



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XI

October 1913

NUMBER 2

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANALYTIC GENITIVE IN GERMANIC

The appearance of Mr. Bradley's *The Making of English* in 1904 brought to the writer of this article several very delightful hours and a little later great unrest of mind and much weary labor, for the two pages 59 and 60 treating of the origin of the English analytic genitive with "of" presented views quite different from those which had for years been slowly ripening in the course of his own investigations. Among other things Mr. Bradley says: "We do not know whether, apart from French influence, the English language would not have evolved this convenient device for obviating the ambiguities arising from the decay of the old inflections; but imitation of French idiom certainly helped it attain currency." The opinion of a scholar like Mr. Bradley had considerable weight and views scarcely formed and not yet securely established began to totter. Moreover, Mr. Bradley is very fair in giving credit to both native English tendencies and the foreign influence of French. Nevertheless his words did not bring peace. Old thoughts returned and demanded a new hearing. To restore harmony once more the writer took up work again on this subject. It soon became evident that the analytic genitive did not spring at once into being. It had a very modest beginning. It was at first only occasionally used instead of the old simple synthetic genitive. Thus its history is intimately connected with the history of the older synthetic form. It became perfectly clear to the writer

that the meaning and growth of the new form could be understood only in the light of the meaning and the growth and decline of the old form. Thus, before we take up the study of the first beginnings of the analytic form, a brief history of the older synthetic genitive is here given.

Scholars would fain penetrate the darkness that surrounds the origin of the genitive case, but up to the present nothing whatever has been discovered. We do not even know whether its original use was adnominal or adverbial. As, however, the new analytic genitive, which has similar meanings and exactly the same functional force as the older synthetic genitive, is of adverbial origin, it is quite possible that this is also true of the origin of the synthetic form. While the synthetic genitive is more used than any other case to modify nouns, it was also in former periods freely used with verbs and adjectives. Only in recent times has it become restricted almost exclusively to adnominal use. On the other hand, the new analytic genitive is freely used with both nouns and verbs. In a study of the genitive it is important to remember that there has always been a close relation here between adverbial and adnominal functions. This can best be illustrated by showing the relation between adverbial and adnominal function in the new synthetic genitive which has developed in historic times where the stages of development are open to study. Thus in the following sentence *hinz* (*hin ze*) *got* has probably still adverbial force: "Swer die minne *hinz got* hat daz er durch sine hulde alle dise welt versmaht daz ist diu heilige gots minne" (*Altdutsche Predigten*, III, 119, thirteenth century), "If anyone has his love directed to God so that he for His favor despises this world, that is truly the holy love of God." Here *ze got* may be, perhaps, more closely related to the verb than to the governing noun *minne*, but it was often felt as belonging to the governing noun and in that case it ceased to be an adverbial element and became an adnominal adjunct, the modern representative of the older objective genitive, as in "Die Liebe *zur Freiheit* [instead of the older genitive *der Freiheit*] wohnt im Herzen."

Although the development is usually perfectly clear in case of the new analytic genitive the development of the older synthetic genitive is wrapped in darkness. Thus in the Middle High German

sentence quoted in the preceding paragraph nothing is known of the origin of the objective genitive *gots*. The genitive in *gots minne* is usually explained as an objective genitive, which is a development of the possessive genitive, and *minne* is interpreted as having passive force. Thus the expression would mean "God's being loved," or "the love of God," i.e., love which God possesses in a passive sense, not love that God has, feels, but love which God has, receives as a passive recipient. There is, however, another view as to the origin of the objective genitive: "Der subjektive Genitiv ist nur eine Abart des Genitivs poss., der objektive hat ein eigentümlichere Bedeutung. Er berührt sich mit den Genitiven, die zu einem durch ein Substantivum bestimmten Verbum als weitere Bestimmung hinzutreten: Johannes vollzog die Taufe Christi = er vollzog die Taufe an Christus" (Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik*, III, 600). According to this theory the objective genitive was originally an adverbial genitive of reference or specification: "With reference to Christ John performed the baptism." This theory explains a large number of objective genitives. Thus *gots minne* would mean "love with reference to God," or "love of God." It may possibly be that the objective genitive is of composite origin, sometimes a possessive genitive, sometimes a genitive of specification. The adverbial genitive of specification also has often seemingly close relation to the attributive possessive genitive: "We sceolon us gearcian on eallum pingun swa swa Godes penas on micclum gepylde on fæstenum, and on clænnysse *modes* and *licaman*" (Aelfric, "The First Sunday in Lent," tenth century), "We should prepare ourselves just as God's disciples by patience, by fasting, and by cleanliness of *mind* and *body*." Are *modes* and *licaman* possessive genitives or adverbial genitives of specification? We find the same ambiguity in modern German: "die Gleichheit der Gesinnungen," "der Unterschied der Jahre," "ein Muster der Trefflichkeit." In years gone by the writer had definite ideas as to the growth and development of the synthetic genitive and ready explanations for the most puzzling genitive constructions. Today these speculations seem to him perfectly idle, for we do not know anything about the *origin* of the genitive and hence cannot construct any trustworthy theories of its development.

Although the writer is not disposed to enter upon the question of the *development* of the different synthetic genitive categories, he believes that a close study of the *meaning* of these categories is very helpful. The English genitive reached its culmination in the ninth century, while it still flourished in almost full power in the thirteenth century in Germany, even in simple *prose*. At this time the genitive had in both countries developed a rich store of meanings which were identical in the two languages. It could indicate source, cause, authorship, possession, the subject, the object, material, composition, quality, characteristic, measure, the appositive idea, the partitive idea, means, removal, separation, deprivation, specification, a goal, and still other shades of meaning. It meant so much that it often didn't mean anything at all. The constructive force that built the genitive categories up, the feeling for fine shades of meaning, now began to tear them down. There arose in all the Germanic peoples a longing for a clearer and more concrete expression of these ideas. The genitive had the great disadvantage that its original force was not known. It did not convey a vivid concrete picture of any kind. Over against the vague idea of *separation* contained in the colorless genitive stood the clear forceful preposition "of" in English, *von* in German, *af* in Swedish, *de* in Late Latin and French, etc. The writer in earlier years misunderstood this common development in the direction of greater clearness and concrete force. To him then it was deterioration, decay. Today this destruction seems only intelligent reconstruction. There is, however, a grave danger here. The too extensive use of the expressive prepositions may in time destroy the vividness and forcefulness of their original meaning. They often are thoughtlessly used to replace the synthetic form in its many categories without regard to the meaning of the preposition. Thus the preposition becomes loaded down with too many meanings as was formerly the simple genitive. French has gone too far in this direction. English has gone far enough. German is fortunate in retaining the old synthetic form in such large measure. For many years the writer has studied the German development of the last century. From an extensive collection of materials it is entirely clear that there is in a number of cases a tendency in the present literary language to prefer the simple genitive to the use of *von* where this

preposition once seemed to threaten the life of the synthetic form. The large decrease of the use of the German simple genitive in adverbial function has made it more available for forceful use in the adnominal relation. Although, however, the use of the simple genitive has decreased here in adverbial function, many felicitous compounds preserve the older formation: *wesensähnlich*, *mannstoll geistesumnachtet*, etc. The writer takes no stock in the cheap fun that has often been poked at German compounds. He admires the union of simple beauty and strength in English, but he is not blind to the beauties in other languages. He loves to find them and feel them. He has often paused in reading German to muse over a compound with the pronounced feeling that the Germans here are great masters and that English would be richer today if it had not destroyed so much of its former wealth. Alas, the destruction mentioned above was not always intelligent reconstruction! We now turn to a detailed study of the development of the new analytic genitive in the different Germanic languages.

