Leeds Studies in English

Article:

George B. Jack, 'Relative Pronouns in Layamon's Brut', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 19 (1988), 31-66

Permanent URL:
https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123692&silo_library=GEN01

Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse

Relative Pronouns in Laȝamon's *Brut*

George Jack

The use of relative pronouns in Laȝamon's *Brut* has been given detailed discussion within several works of wider scope; but none of these studies, interesting though they are, takes account of more than the first half of the poem.[1] In the choice of relative pronouns, however, as in other features of its language, the Caligula text of the *Brut* is not uniform in usage, and characteristics found in one part need not hold good for the remainder; the present discussion has therefore been based on examination of the whole of the *Brut*. As well as establishing the degree to which usage varies in different parts of the Caligula text, analysis of the whole work reveals a number of points not hitherto apparent. The most notable of these is that the influence exerted by gender on the choice of relative pronouns is greater than has previously been recognized, and the role played by animateness or inanimateness of the antecedent is rather slight. A full analysis also shows that certain other features of usage, which at first sight imply that the choice of relative pronoun was influenced by its syntactic function and by the type of clause in which it occurred, are in fact largely derivative in character; for the most part they are a consequence of the association of pronouns with particular types of antecedent, and have little independent influence on the choice of relative form.

My discussion concerns the system of usage shown by *þe*, *þa*, and *þat*, the relative pronouns chiefly employed in Laȝamon's *Brut*, and by rarer forms of a similar kind, such as *þæ* and *þeo*. I have excluded relative pronouns derived from originally interrogative forms, such as Otho 11531 *wan* and 14856-7 *woche*; instances of this kind are extremely uncommon in the *Brut* and cannot usefully be considered save as part of a broader discussion, taking account of other early Middle English texts. I deal throughout with relative pronouns following an expressed antecedent, leaving aside those instances, rather different in character and very much less common, in which relative pronouns are used independently, e.g. Caligula 5975 *þe* "he who", 3734 *þa* "those who", 4914 *þat* "that which", and 6607 *þat* "he who".[2]

The choice of relative pronouns in the Otho text is for the most part straightforward, lending itself to brief description; but the pattern of usage found inCaligula is more complex and less readily unravelled, and it is with the Caligula text that my discussion is mainly concerned. Usage in the Caligula text is analysed in sections I-V below, and that in Otho in section VI; some concluding remarks are then given in section VII.

I

The exact number of relative pronouns used in the Caligula text of the *Brut* cannot be determined with certainty, for some possible instances are ambiguous in interpretation. I have excluded instances in which *þe*, *þa*, or *þat* follows *while* to form a phrasal conjunction meaning "while, as long as" (e.g. *þe while þe*), though these could be analysed as relative pronouns; this point is further discussed in section III below. I have also excluded instances in which *þat* may be interpreted either as a relative pronoun followed by a resumptive personal pronoun or (more probably) as a conjunction introducing an adverbial consecutive clause, e.g.

> For nauede Belin nan cnihte þat he næs þere god kimppe,
> Ne neauere nenne herd-swein þat he ne fahte alse þein,
> Ne næuer nænne hird-cnaue þat he nas wod on his laȝe. (2823-5)

Other examples of this kind occur at 5440, 6612, 7016, 9954-5, and 12951.[3] There are some instances, following phrases with *swa*, in which *þat* may be either a relative pronoun or a conjunction introducing an adverbial consecutive clause with unexpressed subject (or object), e.g.

> Ne funde he nonne swa kene mon þat hond him durste leggen on (4085)
> Nes þer nauer nan swa hæh þat his quides durste halsien. (6609)

The fact that a relative pronoun may be used in this situation is shown by the occurrence of two instances with *þe* (9454-5, 10429) and one with *þa* (460-1), e.g.

> Nes þer nan swa reh ȝ mon þe him durste ræden. (10429)

But there are also instances with *þat* in which the clause seemingly must be adverbial consecutive, not relative, e.g.

