PC do SV, on the other hand, are highly plausible candidates for main verb stress:

(57) Then did King A. ride about to view... (Hol, 485)
(58) And of this people dooth the poet make mention...

Here the main verbs seem much more amenable to heavy stress relative to the PC and the subject than in (52) to (56). In sum, I believe that the occasional occurrence of non-subject stressed full inversions during the time when most full inversions were presentative with stressed subjects and when the do auxiliary was increasing in use can be explained by postulating a functional distinction between PC VS and PC do SV. This functional distinction prevented do from spreading to all unstressed subject inversions at once and results in the use of superficially "inconsistent" forms of inversion by a single author in a single text.

As in Hakluyt, Holinshed's inversions are characterized by two other distinctly non-modern features: the use of full inversion with non-presentative/ existential verbs.

(59) There died of the Roman's part...400... (Hol, 501) and the occurrence of semi-inversion after PC's that today generally require straight order:
Inversions (60) to (62) are now regarded as archaic. Indeed, late 16th c. inversions seem either modern or archaic (like those with daggers in Chapter I) to modern English speakers. In the remainder of this chapter I discuss the causes and mechanisms of the changes whereby some late 16th and 17th century inversions (the "archaic" ones) have been lost while others (the modern sounding ones) have been retained.

Part 2: SOME EXPLANATIONS FOR CHANGES IN INVERSION BETWEEN MIDDLE AND MODERN ENGLISH

In this part I offer some explanations for the data from the mid 15th to the end of the 16th centuries as presented above and I discuss some changes in inversion occurring from the 17th century to the present time.

In Chapter IV I discussed how the EME data show a change in the function of inversion from stress on the inverted subject to stress on some other constituent—the PC or the verb. The mid 15th century to the mid 16th century inversions that have been presented here are essentially the same as those found in EME except for an increase in semi-inversions with do. Now we turn our attention to explaining the other main change in inversion to occur (besides the development of do inversions):
namely, the often observed decrease in the frequency of inversion.

**Ambiguity in inversion in the written language and the loss of subject stress inversion**

One basic factor that determined the state of Late ME inversion is the absence of the Modern English dummy auxiliary *do*. As a result of the lack of this auxiliary, semi- and full inversions are incompletely distinguished. Another characteristic of late Middle English inversions, which I briefly discussed in Chapter IV, belongs only to full inversions and then only to full inversions in authors who did not use the auxiliary *do* (generally pre-mid-16th century). This trait is that inversions are to a certain extent ambiguous in the written language between stressed PC and stressed verb. In fact, I have previously suggested that in Early and Mid Middle English (before *do* was widespread) inverted clauses were three ways ambiguous: main stress on the PC, main stress on the verb, or main stress on the subject. This ambiguity was, in part, caused by the absence of a dummy *do* auxiliary and the yet infrequent use of verb-emphasizing *do*.

In OE, the generalization could be made that inversion (with a few regular exceptions) in the written language stressed the subject. By Middle English, however, due to the introduction of PC and verb stress inversions, subject stress could no longer be assumed. In fact, the only inversions which unambiguously stressed the subject are those with first mention subjects, low stress thematic heads and inherently low stress
verbs (e.g. be), in other words existential/presentative Ss. Inversions with subjects having greater degrees of thematicity (such as topic and subject switches) were potentially three ways ambiguous; inversions with pronouns and non-subject shifted nominal inversions, which would rarely be stressed, were generally two ways ambiguous (PC or V stress), stress on the subject being much less likely. As far as I can see, there is no way for an EME writer/reader to disambiguate subject stress and PC/V stress when the subject is recently mentioned or topic/subject switched. On the other hand, PC and V stress, while potentially ambiguous, appear to be distinguished, at least to some extent, by either relative thematicity or by the inherent stress indicated by semantic content. Some examples of stress on various constituents follow:

(63) And so departed kynge Marke. (KTS 73.19)
(64) There had Arthur the first sight of queen G. (Mer. 39)
(65) With that departed the damsell. (KTS 64.22)
(66) Sone come Merlin unto the king. (Mer. 10)

All of the above subjects are either thematic or recent mention. Ss (63) and (65) probably placed primary stress on the verb as the action denoted by the verb appears more important than the PC. (However, it is quite likely that these inversions also heightened the emphasis of the PC, even though it probably did not receive primary stress. The discussion here concerns the location of the primary stress).
S (64) probably stressed the PC, as, relative to the verb, it seems more important. S (66) is an example of probable ambiguity as both *sone*, the PC, and *come* are equally informative. Furthermore, the subject may also have carried the stress, since its previous mention is as a genitive, and the fact that *Merlin* came is informative. Hence, this S, when written, is potentially three ways ambiguous as to stress.  