In tracing the development of the analytic genitive it is desirable to begin with the oldest examples of the new usage. It is, however, quite difficult to draw the line between adnominal and adverbial function as nicely illustrated by the use of the words in italics in the following sentence: “*manna us bizai managein* ufwpopida qipands” (Wulfila, Luke 9:38), “a man *of the company* cried out saying” (King James Version). According to the King James Version the words are undoubtedly adnominal, an analytic partitive genitive. Both the use of the preposition “of” and the position of the verb show this. The verb follows the subject and its modifiers. In Gothic, however, the position of the verb could not decide this question, for it does not of necessity follow the subject *immediately*. The words “*us bizai managein*” may modify the verb as well as the subject. This difficulty is a serious one and the writer believes that it was felt in the older periods as such and gradually led to the establishment of the verb in the first place after the subject and its modifiers. This new word-order has, in general, become fixed in both English and German. In English it led to a still further step, as becomes evident by comparing the above sentence from the King James Version with the following form from the Corpus Version

1000 A.D.: "pa clypode an wer *of þære* menego." Here the words "of þære menego" may easily be an analytic partitive genitive belonging to *wer*, for the new genitive is quite common at this date, but it may also be considered as an adverbial element modifying the verb. The adnominal genitive with "of" was originally an adverbial form. Perhaps it stood originally between the subject and the verb just as the Gothic words "us pizai managein" in this same passage. It became adnominal when it was felt as belonging to the subject more than to the verb. The *form*, however, was at first adverbial. In 1000 A.D. when the Corpus Version arose there was as yet no differentiation between "of" in adnominal function and "of" used adverbially. Thus the words "of þære menego" from the Corpus Version are ambiguous. Later to give the words adnominal force they were placed immediately after the subject and before the verb, as in the King James Version, and to give them adverbial force they were placed after the verb and the form "of" was replaced by "from" or "from out": "Then a man cried *from out* the crowd." When an adverb introduces the sentence as in this example the German cannot follow the English in placing the subject and its modifier *before* the verb, but must place both *after* the verb: "Da rief ein Mann *unter dem Volk*" (adnominal element), but "Da rief ein Mann *aus dem Volkshauften heraus*" (adverbial element). The preposition distinguishes the two elements.

A careful study of the preceding paragraph will make it perfectly plain that it is very difficult to determine accurately when the new analytic genitive arose, as it was at first adverbial in *form* and could not be distinguished from an adverbial element by any formal sign either in the words themselves or in the word-order. The new English word-order often seems to present a good test as illustrated in the preceding paragraph, but in the older periods the older word-order existed alongside the new and nothing definite can be determined by this test, and the writer absolutely rejects it as too untrustworthy for scientific purposes. It may easily be that the first beginnings of the analytic form belong to the Gothic or the prehistoric period. Although we cannot assign dates and cannot always distinguish the adnominal relation from the adverbial, there are nevertheless clear indications that the new genitive was developing. By comparing

the Gothic Testament with the Corpus Version we find that a very large number of Gothic adnominal genitives are represented in the English of 1000 A.D. by the analytic form with "of." Here we are on fairly safe ground. What Wulfila considered adnominal and translated by the synthetic genitive, which cannot in most cases be possibly interpreted as belonging to the verb, is often rendered in the Corpus Version by the analytic genitive with "of." Many of Wulfila's expressions with adverbial form may also be adnominal, but here there exists a good deal of doubt. On the other hand, the expressions with the synthetic genitive in connection with a noun are probably in every single case true adnominal elements, and if we find in the Corpus Version the form with "of," in these same passages we may be quite sure that we have the new genitive before us. A few parallel passages from the two documents are here given for careful study. Partitive genitive: "anþaruh þan *siponje* is qaþ du imma" (Matt. 8:21), "ða cwæð to him oþer of hys *leorningcnihtum*," "Another of his *disciples* said unto him"; "gasaihwandans sumans *pize siponje* is" (Mark 7:2), "þa hi gisawon sume of his *leorningcnihtum*," "When they saw some of his *disciples*"; "Sahwazuh sæi gamarzai ainana *pize leitane*" (Mark 9:42), "Swa hwa swa gedrefð ænne of *byssum lytlingum*," "Whosoever shall offend one of *these little ones*." This is a very common group and is already not infrequent in the prose of the ninth century both in Germany and in England. In Latin we find the same tendency. If there has been any foreign force at work at this point on the development of the analytic form in English and German it is the influence of Latin. English and German translators often follow the Latin literally. The fact, however, that this development is stronger in dialect than in the literary language shows clearly that the Old English and German translators in following the Latin here closely were at the same time following strong native tendencies. There was early in the historic period a desire for a clearer expression for the partitive idea. The English "of" and German *von* graphically represent the separation of one or more from a group. This seems evident in case of *von*, but it is also true of "of," for it had in Old English the force of "from." Indeed, we sometimes find "from" where we now use "of." Since the Old English period, "of" has lost much of its old graphic force.

It is becoming more and more to be a mere colorless adnominal form with the force of the older colorless synthetic genitive. This was, however, in earlier periods quite different.

This new partitive genitive was not only used in adnominal function, but was also often employed with verbs instead of the old simple partitive genitive: "jabai hwas matjip *his hlaibis*" (Wulfila, John 6:51), "swa hwa swa ytt of *ðyson hlafe*" (Corpus), "if any man eat of *this bread*"; "ni sijup *lambe meinaize*" (John 10:26), "ge ne synt of *minum sceapum*," "Ye are not of *my sheep*." The German developed here in exactly the same way: "gebet uns fon iuuuere mole" (Tatian, 148.5), "Give us of *your oil*"; "ir ni birut fon *minen scafon*" (*ibid.*, 134.3), "ye are not of *my sheep*."

This common genitive construction developed later quite differently in German and English. In order that the later development may become perfectly clear the origin of the construction is here given in brief with the entire subsequent development in both languages.

The freedom of position in case of the word denoting the whole so often found in partitive constructions in both English and German seems to indicate that it was originally not an attributive genitive modifying the noun denoting the part of the quantity, but was a modifier of the verb: "Des Brotes [partitive object] isst er, einen Bissen" (explanatory addition), or with different word-order: "Er isst des Brotes, einen Bissen." In time a close relation developed between the two nouns, so that the genitive was felt as belonging to the following noun rather than to the verb: "Thiu faz thiu namun lides zuei odo thriu mez" (Otfrid, 2. 9. 95), "The vessels contained two or three measures of wine." The punctuation here indicates that the genitive *lides* modifies the noun *mez*, but in such a delicate question as this we cannot rely on the punctuation of a printed text or even the manuscript itself. The punctuation may in fact represent the true state of things, but it is also possible that *lides* here is the partitive object of the verb and that "zuei odo thriu mez" is an explanatory addition. The next step in the development made the situation perfectly clear. In those cases where the genitive was felt as belonging to the noun a change in the word-order developed. The genitive instead of preceding the governing noun followed it in accordance with the general tendency elsewhere to place the genitive

after the governing noun: "Er isst einen Bissen des Brotes." English examples are not given, as they correspond in the older period exactly to the German ones just given. Later English usage varies only in that the older synthetic genitive was replaced by the new synthetic form with "of": "He is eating a piece of *the bread*."