> Næs þe king noht swa wis ne swa ȝære-witele
> Þat imong his duȝeþe his þoht cuðe dernen. (9255-6)

In a number of cases following phrases with *swa*, therefore, *þat* is ambiguous between interpretation as a relative pronoun and as a conjunction (e.g. 379, 650, 8395, 8717, 11896, 11933, 12757); and I have excluded these instances of *þat* from the figures that I give. There are also cases in which *þat* may be interpreted either as a relative or as a demonstrative pronoun; in 4508, 6886, and 12535, for example, I have taken *þat* to be a demonstrative pronoun, but interpretation as a relative would be possible. In cases of this kind I have adopted the interpretation that seems to me more likely in the context, but judgement may differ. For a variety of reasons, therefore, the figures of usage that I give are in some measure uncertain.

In the Caligula text of the *Brut* there are three relative pronouns in frequent use: *þe*, *þa*, and *þat*. There are also occasional instances of other pronouns of a similar kind, though slightly different in form; these are *þæ*, *þea*, *þeo*, *þæt*, and *þet*. *Þæt* and *þet*, found only sixteen times in all (*þæt* 3x, *þet* 13x), are clearly no more than rare variants of *þat*, and will be classified as instances of *þat* in the discussion below. Whether *þæ*, *þea*, and *þeo* are simply variants of *þe* or *þa*, and if so of which of these, is less obvious; these forms will therefore be treated separately, in section V below, after consideration of *þe*, *þa*, and *þat*.

Of the relative pronouns commonly found in the Caligula text *þe* is much the most frequent, occurring more than twice as often as *þat* and well over three times as often as *þa*: of 1739 relative clauses introduced by *þe*, *þa*, or *þat* (including with *þat* the sixteen cases in which the form is *þæt* or *þet*), *þe* is found in 984 instances (57%), *þat* in 471 (27%), and *þa* in 284 (16%). Underlying these general figures of occurrence, however, are considerable variations in the proportions in which the three pronouns are found in particular parts of the text; this is shown by the analysis presented in Table 1, in which four sections of the Caligula text have been distinguished on the basis of the differing frequency with which the three pronouns are found.

Table 1

	þe	*þa*	*þat*
Lines 1-1500	124 (57.5%)	40 (18.5%)	51 (24%)
Lines 1501-6000	380 (74%)	28 (5%)	106 (21%)
Lines 6001-12000	292 (51%)	90 (16%)	192 (33%)
Lines 12001-16095	188 (43%)	126 (29%)	122 (28%)

As Table 1 indicates, *þe* and *þa* show marked fluctuations in their frequency of occurrence in different parts of the text: the proportion of instances with *þe* ranges from 43% (lines 12001-16095) up to 74% (lines 1501-6000), and the proportion with *þa* ranges from 5% (lines 1501-6000) up to 29% (lines 12001-16095). *þat* shows greater stability; though it too varies in frequency in different parts of the text, the range of variation is noticeably less, for at its least common *þat* is found in 21% of instances (lines 1501-6000), and at its most common in 33% (lines 6001-12000). Overall, however, there is a lack of uniformity in the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text; practice evidently varies in different parts of the work, at any rate in the use of *þe* and *þa*.

These shifts in usage are no doubt complex in source, blending some that may derive from Laȝamon himself with others that arose during the transmission of the text, but to establish conclusions more exact than this about the origin of the variations is difficult. The Caligula MS has been analysed as the work of two scribes, the first being responsible for lines 1-1468 and 7435-7553, and the second for the remainder of the poem;[4] but the fluctuations in the use of relative pronouns cannot be attributed simply to this scribal interchange. It is true that a diminution in the use of *þa* sets in around line 1500, and thus in effect where the second scribe took over from the first; but since there are striking variations in the frequency of *þa* within the work of the second scribe, the fluctuating usage of relative pronouns that is found in the Caligula MS cannot arise merely from the contrasting practices of its scribes. Nor is it possible to make any exact correlation between changes in the use of relative pronouns and the changes of orthography within the Caligula MS that were identified by Luhmann in his study of the transmission of the text. Luhmann found that in the initial part of the work of both copyists of the Caligula MS there is

a greater incidence than later of spellings characteristic of a French scribe, and he also observed that in approximately the first 2500 lines of the Caligula text there are orthographic features of an archaic kind that are largely absent from the later part of the poem;[5] but the divisions within the language of Caligula suggested by these orthographic characteristics do not correspond at all closely to divisions apparent from the use of the relative pronouns, and this seems to be true also of the other variations in orthography noted by Luhmann. The fluctuations in the use of relative pronouns that are found in the Caligula text therefore do not have any obvious or direct correlation with other variations in the language of the text that have been studied. It is possible that analysis of other aspects of the grammar of the Caligula text would reveal shifts of usage that might be linked with those apparent in the relative pronouns, but this is a topic that would require separate investigation at length.