I point out here that if my hypothesis about the early function of auxiliary *do* and about the functions of the inversions that were introduced in EME are correct, then there were two different sources for the two means of indicating verb stress. XVS was borrowed while S *do* + infinitive originated language internally. If *do + infinitive* did stress the verb the question arises as to whether there occur any instances of full inversion with *do + infinitive*, since it appears that sometimes full inversion clauses had primary stressed verbs. One guess is that *do + infinitive* in addition to inversion would have been too emphatic and hence would not often have occurred. However, Engblom's (1938) data shows several examples of X *do V S* inversions, as in (19) and (20) above.

I wish to claim that it was precisely the impossibly ambiguous situation of topic/subject switch inversions (i.e., inversions that stress the subject) that forced writers to stop using them. Further, if they were used, I would guess that they were more often misinterpreted as PC/V stress inversions than PC/V stress inversions were misinterpreted as subject stress inversions. My guess is based on the number and variety of PC/V stress inversions that had been introduced into the language and on the fact that highly thematic subject inver-
sions were a relatively infrequent occurrence even in OE. Thus, I am suggesting that analogy to (or confusion with) PC/V stress inversions was in the EME period and thereafter an active process in the language. As a result of this situation, I believe that by the mid 15th century there were basically two types of inversions: topic introduction/shift inversions and PC/V stress inversion (inversions with athematic subjects).

The topic introduction inversions were a continuation of the topic introduction inversions that had existed in OE. The PC/V stress inversions were an innovation, in the written language at least, and had been borrowed from the English colloquial language and/or French. The subject stress function of inversion was on its way to becoming obsolete.

Until the introduction of the dummy auxiliary do (after which PC stress was indicated by semi-inversion) both topic shift and PC/V stress inversions could still be full inversions. That is, PC/V stress was indicated by semi-inversion except where no modal or auxiliary occurred.\(^3\)

\(^3\)While the ambiguity discussed here was resolvable in the spoken language through intonation, I am not suggesting that it was the written language that instigated the loss of subject stress inversion. Rather, I believe that the process whereby existing PC/V stress inversions in the colloquial language were increased and their position in the inversion system strengthened was an important enough one that PC/V stress inversions were well on their way to becoming dominant over subject stress inversions already in spoken EME if not before. The process was an analogical one: the source of the analogy being either/or both French inversions and already existent
In sum, the first factor in the decrease of the overall frequency of inversion was the loss of inversion as a means of stressing the subject. What ultimately remained of this function were inversions of first mention subjects, which were unambiguously stressed, and inversions that reintroduce a subject after it has been out of the discourse for some time, another environment in which the subject is clearly stressed. Inverted clauses with stressed first mention subjects often served also to introduce a topic into the discourse, and this is precisely the function most of these inversions have in Modern English.

As I noted in Chapter I, the only remaining instances of topic switch inversions involve directional adverb/stressed locative adverb (here/there) preposings. These remained, I believe, because they are emphatic Ss with readily assignable stress---both the PC and the subject are easily identifiable as the loci of the stress: the subject because the S is representative and the PC because it is obviously being emphasized. Thus, these Ss, though topic switch inversions in a language that generally allows only topic shift inversions, are never ambiguous as to stress.

FURTHER CHANGES IN INVERSION WITH PC/V STRESS AND IN SEMI-INVERSION

In this section I discuss some further changes in PC/V stress inversions, most of which are semi-inversions. The
auxiliary *do* began to increase rapidly in PC/V stress inversions in the late 16th century. In time, *do*-inversion came to distinguish completely subject (topic) as opposed to PC/V stress inversions by inversion type: full or semi-inversion. In addition, *do* came to be used to distinguish all verb stress clauses (eventually heavy stress verbs) from PC and subject stress clauses, with S *do* V the sole form remaining in Modern English.