Alongside this German and English form of statement there is another which represents a different development. The original form "Er isst des Brotes, einen Bissen" could be replaced by "Er isst Brot, einen Bissen," as the partitive object could be replaced by an accusative object. This is not a modern form but like the genitive construction is very old: "usnemum laibos gabruko sibun spwreidans" (Wulfila, Mark 8:8), "hi namon pæt of pam brytsenum belaf, seofon wilian fulle" (Corpus), "they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets" (King James Version), "We sceolon ealle þa þing þe us gesceotaþ of ures geares teolunge Gode þa teopunge syllan" (Sweet, *Selected Homilies of Aelfric*, p. 48), "We should give to God the tenth part of all the things which accrue to us from our year's work." In the King James Version we have the partitive construction, in Wulfila, Aelfric, and Corpus the appositional construction. Wulfila has followed the Greek here. This appositional construction is also found in colloquial Latin and in careless, easy style in general. It is of course also found later in English and German. "I yow foryeve this trespas every del" (Chaucer's "Knight's Tale," 969). "But there is gold and silver gret plentee" (Mandeville). "Silver and Gold have I none" (Acts 3:6). "Aber Geld sieht man keins" (Karl Schönherr, *Sonnewendtag*, p. 9). "Schmerz empfand ich keinen" (Isolde Kurz, *Nachbar Werner*). It is much more common in modern German than in English. The writer gives a long list of examples from recent German literature in his *Grammar of the German Language*, p. 515, and has since found many additional examples, which show that this construction is a conspicuous feature of colloquial speech in the German of today.

Especial attention is here called to the two forms, the usual *literary* form with the genitive and the colloquial form with the appositional construction, for the former has become fixed in English and the latter in German. The word-order in the appositional

construction, however, now more commonly follows the analogy of the word-order in the genitive form. Thus after the analogy of "Er isst einen Bissen des Brotes" the appositional form often becomes: "Er isst einen Bissen Brot." This appositional construction has in recent German almost entirely replaced here the genitive form, as the modern genitive has often no distinctive ending and the genitive construction has become confounded with the appositional construction: "Er trank ein *Glas Milch*" (perhaps genitive, but in form an appositive to *Glas*); "Er kaufte ein Paar *Schuhe*" (perhaps genitive plural, but in form an appositive to *Paar*). There is in modern English no construction exactly like this. A seemingly similar construction is found in "a dozen eggs," "much good," "a little good," "something good," "nothing good," "anything good," etc. In older English the substantive form was in the partitive genitive: "nan ping *yfeles*" (*Twelfth Century Homilies*, p. 138). A little later the synthetic genitive here ought to have been replaced by the analytic form as was the common usage outside of this little group, and this new form indeed occasionally appeared: "Of Nazareth may sum thing *of good be?*" (Wyclif, John 1:46, Pickering's ed.). The partitive genitive later disappeared as the preceding words "a dozen," "much," "a little," etc., had come to be felt as mere limiting adjectives. Hence the substantive was no longer felt as a modifier but as an independent noun.

The real appositional construction, however, as found in modern German was also employed in *older* English: "no morsel *bred*" (Chaucer's "The Monkes Tale," 444), "pre *þe noblest ryueres* of al Europe" (Trevisa, Higden's "Polychronicon," 1. 199, about 1387 A.D.), etc. This construction has entirely disappeared without leaving a single trace behind and the question of the cause of this disappearance naturally arises. This construction was in Old English a favorite in colloquial speech and was felt as a distinct construction. In the early Middle English period after the destruction of the older declensions an occasional indistinct trace of the older synthetic partitive genitive survived. Such defective and often ambiguous synthetic forms were finally entirely replaced by the clear analytic form. There was no strong literature which, with the natural conservatism of standard speech, held the people to their

older synthetic genitive. Only dialectic influences prevailed and all the native tendencies were toward the clear analytic form. Thus every trace of the old synthetic partitive genitive disappeared. The old colloquial appositive continued a little longer than the indistinct synthetic forms, for it was in fact quite a different construction and some feeling for it was left. Still later it was felt as the last remnant of these old defective synthetic genitives and was replaced by the clear analytic genitive.

Thus in fact the English development is the opposite of the German. In English the appositional construction was confounded with the genitive construction, while in German the genitive was confounded with the appositional form. German, on the other hand, developed as above described because there were no serious ambiguities of form which made imperative the use of *von*. All the tendencies in the literary language were in the direction of the retention and the steady use of the synthetic genitive. The modern use of *von* in the partitive category rests, in general, upon the same basis as in the ninth century. It is employed only to emphasize the idea of separation: "Geben Sie mir ein Stück vom Braten" emphasizes the idea of separation which is about to take place, while the appositional construction, "Das Kind hielt ein Stück Braten in der Hand," contains the partitive idea without the idea of separation. There is here a double form and there is always a tendency to differentiate forms. It is possible that the so-called appositional construction here is dimly felt as a reduced form of the old synthetic form so that the new analytic and the old synthetic forms stand in contrast to each other. The former emphasizes the idea of separation, the latter contains the usual partitive idea as found in the synthetic partitive genitive. Differentiation cannot usually take place here in English, as we usually have only one form. The analytic form has not now its original idea of separation as it has been pressed into service as a substitute for the older ambiguous discarded synthetic genitive. Hence without differentiation in form we say: "Give me a piece of the roast meat," and "The child held a piece of roast meat in its hand," using "of" in both cases.

The new analytic partitive genitive plays an important rôle in the development and spread of the new form. The origin of the

old synthetic genitive is wrapped in complete darkness, but the principal source of the development of the new analytic form is in the new partitive genitive with "of" and *von*, which had already in the ninth century developed considerable force. Other genitive categories closely related to the partitive genitive laid aside their old historic form and assumed the new form employed in the partitive category. We shall now take up these different categories one by one.

Very closely related to the partitive genitive is the genitive of material or composition: "and wundon cyne-helm *of þornum*" (Corpus, Matt. 27:29), "and when they had platted a crown of thorns" (King James Version), "plectentes coronam de spinis." We are here at the very source of the attributive construction. We cannot tell whether *of þornum* is an adverbial element modifying the verb or whether it is an attributive modifier of the noun *cyne-helm*. Even in the King James Version the distinction has not yet become clear. Today we can distinguish the adverbial element by using "out of" instead of simple "of": "they made a crown out of thorns." Thus the "of" in the Old English was originally employed in the sense of "out of" and even in attributive function retained for centuries its full original force. Indeed, it must have been difficult at first to distinguish attributive and adverbial functions. In the translation of these same Latin words the glossarist of the Lindisfarne MS (about 950 A.D.) in John 19:2 seems to have tried to differentiate them: "ða ðegnas gewundun *of ðornum* ða corna, or pæt sigbeg *of ðornum*." In the first use of *of ðornum* we have beyond doubt the adverbial function, in the second it seems as though the glossarist intended the attributive use, as he puts it after the noun. It seems as though he were not entirely sure whether *de spinis* was an adverbial or an adnominal element and hence gave both translations. We have a clear case of adnominal use in the Corpus Version: "se iohannes hæfde reaf *of olfenda hærum*" (Matt. 3:4), "John had raiment of camel's hair," "ipse iohannes habebat uestimentum de pilis camelorum." The Latin model has not been given because the writer thinks that the English has been influenced by it. The Corpus Version is characterized by great simplicity and independence. The development in English here runs parallel with the Latin. The analytic form is also found here in the Lindisfarne and