There are, however, some further points that may be established concerning the nature and extent of the variations in the use of relative pronouns found in the Caligula text. In particular, it can be shown that the variations are primarily a matter of shifts in the frequency with which the different pronouns are employed, rather than in the circumstances in which each pronoun is characteristically chosen; for the most part there is a consistent pattern of selection for each pronoun, within a changing frequency of use. Evidence for this is given in Table 2, in which antecedents are classified according as they are animate or inanimate, singular or plural, and in which figures of usage are given first cumulatively for the whole text, and then separately for the four sections already distinguished in Table 1.[6] Omitted from Table 2 are two groups of instances in which classification of antecedents as animate or inanimate seems beside the point. One group comprises relative pronouns following the antecedents *al* "everyone, everything" and *hit* "it", for in this situation *þat* is almost invariably employed, whether the antecedent is animate or inanimate in reference. The other group comprises instances in which the relative pronoun has an adverbial function, meaning "on which, in which, at which", e.g.

Seoððen com þe ilke dæi þat þe king dæd læi (4504)

3if aueremare cumeð þæ dæi þat ich king beon mæi. (6529)

In such cases *þat* is the pronoun usually employed, and it is evidently the function of the relative pronoun, and not the character of the antecedent, that is the significant factor; instances of this kind, like those following *al* and *hit*, have therefore been excluded from Table 2.

Table 2

Antecedent	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Whole text:			
Animate singular	512 (73%)	68 (10%)	118 (17%)
Animate plural	211 (54%)	128 (33%)	52 (13%)
Inanimate singular	181 (58%)	35 (11%)	98 (31%)
Inanimate plural	74 (47%)	53 (34%)	30 (19%)
Lines 1-1500:			
Animate singular	59 (73%)	9 (11%)	13 (16%)
Animate plural	26 (59%)	13 (30%)	5 (11%)
Inanimate singular	27 (55%)	8 (16%)	14 (29%)
Inanimate plural	12 (50%)	10 (42%)	2 (8%)
Lines 1501-6000:			
Animate singular	183 (86%)	11 (5%)	20 (9%)
Animate plural	90 (79.5%)	11 (10%)	12 (10.5%)
Inanimate singular	71 (75%)	0	24 (25%)
Inanimate plural	33 (72%)	6 (13%)	7 (15%)
Lines 6001-12000:			
Animate singular	160 (66%)	22 (9%)	60 (25%)
Animate plural	59 (49.5%)	40 (33.5%)	20 (17%)
Inanimate singular	55 (53%)	15 (14%)	34 (33%)
Inanimate plural	17 (40.5%)	13 (31%)	12 (28.5%)
Lines 12001-16095:			
Animate singular	110 (68%)	26 (16%)	25 (16%)
Animate plural	36 (31%)	64 (56%)	15 (13%)
Inanimate singular	28 (42.5%)	12 (18%)	26 (39.5%)
Inanimate plural	12 (27%)	24 (53%)	9 (20%)

The conclusions implied by the material of Table 2 are in some measure provisional, and will require modification in the light of further analysis to be given in section II below; but it is at any rate clear that the proportions in which the three pronouns occur vary according to the character of the antecedent. Table 2 shows that *þe* is found with greater frequency following animate singular antecedents than with those of other kinds, that *þa* occurs more often following plural antecedents, animate and inanimate alike, than following those that are singular, and that *þat* occurs most frequently when the antecedent is inanimate singular. More exactly, in the text as a whole *þe* is used in 73% of relative clauses following animate singular antecedents, whereas following antecedents of other kinds the proportion of instances with *þe* does not rise above 58%; *þa* occurs in 33% and 34% of instances following plural antecedents, but in only 10% or 11% of instances following singular antecedents; and *þat* is found in 31% of instances following inanimate singular antecedents, but in no more than 19% of instances following antecedents of other types.[7] The figures for the text as a whole in Table 2 give no clear evidence of points of usage other than those just described; for although in the plural *þe* is found more often following animate than inanimate antecedents, and *þat* more often following inanimate than animate antecedents, the differences are in each case small and appear to be without statistical significance.[8]