The loss of XVS order with primary stress on the verb has already been discussed. In particular, I have suggested that XVS gave way to X *do* S V. X *do* SV eventually gave way to S *do* V as a means of indicating unambiguous or enhanced stress on the verb. XVS order first was reserved for PC or subject stress and finally for subject stress alone. I have suggested in Part 1 of this chapter that the stage where XVS had PC or subject stress is represented by the Hakluyt and Holinshed data. The order X *do* SV lost its verb stress meaning when the change of *do* to a dummy auxiliary occurred. Subsequently, the rapidly increasing X *do* SV stress pattern (primary PC stress) supplanted the older order for PC stress: X V S (see below).

One of the most obvious changes in semi-inversion is the decreasing number of PC's that are commonly inverted. Jacobsson's study (1951) clearly shows the fluctuations and variability in the occurrence of semi-inversion after specific heads in EME and also the overall decrease in inversions. As I have outlined the change, variability in the use of semi-inversion
after all heads is correlated with the degree of stress of the
PC or the V from EME onward. Eventually, semi-inversion after
a non-thematic or a thematic PC was restricted to heavy stress
on the PC. It is to this change that I now turn my attention.

When PC stress inversion became widespread in EME, this
means of stressing the PC was in contrast with another means
of stressing the PC---fronting (XSV order). In accordance with
Bolinger's argument that syntactic contrasts correspond to
semantic and/or stylistic contrasts, I suggest that XSV and
X aux SV orders were already distinguished by stress differences
in Middle English. In particular, I suggest that X aux SV or­
der put more stress on the PC than did XSV order. This follows
from the fact that the order X aux SV is more marked than XSV
order in that X aux SV order is achieved by two permutations:
fronting and inversion while XSV order is achieved by one---
fronting (or by no permutations if an adverb is normally in
first position). Presumably, a clause having a greater degree
of markedness would also have greater stress on the marked con­
stituent. This difference in PC stress between EME XSV and
X aux SV clauses would then be the origin of the Modern English
distinction between these same two orders, a distinction like­
wise based on differences in the degree of stress.

In the time between Middle English and Modern English two
changes in semi-inversion have occurred. First, semi-inversion
has become obligatory after certain heavily stressed PC's:
negative and restrictive PC's. Second, semi-inversion has
become archaic or obsolete after many PC's which formerly were common with semi-inversion, e.g., preposed *yet*, non-negative direct objects and -ly manner adverbs.

I suggest that these changes occurred because semi-inversion came to indicate heavy stress and only heavy stress on the PC. With those PC's that are in general heavily stressed semi-inversion became obligatory. On the other hand semi-inversion has become archaic after those PC's which are already stressed by virtue of their being fronted. After such PC's (such as non-negative direct objects and -ly manner adverbs) semi-inversion either seems to be redundant or seems to put too much stress on the PC for most contexts.

We can postulate two mechanisms by which these changes could have occurred. One is that the stress on the PC, when followed by semi-inversion, has become heavier. The other is that the PC's themselves have somehow changed such that their requirements for stress by means of inversion have also changed. For instance, the semantic content of a PC could change such that the PC comes to be rarely stressed or stress on the PC could come to be indicated by means other than inversion. It is possible that both of these mechanisms are involved in the changes in question.

First, let us consider one way in which stress on the PC when followed by semi-inversion might indeed have become heavier. It seems clear that EME semi-inversions had several possible stress patterns. In particular, there seems to be
greater permissible stress on the verb than in Modern English semi-inversion.

The numerous instances of EME semi-inversion in clauses with low stress subjects and relatively less emphatic PC's attest to the semi-inverted stress pattern: /uvuv/. In Modern English such semi-inversion with relatively less emphatic PC's and more emphatic verbs is not used except after contrastive nor and neither. However, in the following Ss from Malory the primary stress probably is on the verb, as the verb appears to be more important than the PC:

(67) We came bothe oute of one wombe... and so shalle we lye bothe in one pytte. (KTS 90.36)

(68) And whan they com to Benwyke hit fortuned both the kynges be there, Ban and Bors. Than was hit tolde the two kyngis how there were com two messyngers. (Mer. 21)

In Modern English, perhaps by analogy to do + verb order, we would stress the verb of these Ss with the order: So we shall lye. Than it was told. (cf. Then he did go). In short, I suggest that EME semi-inversions could have the stress patterns: /uvuv/ , /uvuv/ , /uvuv/. Modern English semi-inversions generally have the obligatory pattern: /uvuv/.