Rushworth MSS. It is quite probable that the analytic genitive of material was common in the plain prose of the late Old English period, for Mr. George Shipley in his *Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, p. 89, gives an older example from poetry, which in general is quite conservative with regard to the use of new forms: "pære burge weard | anne manlican ofer metodes est, | gyld of *golde*, gumum arærde" ("Daniel," 175, eighth century), "the lord of the city set up for the people against the Creator's will an image, an idol of gold." In German we find a case in the ninth century: "flehtente corona fon thornon" (Tatian, 200:2). We find here the same ambiguity as in the first English examples given above. The later spread of the analytic form is due in both English and German to the vivid force of "of," not to the loss of the declensions. Of course the loss of inflection facilitated the development in English. In 1200 A.D. the triumph of the English analytic form is almost complete. In German the old synthetic genitive persisted throughout the Middle High German period and in figurative language is even still found: "Die Sonne versinkt hinter einer Wehr *weisser Berge* im Westen" (Ernst Zahn). Also in the broad sense of composition: "ein Schwarm Heuschrecken," "eine Reihe blühender Kinder." In spite of full inflectional forms, however, the analytic form has elsewhere by reason of the graphic force of *von* gained a complete victory: "ein Ring von Gold," etc. On the other hand, in compounds the oldest form, i.e., the synthetic genitive in the position *before* the noun, is still well preserved: "Dornenkrone," "Blumenkranz," etc.

The possessive genitive is in the new development closely related to the partitive idea as clearly seen in the following examples: "pæt gemong ðara wyrтана of *tuæm treum* receles" (*Lindisfarne Glosses*, John 19:39, about 950 A.D.), "the mixture made from the leaves of *two fragrant trees*." "pæt he þe ðone ele syllan sceolde of *þam treowe* ðære myldheortnysse" ("The Harrowing of Hell," eleventh century, Bright, *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 130), "that he should give thee the oil of the tree of mercy." In the first example the leaves belong to the tree but here they are represented as having been taken *from* the trees. The same is true of the oil in the second example. Here, perhaps, the idea of *separation* is stronger than

the idea of *possession*. In the following example the idea of separation is entirely absent and the idea of possession alone remains: "Ne for-wyrð a locc of *eowrum heafde*" (Corpus, Luke 21:18), "But there shall not a hair of your head perish." A single hair is a part of the head, it also belongs to the head. In still earlier periods the idea of possession ruled here supremely. From late Old English on the imagery of the language changed a little. For the expression of the conception of belonging to something as an integral part or an essential element the old synthetic genitive was discarded and the preposition "of" was employed, which retained in large measure its old original partitive idea, but with a new application of its force. Thus we read in the *Saxon Chronicle* for the year 992 E of the "Abb (ud) of Burch," "the abbot of Burch," for the year 1066 D of "Harold cyng of Eoferwic," "Harold king of York," "Harold cyng of Norwegan," etc. For this same year, however, in MS E we find the older synthetic genitive with the older conception of personal ownership: "Harold se *Norrena cyng*." The old synthetic form is still employed in warm poetic language, but by reason of the lack of a clear genitive form for the plural we today use the singular: "England's king," "Albion's queen," etc. The new analytic form also occurs in the German Otfrid: "ther keisor *fona rumu*" (1. 11. 2). As in this last example the analytic genitive is still used in German in formal titles, as in "der Kaiser von Deutschland," but in warm poetic language we can say: "Deutschland's Kaiser" (indicating pride in ownership). The analytic form is also employed in case of names of places ending in a sibilant: "die Strassen von Paris," but "die Strassen Berlins." Here the use of *von* is a mere matter of form. The *s* of the genitive ending in words ending in a sibilant is lost in the preceding *s* and the form is not felt as a clear genitive ending. Instead of the synthetic genitive we find the appositional construction where the possessive idea disappears: "das Porträt W. Zimmermann," "the portrait of [representing] W. Zimmermann," "der Antrag Rümelin," "the motion made by Rümelin," etc. In general, however, the old synthetic form is remarkably well preserved in German in the possessive category. In English on the contrary it has almost entirely disappeared in case of nouns representing things.

Why in the possessive category is the analytic genitive so much more used in English than in German? There are two chief factors which favored in English the spread of the analytic form, the graphic force of the preposition "of" with its clear idea of separation, source, or integral part, and, on the other hand, the lack of clear genitive forms in the later period of the decay of the old declensions. Let us first study the first factor. There was already in the Old English period a distinct feeling for the graphic force of "of" in the possessive category. It emphasized the idea of source more than the colorless synthetic genitive. Although the synthetic form was usually employed with nouns representing persons, "of" was sometimes even there preferred that the idea of source might become prominent: "he gesceop ealle gesceafta purh pone Sune sepe wæs æfre of him acenned wisdom of pam wisan Fæder" (Aelfric, *Preface to Genesis*, tenth century), "He [i.e., God] created all creatures through His Son, who born of Him and always with Him was the wisdom of the wise Father." This is a beautiful use of "of." It is still vividly felt when we say: "he walks in the strength of God." The picture becomes quite different when we say: "he walks in *God's* strength." This emphasis upon possession robs man of his dignity, of his independence. The full force and beauty of "of" is nicely brought out in: "fortitudo þat is, strengþe of gode" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 81, about 1200 A.D.). The use of the synthetic genitive would entirely destroy the sense. Thus it becomes perfectly clear that although "of" is usually employed with nouns representing things it also often becomes necessary with nouns denoting persons when the idea of source becomes more prominent than the possessive idea. This was never true of German in the same measure as in English. This tendency is old in English. It arose at a period when the declensions were intact. Thus it is a question of feeling, not a mere question of form.

The natural fondness for the expressive "of" led to its use in different shades of the original meaning with different applications of its force: "bituih medo gemæro of decapol" (Mark 7:31, Lindisfarne MS, about 950 A.D.), "through the boundaries of Decapolis." The glossarist uses the analytic form with "of" although the Latin text over which he wrote the English words has the synthetic genitive

decapoleos. The "of" here has a force quite different from its original meaning. There is no idea of separation. It has the derived meaning of belonging to something as an integral part of it. The idea of an *integral* part is, however, rather faint. The force of "of" has here become almost as colorless as the older synthetic genitive, which we find in this same expression in the ninth century: "eal *Breotene* gemæro" (Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 338), "all the boundaries of Britain." The use of "of" here in the Lindisfarne MS seems to indicate a previous usage so long and steady that the original coloring had worn off considerably, and yet the new conception of integral part was felt vividly enough to be preferred to the older conception of possession. Even if the glossarist employed the analytic form to avoid the addition of an *s* to a sibilant, it remains true that the form was felt as a genitive. The glossarist might have retained the foreign genitive as he does elsewhere and as the translator of the Corpus Version has done in this same passage. He preferred, however, the analytic form just as we do today. The idea is removed a little too far from that of personal possession for the use of the synthetic form. Modern Swedish, which has much wider boundaries in the possessive idea than English, preserves the synthetic form here even though the noun ends in a sibilant: "midt igenom Dekapolis' gränsland." The Rushworth glossarist followed the example of the Lindisfarne glossarist and wrote: "bitwih middum gimærum of decapolem." The Latin of the Rushworth text has the appositional construction with the non-inflection of the proper name: "medio finis decapolis." Thus also the Rushworth glossarist translated independently of his Latin model. Also in another passage in the Lindisfarne text, John 19:39 quoted above, the English glossarist employs the analytic genitive independently of the Latin text. Thus we are forced to the conclusion that "of" had in northern English already attained wider boundaries than a careless reading of this text might suggest. This is confirmed by the remarkable fact that in this extensive translation consisting of the Four Gospels the translator or translators have never once failed to translate an analytic genitive by the corresponding English analytic form. The two forms *de* and *ex* are used in the Latin, but the English glossarist almost uniformly uses "of." Only occasionally does he employ