The points of usage evident from the figures for the whole text that are given in Table 2 are largely borne out in the separate figures for the four parts of the text distinguished in the table. Despite the changing frequency of the pronouns within the text there is a broadly consistent pattern of usage to be observed throughout, for in each section of the text analysed individually *þe* is found most often following animate singular antecedents, *þa* following plural antecedents, and *þat* following inanimate singular antecedents. It is true that the pattern emerges less strongly in some parts of the text than in others. In lines 1501-6000, as elsewhere, *þe* is found most often following animate singular antecedents; but the difference in proportions is markedly less than in other parts of the text, for in lines 1501-6000 *þe* is considerably more common than elsewhere following antecedents of other kinds, reducing the margin of frequency between these instances and those following animate singular antecedents. In a similar way in lines 6001-12000 *þat* retains its general characteristic of occurring most often following inanimate singular antecedents; but the difference in proportions is here slight, because *þat* shows an increased frequency of use following antecedents of other kinds. With these qualifications, however, there is a broadly consistent pattern of usage to be observed throughout the text, despite the varying frequency of the pronouns in different parts;

what changes within the text is chiefly the overall frequency with which each pronoun is employed, rather than the circumstances in which each pronoun is most commonly used. The same point seems to be true also of other factors influencing the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text; and it follows from this that in considering the role of these factors it is sufficient to compile evidence for the text as a whole, without continuing to distinguish the different parts of the text recognized in Tables 1 and 2. Determining the nature and extent of the variations in usage found in the Caligula text thus has the consequence that in further discussion the text may be treated as a single whole.

It is noticeable that the variations in frequency of the relative pronouns that are found in the Caligula text primarily involve *þe* and *þa*, and are less evident in the case of *þat*. Whatever the exact balance of the authorial and the scribal in the genesis of these variations, it seems that the distinction in usage between *þe* and *þa* was less firmly based than that between *þe* or *þa* and *þat*. This is not surprising, since *þa* was a recessive form in early Middle English; and it implies that the three-term system of *þe*, *þa*, and *þat* that is present in the Caligula text was in some measure unstable, and moving towards a two-term system of *þe* and *þat*, such as is found in some other early Middle English texts (the Final Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, for example). The variation that is found in the Caligula text is a sign of instability in the place of *þa* within the system of usage.[9]

II

As well as indicating that *þa* was used more often with plural than with singular antecedents, the material of Table 2 apparently shows an association of *þe* with animate singular antecedents and of *þat* with inanimate singular antecedents; but what is in fact involved in the cases of *þe* and *þat* is only imperfectly revealed by Table 2, and a truer picture emerges when the role of gender in the choice of relative pronouns is considered. In discussing the role of gender (as in the compilation of Table 2) I shall omit instances in which the antecedent is *al* "everyone, everything" or *hit* "it", and instances in which the relative pronoun is used with an adverbial function, meaning "on which, in which, at which"; for in these cases, which I shall consider in more detail later, it seems clear that the gender of the antecedent had no part in the choice of relative pronoun.

In the singular, though not in the plural, both natural and grammatical gender have some influence on the choice of relative pronouns. Following animate singular

antecedents the influence of natural gender is apparent in the use of *þa*, of grammatical gender in the use of *þat*, and of an admixture of natural and grammatical gender in the use of *þe*. Evidence for this is given in Table 3, in which animate singular antecedents are divided into three groups according to gender: feminine (natural gender), neuter (grammatical gender), and others.[10]

Table 3

Antecedent (animate sing.)	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Feminine (natural gender)	30 (60%)	15 (30%)	5 (10%)
Neuter (grammatical gender)	28 (44%)	9 (14%)	27 (42%)
Others	455 (77%)	45 (8%)	88 (15%)