I digress here momentarily to discuss a possible mechanism for the changes here involving do. I have suggested that it was by analogy to such clauses as (67) and (68) that semi-inverted do + verb first came into use; that is, the order X do SV may have originated to indicate primary stress on the
verb in semi-inverted clauses. If so, then a possible mechanism for the change of *do* to a dummy (non-emphatic) auxiliary would be the analogy of \[X \text{ do} \text{ SV}\] to \[\text{PC aux. SV}\] clauses which stressed the PC rather than the verb. Since \[/uvu\] (the Modern English pattern) increased at the expense of \[vvv\] as the most common semi-inversion stress pattern (see below), such primary PC stress semi-inversions are a plausible basis for analogy. The verb-stressing *do* semi-inversions could well have been drawn along into the new stress pattern, changing to primary PC stress. Thereby, *do* would lose its verb stress function, becoming a dummy constituent. The historical development of *do* semi-inversions in interrogative Ss is obviously relevant to this discussion and may shed light on the introduction of *do* semi-inversions in declarative sentences.

We can see now that stress on the PC of semi-inversions has indeed become heavier, in the sense that heavy stress on the PC is now obligatory in Modern English semi-inversions, whereas formerly PC's of lesser degrees of stress were allowed. Now we must explain how and why the stress on the PC's of semi-inversions has become heavier and concentrated on the PC alone.

To explain this change let us now consider how the treatment of the PC's by the grammar of Early Modern English has changed. In particular let us consider the general rigidification of English word order. In OE, the basic SVO order could more readily be changed around by theme-rheme considerations than in Modern English. My overall impression of OE order is that theme-rheme order, when it does not coincide with SVO
order, is more common (and thus less marked) than a similar constituent reordering with theme-rheme order is in Modern English. The claim is, for example, that the Ss:

(69) To him King Alfred stood as sponsor.
(70) These things saw King Alfred.
(71) That saw they.

are marked, but not as marked as in Modern English. During the history of English SVO order stabilized and increased in frequency and theme-rheme order became correspondingly less frequent and less a factor in determining an unmarked clause. The scope and nature of this change, in fact, is important and deserves further study, as Prague School linguists have long argued. Here I note only that I strongly believe such a change has occurred and that it had an effect on inversion.

Specifically, even though the PC's of the above Ss are thematic, they are now regarded as being considerably emphatic simply by virtue of their being fronted. Thus, further stress by means of semi-inversion is generally unnecessary and is now used only when very heavy stress is caused by contrast: e.g., the Early Modern English S: that may he do came to have greater stress on the PC with the loss of theme-rheme order: that may he do. In Modern English there is no inversion in this S because the order X S V (that he may do) has precisely the same stress pattern as the inverted order: fronted direct objects have primary stress, and inversion is unnecessary to indicate the locus of the stress in clauses with fronted
direct objects. Thus, semi-inversion here is redundant. Further, as the PC's of semi-inversions become more stressed, the main verb becomes less stressed. This "vuu" pattern for semi-inversions has been grammaticized and is now obligatory. Thus, the S that he may do is not a candidate for semi-inversion, because the verb do has too much stress. In Modern English the order XSV occurs with moderately stressed PC's and allows verbal stress: /vuu/. The stress pattern of Modern English XSV order therefore corresponds to one of the possible stress patterns of Early Modern English semi-inversions.

Yet another factor to consider is that adverbs have come to differ in inverting tendencies according to whether fronting alone places heavy stress on them or whether semi-inversion is required for stress. Thus, adverbs that normally occupy S initial position (thus, therefore, likewise, etc.) require semi-inversion for heavy stress. These adverbs are all thematic in that they refer to something in the context. Adverbs that normally do not occupy S initial position are generally stressed merely by fronting. Thus, we have the contrast:

(72) Thus did John come to realize his error.

(73)?? Bitterly did John come to realize his error.

The historical changes can be summarized as:

EME So may he see. → Modern English So he may see.
(X aux. S V→ XSV)

EME So may he see. → Modern English So may he see.
(no change)
In sum, fronting alone now indicates a greater degree of stress on thematic PC's than formerly and semi-inversion after these thematic PC's indicates very heavy stress (heavier than in EME) on the PC.

Now we must consider the loss of inversion after non-thematic PC's. Non-thematic adverbs (such as -ly adverbs) and non-thematic direct objects are generally stressed by means of fronting alone:

(74) Loudly the lion roared.
(75) Lobster my cat will eat.