“from”: “hua is *from* iuh” (Matt. 7:9), “hwylc man is *of* eow” (Corpus), “what man is there of you” (King James Version). Usually “from” is employed with adverbial elements as in present usage. The “of” has begun to lose its original force and has developed perceptibly in the direction of becoming a mere substitute for the old synthetic genitive. This process has gone farther in the Lindisfarne MS than in the Corpus text: “hwa awæltēs us ðone stan *from* duro ðæs byrgennes?” (Lindisfarne, Mark 16:3), “hwa awylt us ðysne stan *of* pære byrgene dura?” (Corpus), “who shall roll us away the stone *from* the door of the sepulcher?” (King James Version). Thus in the English Corpus text “of” is still used adverbially, and this usage continued for a long time. In the Lindisfarne text, on the other hand, “from” is occasionally used in adnominal genitive constructions, but “of” prevails in general, and the usage of today is already clearly foreshadowed. In German this differentiation between “of” and “from” was absolutely unknown, so that at this point the two languages from now on developed in different directions. In the Lindisfarne MS over against the many adnominal *de*'s and *ex*'s of the Latin text is the almost uniform “of” in the English glosses, a clear indication of the almost complete crystallization of the usage so familiar to us today. The firmness of this northern usage becomes apparent when we observe that the glossarist does not once put a second form, a synthetic genitive, alongside the “of,” for it is his common practice to give *two* or *three* translations in cases where he is not quite sure whether he has rendered the word idiomatically. He often gives a close translation and then gives a freer, more idiomatic rendering. He is uniformly contented to translate the analytic genitive *de* or *ex* by the analytic “of,” for it corresponds to the common usage of his dialect.

The use of “of” as a mere substitute for the synthetic genitive is found not only in northern English but also in the literary language of the South: “sum seoc man wæs genemned lazarus of bethania of marian cæstre and *of martham* his swustra” (Corpus, John 11:1), “Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha” (King James Version). The word-order here is very interesting. In the King James Version we have the modern order as found when we use “of.” In the Corpus

text we have the older order as found when we use the synthetic form, as in "John's hat and William's." We often find this order in the Corpus text: "iocobes broðor and Iosepes" (Mark 6:3). In the passage from John 11:1 the author of the Corpus text used a synthetic genitive in the first instance and the new analytic genitive in the second instance, which in literal translation would now read "Bethany, *Mary's* home town and also that of *Martha*, his sisters." In modern English we must insert here the determinative "that." We do not now use the mixed form much, but it occasionally occurs. It is hard to account for the analytic form here in the Corpus text on the basis of the *meaning*. The "of," as in the Lindisfarne example quoted in the preceding paragraph, has entirely lost its original meaning. It is evidently used as a mere substitute for the synthetic genitive.

The author of the Corpus text does what we told above of the author of the *Lindisfarne Glosses*—he employs the analytic genitive where his Latin model has a synthetic form: "ne eom ic asend buton to pam sceapum þe forwurdon of isræla huse" (Matt. 15:24), "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of *the house* of Israel" (King James Version). The Latin text of the Lindisfarne MS has the synthetic form here: "*domus* israel." The same Latin reading is found in the Rushworth MS, also in Tatian. We do not know whether the Latin text used by the Corpus translator was different from the other texts. In general, however, this translator proceeds quite independently of the Latin text. He often uses the analytic genitive, often the old synthetic form without regard to the Latin model. He is familiar with both forms and uses both freely. This is true not only of the possessive category of which we are talking, but also of the other genitive categories. This translator was writing in a literary language with firm transitions fixed by centuries of usage. He naturally departed from tradition only under strong pressure, for he was undoubtedly a man of culture and refinement and had the conservative regard for literary models that naturally accompanies culture and education. A learned man lives not only in the present but also in the past. Not only his thought but also his language is connected with the past. It must have been a really strong pressure that could lead a learned man to lay aside the established *grammar* of his

language. This strong pressure in the present instance was the strong tendency that undoubtedly existed in spoken English toward the use of the analytic genitive. If "of" is used a large number of times in this translation it was surely used much more in natural spoken language. When this literary language disappeared in the twelfth century and dialect took its place, in every part of England "of" appeared at once with the wide boundaries of usage that it has today. This usage had been developing for centuries in the spoken language. In the same way the instances of the use of the analytic genitive in the Late Latin were only a faint indication of the strength that the new development had acquired in popular usage. We now turn to the consideration of the possessive genitive in the later period to study the formal factors involved in the development of the analytic genitive.

We have seen in the preceding paragraphs that there was a natural inclination toward the use of the analytic genitive with "of" on account of a widespread fondness for the vivid force of its meaning over against the colorless synthetic genitive. The development of the new form was further favored by a mere formal force—the decay of the old declensions and the resulting ambiguity on account of the lack of distinctive endings. This disintegration began in the North. It can be noticed in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*: "sunu ðe monnes" (Luke 17:30), "the Son of man." The article *ðe* has lost its inflection here. Also the declensions of nouns and adjectives in this same manuscript show abundant signs of approaching disintegration. Later in all parts of England the old declensions of nouns and adjectives were quite thoroughly destroyed by a natural process of development. Doubtless the Norman-French invasion hastened this process, because it led to the neglect of the literary language. A rich, live literature always has a conserving power. The loss of inflection here completed the work of the destruction of the synthetic genitive. The form was beginning to lose its popularity on account of its colorless meaning; now it became impossible on account of the loss of the different declensions. There was nothing left to distinguish the singular from the plural. The genitive singular and plural now ended in *s*. If we did not have the analytic genitive we should have to say: The branches the trees, the marbles the boys,

the fingers the hands, the legs the chairs, the eyes the girls, the grass the fields, the sides the mountains, the soil the valleys, etc. There is here no sense at all, it is all pure nonsense. It is not the English language, it is no language at all; for the most elementary language of the crudest people means something, but these words mean nothing. Someone might thoughtlessly reply that these are only a few well-chosen examples, but the writer replies that there are many thousands of examples just as good. It was, moreover, not only the absolute danger of ambiguity that militated against the use of the old synthetic form in this reduced state of the inflectional systems. The rudest suggestion sometimes conveys an idea with perfect accuracy. A mere fragment of a sentence reveals often the entire thought. The normal thought of a people, however, usually demands a clear grammatical expression. The mind is as much disturbed by slovenly conditions of speech as our bodily feeling is sensible to slovenly conditions around us. It demands imperatively law and order. In the words "chiuringe of toðen" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 19, about 1200 A.D.), "the gnashing of teeth," the "of" was inserted because the grammatical relations of the old synthetic genitive *toðen* was not clearly expressed. The case might possibly be nominative, genitive, dative, or accusative. The connection suggested the genitive, but the feeling of the author demanded a clear and orderly expression and hence he inserted "of." In the same way a German says: "Blätter von Blumen" to avoid the slovenly expression "Blätter Blumen." Such language would sound more like baby talk than intelligent speech.

There is a remarkable law here which defines accurately just what constitutes slovenly speech. Any deficiency of form however slight is considered unpardonable slovenliness if the form follows the governing noun, while the same deficiency is regarded as perfectly satisfactory if the form stands before the noun. This law can best be studied in the English of the twelfth century. At this time a few adjective forms occasionally retained the older inflection. In this case the older synthetic genitive was retained even where it followed the noun: "seinte poul hegest *alre* lorpew" (*Old English Homilies*, Series 2, p. 153), "St. Paul, the greatest of all teachers." It should be noticed here that the genitive is not a possessive genitive

but a partitive and hence one that would naturally incline to the new analytic form, but the clear genitive form *alre* made the synthetic form possible even at this late date. It should also be noticed that the genitive *lorþew* is not a clear genitive, as it is exactly like the singular. It expresses neither the case nor the number clearly, but it did not give offense here, as the preceding adjective expressed number and case clearly. The same thing is found in modern German: "Der Vater des jungen Goethe." Here *Goethe* has no ending at all, but it is not felt as imperfect as the preceding article expresses the genitive relation clearly. Now it should be noticed that these inflected adjective forms are in direct contact with the preceding noun. This explains the fact that the genitive that precedes the governing noun does not give offense, even though the preceding adjectives are not inflected. The genitive of the noun usually has a clear genitive form and this genitive is in direct contact with the following governing noun: "þis *childes* witige gost" (*ibid.*, p. 127), "this child's prophetic spirit." Here *þis* is uninflected but *childes* has a clear genitive form and is in direct contact with the governing noun and its modifiers. Thus inflection was demanded only at the point where the two components of the adnominal group touched each other. This law the writer names "the law of immediate contact" for the want of a better term. The law is so simple that it must have been noticed by others, but the writer has not been able to find any record of it in his studies. This simple law explains the entire development in English. The danger of ambiguity in many places must have facilitated this development but the law itself has nothing to do with ambiguity. Swedish has much fuller synthetic forms than English and thus the danger of ambiguity was not as great, but the development there as in English was *entirely* controlled by the law of immediate contact. Thus after the loss of the inflection of the article and of adjectives the synthetic form entirely disappeared in English and Swedish wherever it followed the governing noun.

Thus the study of this development does not point to French influence. The English language had developed the analytic form centuries before the Norman French came in. It was used at first for its vivid force. When the different declensions were destroyed, the analytic form already in a flourishing state of development simply

replaced it. The development was so natural and inevitable that the writer rejects in his own thought the suggestion of the faintest influence from the French. Swedish, far removed from French influences, has had a similar development. The only difference in the development in the two languages is the stronger life of the analytic form in English. This is amply accounted for by the strong inclination to the analytic form which was already manifest in the literary language of the Old English period and by the later destruction of this literary language. The conserving power of the literary standard form of speech was eliminated and the language entirely given over to the dialects that in still greater measure favored the analytic genitive. We can see very plainly in modern German how the dialects favor the analytic form.

The word-order is an important element in the study of the possessive genitive. The old synthetic genitive is preserved wherever it precedes the governing noun: "John's father," "the boy's father," "the emperor of Germany's father," "death's grip," "the sun's rays," "the earth's axis," "the planet's orbit," "hell's fire," "the World's Fair," "the jury's verdict," "a stone's throw," "a day's journey," "a quarter of an hour's ride," "a boat's length," "at a moment's notice," "the next day's supply," "the ship's crew," "my journey's end," "for goodness' sake," "for conscience' sake," "good for good's sake," "at his wits' end," "to his heart's content," "out of harm's way," "yesterday's mail," and many others. The list was once larger: "at his *beddes* heed" (Chaucer's "Prolog," 293), "unto our *lyues* ende" (*ibid.*, "The Shipman's Tale," 434), etc. This usage is, in general, limited to the singular, as the plural form does not differ from the singular and could not in most cases be recognized as such. We say "the children's hats," "the women's hats," "men's clothing," but "the hats of the girls," etc.

It is a remarkable fact that the synthetic genitive has not been preserved in a single instance where it formerly stood after its governing noun. The ambiguity of the form here or the slovenliness of the form by reason of the lack of clear case forms to indicate in an orderly way the grammatical relations, as illustrated above, usually made its use impossible. It might have been used in the few cases where the noun had a different genitive form in the singular and plural

as "woman's" and "women's," "man's" and "men's," "child's" and "children's," but these words almost uniformly stood *before* the governing noun. On the other hand, in the cases where these words or others stood after the governing noun the old synthetic genitive was impossible by the operation of the law of immediate contact explained above, for the preceding article was uninflected. Moreover, there was a strong tendency to the use of "of" on account of its meaning. Thus the two most powerful factors, form and meaning, conspired here to destroy the synthetic genitive wherever it followed the noun. It was purely native forces that brought about the loss of this form. The English-speaking people no longer had a choice here between the synthetic and analytic forms as in the period of richer inflection. They were forced to discard entirely the older genitive. The only way to prove French influence here would be to show that French has influenced English where the genitive stood *before* the noun, i. e., in the possessive category in the narrow sense, i. e., literal personal possession. This is, however, the only place where the old synthetic genitive has been preserved in its full extent. Thus it is quite clear that the loss or preservation of the synthetic form was solely a question of its position and its position was a question of its meaning. We turn now to a study of these two factors.

In oldest Germanic the genitive could stand either before or after its governing noun, but it preferred the position before it. The same is true of adjectives. Gradually the adjective began to abandon the position after the noun and became ever more and more fixed in the position before the noun. In the same measure the genitive began to abandon the position before the noun and became established after the noun. The process went on steadily in both English and German for centuries. Only one class of genitives remained fixed before the noun, the possessive genitive in the narrow sense of personal possession. The only explanation for this remarkable exception that presents itself to the writer is the close relation in meaning between the possessive genitive and the possessive adjective or pronoun. Thus "*his* book" might have influenced "John's book." It seems a little easier to account for the gradual movement of the other genitives to the position after the noun. With advancing

culture language loses its simplicity of structure. The sentences become more involved in intricate hypotactical formations. The genitive becomes loaded with modifiers of different kinds, other genitives, relative clauses, etc. It often became necessary to place the genitive with its modifiers after the governing noun. At the same time it often became desirable or even necessary to put the adjective modifiers before the governing noun. Neither in case of adjectives nor of genitives, however, was this change of position in every case a mere matter of convenience in the arrangement of words. There were psychological factors at work. There was a tendency for adjectives, especially pronominals, as "this," "that," "such," etc., to seek a position before the subject to establish a closer connection with what preceded. In case of genitives, as we have seen, the meaning of the genitive categories had considerable influence.

In oldest English a genitive of any kind whatever preceded the governing noun if it had the natural sentence accent: "No his lif-gedal | sárlic puhte *sé*gca ænegum, | para-pe," etc. (*Beowulf*, 841-42), "His deth did not seem grievous to any of the *men* who," etc. The measure shows clearly that *sé*gca is stressed. Hence it precedes its governing word although it is a partitive genitive which in later English preferred the position after the governing word. Of course, a possessive genitive can also stand before its governing word if it has the sentence accent: "Únferð maðelode *É*cglafe bearn" (*Beowulf*, 499), "Únferth the son of *É*cglafe spoke." The situation changed materially before the end of the Old English period. The genitive that precedes the governing noun is often unaccented: "gif ge *á*brahames bearn synt wyrceað abrahames *wé*orc" (Corpus, John 8:39), "if you were *Abraham's* children ye would do the *wórks* of Abraham." We have no poetic measure here with its well-known accents to guide us, but it seems quite probable that the first *abra*hames is accented, while the second one is without sentence stress. The stress falls upon *wé*orc. The sentence stress has nothing to do with the position as in oldest English. Other considerations which have been mentioned in the preceding paragraph now control the word-order. The word *abra*hames in both cases precedes the governing word because it denotes possession. The more pronounced the idea of personal possession is, the more natural it is to put the genitive