In earlier stages of English these too could be followed by semi-inversion, but, unlike thematic PC's, their obsolescence in semi-inversions cannot be attributed to a change in the theme-rheme structure of the language. However, I believe this change, too, is the result of the newly obligatory stress pattern for semi-inversions: //.../. In particular, semi-inversion now would put too much stress on the PC (for most occurrences of these Ss), since usually these Ss have PC stress and V stress: /u//, /u//.

(76) Loudly the lion roared.
(77) Lobster my cat will eat.

As we have seen, //...// (or //...//) was an acceptable semi-inversion stress pattern in Early Middle English. Today, however, this stress pattern is indicated by the order XSV, which permits greater stress on the verb than does semi-inversion.

In sum, I wish to claim that the overall decrease in the kind and number of heads followed by semi-inversion has been
caused by the restriction of semi-inversion to heavy stress PC's. Preposing alone, given the rigidification of word order, now serves to stress the PC in many clauses which formerly used semi-inversion for the same purpose. The rigidification of word order and the decrease of theme-rheme order as well as the concomitant concentration of stress on the PC of semi-inverted clauses have thus contributed to the overall decrease in the frequency of inversion.

FURTHER CHANGES IN FULL INVERSION

In this section I discuss some changes occurring in full inversions. I noted above that full inversions, after the establishment of the dummy do auxiliary, came to be reserved for topic introduction purposes. Even before this, full inversion apparently lost its topic/subject switch functions and its general stress on the subject function. What remains to be explained is the narrowing of the range of verbs occurring in full inversion and in particular, the loss of transitive verb full inversions.

I have already mentioned the loss of inversion after preposed thematic direct objects. I claimed above that such direct objects in OE were emphatic for having been moved out of SVO order, but were more common and hence less emphatic than in Modern English due to their thematicity. In OE inversion after preposed thematic (especially pronominal) direct objects was very common whenever the subject was athematic. This is readily explainable if one considers that a thematic direct
object often occurred with a subject of less thematicity and heavier stress, hence the inversion to stress the subject. In Modern English, however, we can no longer say Ss of the type: *that made Alfred, even if Alfred is a first mention subject. Nor can we say Ss of the type: *In this land ruled a king named Alfred half the people, again where Alfred is a first mention subject. In other words, transitive verbs are blocked from occurring in full inversions.

The first S died out, I believe, at least partly because, after the rigidification of word order, the preposed direct object came to carry too much stress to be interpreted as anything other than the PC of an emphatic inversion, i.e., an inversion to stress the PC. In particular, there was too much emphasis on the object for an inversion the purpose of which was to introduce a new topic (the subject). Hence, this transitive verb inversion was lost.

The second type of transitive verb inversion died out, I believe, also because of the stress on the object. The added object took some of the stress from the subject, which, as the potential topic and the focus of a topic shift S, was the most important constituent. Bolinger (1977b, p. 102) notes that it appears there is too much being introduced at once in these transitive full inversion Ss. I believe this is precisely the case, a result of there being too much attention drawn from the subject to the object. Since the purpose of the S is to introduce the subject/topic, an odd S results. In contrast, in OE
the purpose of inversion was to stress the subject regardless of what other constituents also were stressed. A wider range of degrees of stress on the subject of full inversions was allowed before full inversion was restricted to topic introduction.

It appears that a direct object after the inverted subject detracts from attention on the subject even if not stressed, i.e., if it is thematic. *In this land ruled Alfred those. Possibly, such a S seems odd because it continues a topic after the inversion which is intended to introduce a new topic. Yet another possible factor in the loss of these transitive verb full inversions is the fact that the presence of a direct object means that a major S constituent is located after the subject, the primary focus of the S. Thus, the subject is forced into clause central position, a less emphatic position than clause final position.

In sum, the loss of transitive full inversions occurred when full inversion was primarily associated with topic shift function, and I believe there is a direct relation between the restriction of full inversion to topic shift and the restriction to intransitive verbs.

There is, however, another factor which probably contributed to the loss of full inversion with transitive verbs and that is the semantic content of the verb itself. We have seen that in earlier periods of English a verb of any semantic type occurred in inversions. In Modern English, however, there are
a common core of verbs that occur most frequently in full inversions: verbs of being, existing, coming, becoming and their synonyms. The context of full inversions (usually a locative or temporal adverb head) causes even verbs which by themselves are not necessarily synonymous with be to become synonymous. For example, With him ran his faithful jogging partner Max. can be the semantic equivalent of With him was his faithful jogging partner Max. While the acceptability of some verbs in full inversions may vary from person to person and from context to context, there is no question that Bolinger's presentative type verbs are most common. Hence, another cause of the overall decrease in the frequency of inversion is the narrowing of the semantic range of full inversion verbs.