before the noun. The more indistinct this idea becomes, the more natural it is to put the genitive after the noun. Of course, the genitive that followed the noun later assumed the analytic form as explained above. Hence in the translation of this last example the authors of the King James Version used "Abraham's" in the first instance but "of Abraham" in the second instance, as the first case seemed a possessive genitive while the second seemed more a genitive of characteristic. Wyclif's translation of this passage reads: "if 3e ben the sones of Abraham do 3e werkis of Abraham." The syntax of this fourteenth-century translation is here nearer that of our own time than that of the King James Version. These Jews were not the sons of Abraham in the literal sense; they had, however, descended from him. Hence the "of" of the analytic genitive expresses this idea better. Thus we should more naturally say: "if you were the genuine disciples of Christ you would be more like him" than: "if you were Christ's genuine disciples." This latter expression seems to us to apply rather to the historic company of twelve. We do not say "the hat of John," because we feel the "of" as meaningless, but we may say either "by the grace of God" or "by God's grace" according to the meaning. We incline, however, more naturally to the use of "by the grace of God," for we do not think so much of the idea of *possession* as we do of the idea of the *source* of the manifold mercies that come to us.

We may see the difference between the synthetic genitive of possession and the analytic genitive with "of," but it may be a little more difficult to see how this differentiation in large measure corresponds to the older distinction of placing the synthetic possessive genitive *before* the noun and the same synthetic genitive *after* the noun to indicate the other genitive categories. The facts of the German and English languages, however, point clearly to this differentiation. The exact boundaries of the idea of possession vary very much. A few examples are here given to show what wide boundaries this idea still had about 1000 A.D. in English: "topa gristbitung" (Corpus, Matt. 8:12), "gnashing of teeth," subjective genitive; "uppan oliuetes dune" (*ibid.*, Matt. 26:30), "the Mount of Olives," appositive genitive; "iudea cyning" (*ibid.*, Matt. 27:27), "King of the Jews," possessive genitive; "swina heord," "a herd of swine"

(*ibid.*, Matt. 8:30), genitive of composition, material, etc.; “mannes sunu” (*ibid.*, Matt. 8:20), “the son of man”; “pæs temples wahryft” (*ibid.*, Luke 23:45), “the veile of the temple”; “ðæs hælendes fet” (*ibid.*, John 12:3), “the feet of Jesus”; “godes weg” (*ibid.*, Matt. 22:16), “the way of God”; “of pæs wingeardes wæstmē” (Luke 20:10), “of the fruit of the vineyard.” These expressions show plainly that the idea of possession in 1000 A.D. is quite different from that which obtains today. As we do not know what the origin of the synthetic genitive was, we do not know whether we have the right to say that the idea of possession is the central thought in all these examples, but the fondness of these words for the position before the noun seems to indicate this. Many of them still maintain this position, as “a stone’s throw,” “a boat’s length,” “the sun’s rays,” etc. Older usage is especially tenacious in the parts of the body in connection with a noun indicating a living being: “the cat’s eye,” or “the eye of the cat,” but “the eye of a pansy,” “the eye of a needle.” In the Corpus Version we find: “þurh are nædle eage” (Luke 18:25), “A nedlis iʒe” (Purvey), “A needle’s eye” (King James Version). The old conception is that of possession, the new one that of an integral part. The Old English expression “Mannes sunu” was also firmly fixed in English feeling. Wyclif and his reviser Purvey with their “Mannes sone” remain throughout their translation consistently true to the Old English. Later the idea of source displaced the older idea of possession as seen by the modern form “the son of man.” The list of possessive genitives was greater in 1000 A.D., not only because the boundaries of the possessive idea were greater but also because the rich inflection of that period made it possible to use the genitive here freely in the plural: “wydywyna hus” (Luke 20:47), “the houses of widewes” (Purvey), “widows’ houses” (King James Version). The fourteenth-century Purvey is closer to modern usage than the authors of the King James Version. Although we often follow the usage of the King James Version here and elsewhere in colloquial usage, we in general avoid the synthetic form here. The usage here in 1000 A.D. was not at all fixed except in case of geographical names, as “oliuetes dune,” etc. The writer has not found a single instance where such genitives stood after the governing noun at this time. In all the other cases, however, these

genitives also followed the noun. Wherever in any case the possessive idea was not quite distinct they inclined to the position after the noun. The examples are countless and only a few need to be given to indicate the nature of the usage. In a very large number of cases the idea of possession yields to the conception of inherence: "þa micelan mihte his godcundnyssse" (Sweet, *Selected Homilies of Aelfric*, p. 48), "the great power of his divinity"; "þa deopnyssa þære lare" (*ibid.*, p. 54), "the depth of the teaching"; "þære nyttenysse his gecorenan Cupberhtes" (*ibid.*, p. 64), "the ignorance of his chosen follower Cuthbert." The idea of possession very often yields to the conception of source: "þurh gife Hælendes Cristes" (*ibid.*, p. 31), "by the grace of our Savior Christ," but also with the possessive idea as in "þurh Godes gife" (*ibid.*, p. 30), "by the grace of God." The idea of source is especially frequent in the subjective genitive: "þurh mynegunge gelimplices lareowes" (*ibid.*, p. 64), "through the admonitions of a suitable teacher"; "þurh gescyldnyssse sopes Drihtnes" (*ibid.*, p. 68), "by the protection of the true God." These two categories, inherence and source, are very much used. Their meanings, "contained *in*" and "coming *from*," are closely related to the meaning of the preposition "of." When the declensions lost their distinctive endings it was very easy to pass from these synthetic genitives denoting inherence and source to the analytic genitive with "of." Attention has already been called to the fact that the analytic possessive genitive that originated in the partitive idea was already at this time in actual use. It was naturally adapted for use also in these two large categories, for the "of" of the new analytic possessive genitive no longer contained the possessive idea pure and simple but ideas closely related to inherence and source.

Personal pronouns in the possessive genitive case have today a position different from that of nouns. In early Middle English, however, they sometimes had the same position as nouns. Whenever the possessive idea became indistinct and the idea of inherence, an integral part, or source became distinct they assumed the analytic form and followed the governing noun. "Wherefore I wole answere in this manere | by the leve *of you*" (Chaucer's "Merchant's Tale," ll. 949-50). The idea here is that of source. In case of a genitive

of a noun we would still employ Chaucer's order and say: "I did it with the permission of my father." We also have the idea of source in Chaucer's "Withouten help or grace of thee." In "whan that I considere your beautee | and ther-with-al the unlykly elde of me" (*ibid.*, ll. 935-6) the idea is that of inherence. We do not possess age. It inheres. In case of nouns we should still say: "The beauty of the granddaughter contrasted strongly with the unsightly age of the grandmother." In Middle English this analytic genitive of a pronoun is found after the noun even in plain prose: "the voicis of hem woxen stronge" (Purvey, Luke 23:23), "The voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed" (King James Version). Again we have the idea of inherence. "Not as the scribes of hem and the Farisees" (Purvey, Matt. 7:29). The Jews did not possess scribes. The scribes were an integral part of their system. This passage from Matthew reads in the Corpus Version: "ne swa hyre boceras and sundorhalgan." Here we have the old idea of possession. The next step would be to put the genitive *after* the noun, and this order we find in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*: "ne suæ uðuta hiora." We do not know whether the order here was the one found in actual speech, for the glossarist in this manuscript usually followed the word-order of the Latin original, as he simply wrote the English equivalent of every word over the Latin word. The change in the word-order of pronouns did not occur as early as the change in case of the nouns. The writer has not found in Old English a single synthetic genitive of a possessive pronoun *after* the governing noun except in the *Lindisfarne Glosses*. These Lindisfarne forms may not represent actual spoken speech, but it is possible that they do, for the language of the North often foreshadowed the later development of the South and Midland. The writer has found in German a few cases of the synthetic genitive of a personal pronoun standing after the noun: "Meine Mutter hatte meine Abwesenheit des Morgens beim Tee durch ein frühzeitiges Ausgehen *meiner* zu beschönigen gesucht" (Goethe, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Erster Teil, Fünftes Buch). If such forms actually existed in English the writer feels that he ought to have found some traces of them. He is inclined to the opinion that the analytic forms which stand after the governing noun as quoted above from Chaucer and Purvey arose from the analogy of the usage with