We saw in earlier chapters that presentative/existential verbs have long been frequent in inversions with thematic heads and athematic subjects. However, even after the auxiliary do separated out emphatic inversions from topic shift inversions, full inversions were not limited to presentative verbs. We find full inversions that have thematic heads and first mention (topic shift) subjects with intransitive but not presentative verbs in Early Modern English literature. For example, the S in Evelyn's diary (year 1703):

(78) This day died Mr. Samuel Pepys... (Evelyn, II, p. 361)

We find a gradual change to presentative type verbs during the Early Modern English period and variability yet today is evidence that the change is not complete.
The change appears to be one where the purpose of the clause and the semantic content of the verb are increasingly coinciding. That is, the clause serves to locate something in time or space or to announce the presence of something in order to talk about that something in further Ss. The presentative verbs semantically accomplish this same function.

Notice that transitive verbs generally are not semantic equivalents of be, come, or become, nor do they readily take on that meaning from context. Thus, With him made Max a deal is not necessarily synonymous with With him (on the deal) was Max. I believe that transitive verbs have too much semantic content and hence too much stress for topic introduction clauses. It appears that transitive verbs, too, detract from the stress on the subject/topic.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have discussed inversion from the mid 15th to the end of the 16th century and beyond. By the 17th century inversion was fairly modern in form and function, although not entirely so. Full inversions had a wider range of verbs than they do in Modern English and a wider range of heads was common in semi-inversion Ss. Further, obligatory semi-inversion after the so-called restrictive heads and negative heads was not yet established. Inversion after these heads became more and more common and ultimately obligatory as semi-inversion became increasingly restricted to heavy stress PC's.

The two most important changes of 15th and 16th century inversions were the beginning of the Modern English do
auxiliary, which came to distinguish full and semi-inversions, and the decreasing overall frequency of inversions. The following factors have been cited to account for this decrease: the loss of inversion for subject stress; the loss of inversions with primary verb stress; the restriction of semi-inversion to heavy stress PC's caused by the rigidification of SVO order (decrease in the frequency of theme-rheme order) and concomitant changes in the degree of stress resulting from preposing; and the restriction of full inversion to clauses that stress the topic and have no constituents, such as a direct object or transitive verb, that compete with the subject for stress.

There is a lot in this chapter that must remain conjecture until further data analyses are done. In particular, a thorough study of the position of adverbs of all types is relevant to the development of inversion. Further study of the occurrence of the do + infinitive construction in relation to the thematicity/relative emphasis of its co-constituents might shed light on whether this do stressed the verb. Finally, as I noted previously, a study of the decline of theme-rheme order is relevant to a further understanding of the changes in inversion.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis I have described and explained an important word order change occurring between OE and Modern English: the decrease in the occurrence of inverted order. In particular, I have addressed the questions: What are the differences between OE and Modern English inversion? What are the causes and mechanisms of the changes in inversion? and When did the changes occur?

My method for investigating these matters was to survey a number of styles of prose for each stage of the language except Modern English, for which I relied on past research and native intuitions. For each inversion found in the literature, I observed as much about its occurrence as possible by ascertaining in detail the nature of its constituents---the verb, the PC, and the subject---and by ascertaining the literary peculiarities of the prose in which the inversion is found.

The first task in this study was to establish the points of linguistic comparison; that is, I had to establish the forms and functions of inversion in Modern English and in Old English so that similarities and differences in inversion between the two periods could be assessed. I have concluded that Modern English has basically two functionally and formally distinct
types of inversion: semi-inversion, which is used to locate heavy stress on the preposed constituent, and full inversion, which is used to introduce a new topic in a discourse. Further, I have argued that OE also had basically two types of inversion but these are quite different from the modern types: optional inversion was used to stress the subject while obligatory inversion had variable stress—either on the subject or on the verb, or possibly on the PC. After establishing the differences between OE and Modern English inversions, the task was to explain when, how, and why English lost the subject stress function of inversion and the variable stress obligatory inversions.

In order to investigate the problem of when changes in inversion began to occur, I studied inversion in Transition English, the period between Old and Middle English. I have concluded that Transition English exhibits no signs of changes in inversion until just prior to the traditional beginning of Middle English. Then the changes are swift and dramatic; inversions begin to occur freely with subjects of low stress, and the earlier optional subject stress inversions are joined by new optional inversions that stress the PC and the verb. In addition, the old obligatory inversions are lost.

Two sources for these inversions are suggested: a language internal source and a language external source. The language internal source is the inversion of the spoken language, in particular, the use of productive first person pronoun subject inversions possibly developed from former subjunctives
or performatives and quite possibly associated with conversational English. The external source is the influence and subsequent borrowing of French inversions. It is further suggested that the change to new literary inversion in EME is tied up with the sociological/political history of the English people: their emulation of their French conquerors and their subsequent use of French and Latin rather than English as the language of writing, which created a hiatus in the English literary language.

Since EME inversion still differs from Modern English inversion, I have described further changes in inversion between Late Middle English and Modern English and have established why and how these changes took place. In particular, I discuss the overall decrease in the frequency of inversion and the development of the do auxiliary semi-inversion. I have concluded that most recent changes in inversion are related to 1. the restriction of full inversions to a topic shift function while semi-inversions with the dummy auxiliary do came to be used for inversions with low stress subjects and 2. the restriction of semi-inversion to heavy stress PC's. Thus we come to the modern forms and functions of inversion.

In sum, I conclude that OE inversion differed substantially from Modern English inversion, especially in regard to the functions of inversion. These functional differences are reflected in the crucial formal and functional oppositions in the three main periods of English. In Old English the opposition
obligatory inversion: optional inversion is the crucial formal distinction and is correlated with the functional distinction: variable stress: subject stress (with a few exceptions, namely the optional inversion of first person pronoun subjects in some environments and variable optional/obligatory inversion of personal pronoun subjects after *ne*). By the EME period the crucial functional opposition was PC/V stress inversion: subject stress inversion. Although these inversions were not always formally distinct, in this stage of the language, this functional opposition began to be correlated with the formal opposition semi-inversion: full inversion. Finally, in Modern English the crucial formal opposition is full inversion: semi-inversion which corresponds in most cases to the functional distinction: topic introduction (shift): (heavy) PC stress.

In short, I conclude that the decrease in the occurrence of inverted order over the course of the history of English is explainable in terms of significant changes in the function of inversion. Further, I conclude that the history of inversion is amenable to study despite the fact that inversion is tied up with differences in literary style and speech register and, most importantly, with differences in stress. The assignment of stress is a most difficult task when dealing with early stages of a language. However, it is my belief that a combination of the type of detailed analysis undertaken in this study and future analyses of poetry (and perhaps translations from languages where stress assignment might be easier) can provide defensible hypotheses on stress assignment.
In addition, one could learn much from other languages (preferably modern) with a stress system similar to that proposed for earlier stages of English. While it is obvious that much work remains, this thesis is a first step towards demystifying this one aspect of the development of English word order. It is my hope that it will prove to be a useful and stimulating basis for future research.
APPENDIX A: Abbreviations

Original Sources:

AH  Aelfric's Homilies
AR  Ancrene Riwle
ASC Anglo-Saxon Chronicles
B   Chaucer's Boece
Hakl Hakluyt's Navigations
Hol Holinshed's Chronicles
KTS Malory's "Knight With Two Swords"
Mer Malory's "Merlin"
MK  The Book of Margery Kempe
MOA Manual of Astronomy
MT  Mandeville's Travels
OE  Boethius Alfred's version of Boethius
OEH Old English Homilies
Or  Alfred's Orosius
PC  Alfred's Pastoral Care
PL  Paston Letters
RR  Richard Rolle
SW  Sawles Warde
TA  Treatise on the Astrolabe
TP  "Torre and Pellynor"
EP  Equatorie of the Planets
Secondary Sources:

H & J  Hartvigson and Jakobsen, *Inversion in present-day English*

H & T  Hooper and Thompson, *On the applicability of root transformations*

Other Terms:

Adj  adjective
Adv  adverb
Aux  auxiliary
Dir  direction
EME  Early Middle English
Ms.  Manuscript
Neg  Negative
Nom  nominal
OE  Old English
PC  preposed constituent (also called head)
Pro  pronoun/pronominal
S(s)  sentence(s)
Subj  subject
V  verb
V/1; V/2;  verb first; verb second;
V/3  verb third
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