nouns and thus did not come from older synthetic genitives which had shifted their position to the place after the noun. As far as the writer can see, the Old English usage here continued without change through the transitional period up to the fourteenth century, when the pronouns began to follow the usage of nouns which had been constantly growing more common. The synthetic genitive found in the passage quoted above from Goethe originated in the same way: It followed the common usage in nouns. As the genitive of nouns with this shade of meaning followed the governing noun, the genitive of pronouns sometimes assumed the same position.

The usage of placing an analytic genitive of a personal pronoun after its governing noun has disappeared except in a few colloquial phrases: "for the life of me," as in "I couldn't for the life of *me* recall his name." "That will be the death of *you*." At one point, however, the analytic genitive of personal pronouns cannot be avoided and hence is in general use. In connection with pronouns, as "all," "both," "three," etc., a real personal pronoun must be used, and hence the analytic forms "of you," etc., must be employed, as there are no synthetic genitives of personal pronouns which are clearly felt as such: "*my* book and the books of *you all*" (or, "you both," "you three," etc.). The synthetic genitive of personal pronouns has been confounded with the possessive adjectives "my," "his," etc., which now serve not only as possessive adjectives but also as the possessive genitive of personal pronouns except in connection with the pronouns "all," "both," etc., where a real personal pronoun must be used and not an adjective. Thus in the example just given the possessive adjective "my" is used before "book," but in connection with "all" the analytic genitive "of you" is employed. The German also uses the possessive adjective in the first case, but employs the old synthetic genitive in the second: "mein Buch and Ihrer aller Bücher." About 1200 A.D. the English synthetic genitive was still in use here: "here beire friend" (*Vices and Virtues*, p. 81), "the friend of them both"; "ure alre heaued" (*ibid.*, p. 131), "the head of us all." Aside from this one special case of use with the pronouns "all," "both," "three," etc., it seems that there was once a chance of a fine differentiation between the possessive adjectives and the analytic genitive of the personal pronouns. By the disappearance

of the analytic genitive we have lost a fine and beautiful shade of meaning. Why did it disappear? The writer feels inclined to answer: "Did it really disappear?" Was it ever a fixed part of the language? After the analogy of nouns, a number of attempts were made to extend this expressive usage to pronouns, but alongside the few examples of this new usage were countless examples of the use of the old possessive in the position before the noun. At first thought it seems strange that this stupid, colorless possessive adjective could ever completely triumph over the expressive analytic form that had elsewhere scored so many victories. As we shall see below, insuperable difficulties were in the way of the spread of the analytic form at this point.

Mr. Eugen Einkenkel raises the question whether the use of the analytic genitive of the personal pronouns as described in the two preceding paragraphs is not of French origin. It seems at first probable, for the examples began to appear at the time when French influence was strongest. The more, however, we study the question the less probable it seems. It is a clear fact that the objective genitive of a noun has become firmly fixed in the position after the noun, as in "the capture of the city," etc. It was only a natural result that the objective genitive of pronouns should assume this same position: "It will be the ruination *of you*." The development was a natural one, but it did not become strong. The old position before the noun is still more common: "my defeat," "his overthrow," "his ruin," "to my utter consternation," "it ended in our complete humiliation," "my bodily injuries," "his promotion to a higher grade," "his reduction to a lower grade," etc. The position after the noun is only in free use where it is necessary to prevent ambiguity: "fear of us," "hatred of us," etc. Mr. Einkenkel misunderstands the English development here where he in his *Streifzüge*, p. 85, thinks that the position of the genitive of the pronoun after the governing noun is natural in case of the objective genitive, while it is imitation of the French in case of the possessive genitive. The spirit of English is equally averse to the position of the objective genitive after the noun. Violations of the rule occur more commonly in case of the objective genitive for the simple reason that the position after the noun is sometimes absolutely required to make

the thought clear. Thus we must say: "The sight of her" to keep it distinct from "her sight." That this tendency developed only in case of absolute ambiguity, in spite of the fact that it had become almost a universal rule in case of nouns, indicates very clearly that there must have been some hindering force in case of pronouns.

The writer regards the new sentence accent as the hindering force here. Within the group made up of a noun and its modifiers the element that follows invariably receives in normal speech the sentence stress: "the little *bóy*," "the boy's *fáther*," "the book on the *table*," "the capture of the *city*," etc. Thus the objective genitive invariably receives the sentence stress wherever it follows. This is uniformly the rule in case of nouns. The objective genitive of a personal pronoun does not usually follow the noun because its weak stress would be in conflict with the general rules for sentence accent. Attempts have been made at different times to place the objective genitive of pronouns after the noun where it naturally belongs according to all grammatical rules, but the harsh conflict with the sentence melody has prevented this grammatically and psychologically natural tendency. Likewise in German we occasionally find a synthetic objective genitive of a personal pronoun after the noun: "aus Verachtung Euer" (Schiller); sometimes even in more recent literature: "die unglückliche Nachricht der Arretierung Deiner" (Johann G. Reuter to his son Fritz, November 4, 1833). Where this word-order is unavoidable, as in case of the example from Schiller, prose usage prefers here the analytic form as it is a little heavier and gives the light pronoun a little more weight: "aus Verachtung für Euch." In the example from Reuter the possessive would now be preferred: "die unglückliche Nachricht Deiner Arretierung [or better Verhaftung]." The objective genitive of the personal pronoun itself can often stand after the governing noun if an accented word follows that can bring the construction in harmony with the sentence melody: "Anbeter Deiner *sélbst*" (Wildenbruch, *Die Quitzows*, Act III). Likewise in case of the *possessive* genitive of pronouns there was an especially strong tendency to place the genitive after the noun and use the analytic form for the sake of its vivid meaning of source and inherence. In case of nouns this tendency developed into a fixed rule. In case of pronouns this natural

tendency came into conflict with the sentence accent and did not develop strength except where as above described the lack of inflectional endings made it necessary. That great poets like Chaucer and Goethe followed this tendency also elsewhere simply shows that in the war between the contending forces the forces of meaning had in their struggle with rhythm a decided advantage in the earlier periods. In one common case where it is necessary to place the genitive after the noun because a relative clause follows, modern usage replaces the personal pronoun by a stressed demonstrative, which brings the expression in perfect harmony with the sentence accent: "not the speech of *them which* [now *those who*] are puffed up" (I Cor. 4:19). Other cases of older usage have been left undisturbed because an accented pronoun follows the unaccented personal pronoun which by its weight places the construction in harmony with the sentence accent: "your books and the books of *us ill.*" In the light of these facts it will become perfectly clear that present usage with regard to the position of the possessive genitive is the result of conflicting native forces and has not been at any point affected by foreign influences.

[*To be continued*]

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

GEORGE O. CURME