As the material of Table 3 indicates, animate singular antecedents are followed more often by *þa* when they are feminine in natural gender (e.g. *dohter, moder, quene*), and more often by *þat* when they are of neuter grammatical gender (e.g. *child, cun, folc*). The number of instances involved is not great, and the influence of gender is not particularly strong; despite the increased frequency of *þa* and *þat* in these two situations, *þe* remains the most common of the pronouns following animate singular antecedents that are feminine in natural gender, and following those that are of neuter grammatical gender *þe* is found no less often than *þat*. Yet it is clear that the frequency of *þa* and *þat* is greater when the antecedents are, respectively, feminine in natural gender and neuter in grammatical gender, and the difference in frequency is statistically significant.[11] A curious fact to emerge from Table 3 is that *þa* is also more common following animate singular antecedents when these are of neuter grammatical gender, though the increase in frequency is markedly less than when the antecedent is feminine in natural gender: following feminine antecedents *þa* is found in 30% of instances, following neuter antecedents in 14% of instances, and following other animate singular antecedents in 8% of instances. The explanation of this somewhat higher frequency of *þa* following neuter antecedents can hardly lie in gender, for there is no reason to suppose *þa* to have any link with the neuter, and it is the sense of the antecedents involved that is probably the relevant factor. Of the nine instances in which animate singular

antecedents of neuter gender are followed by *þa*, eight involve (alone or as part of a compound) the collective nouns *cun* "race, family" or *folc* "people" (e.g. 251, 7875, 11396, 14413, 14644), which are grammatically singular but plural in reference; and in the remaining instance the antecedent is the feminine noun *wif* (41-2). Since *þa* is used more frequently with plural than with singular antecedents, and more frequently with feminine than with other animate singular antecedents, in all likelihood it is the plural sense of *cun* and *folc*, and the feminine sense of *wif*, that has led to the more frequent use of *þa* with antecedents of neuter gender than with the majority of animate singular antecedents.[12]

Though it is not immediately apparent, the material of Table 3 also provides evidence of an association of *þe* with the masculine gender; and this in turn makes it possible to establish more exactly the source of the high frequency, already shown in Table 2, with which *þe* is found following animate singular antecedents. As Table 3 indicates, *þe* occurs less often following animate singular antecedents that are feminine in natural gender or neuter in grammatical gender than following other animate singular antecedents. These other animate singular antecedents are predominantly masculine in natural or grammatical gender. Most numerous among them are nouns that are invariably masculine in reference, e.g. *broðer*, *king*, *sune*, and such proper names as *Arður*, *Brutus*, and *Hengest*; less numerous, though still fairly frequent, is the noun *mon*, which in reference may be masculine, meaning "male person", or indefinite, meaning simply "person", but which is always treated grammatically as masculine; and there are a few instances of forms such as *þe oðer* "the other" and *whaðer/wheðer* "which (of two)", which in principle may be masculine, feminine, or indefinite in reference, but which in practice in the *Brut* are generally masculine (e.g. 2761, 3422, 11810). Almost all the antecedents classed as "others" in Table 3 are thus in fact masculine, in reference or grammatical usage, and it is following these antecedents only that *þe* occurs with special frequency. Following animate singular antecedents that are feminine in natural gender or neuter in grammatical gender, *þe* is found less often; indeed *þe* is less common following these two types of animate singular antecedent, taken as a class, than it is following inanimate singular antecedents (following animate singular antecedents of feminine or neuter gender, *þe* is found in 51% of instances; following inanimate singular antecedents it is found in 58% of instances). It is therefore only after masculine singular antecedents, and not animate singular antecedents in general, that *þe* occurs with particular frequency. The apparent association of *þe* with animate singular antecedents that was shown in Table 2 has its source in the fact that most of the animate singular antecedents in the *Brut* are

masculine; what underlies the distribution shown in Table 2 is an association of *þe* with masculine singular antecedents, not with animate singular antecedents as a whole.

The influence of gender on the choice of relative pronouns is apparent also following inanimate singular antecedents, for which evidence is set out in Table 4.

Table 4

Antecedent (inan. sing. nouns)	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Masculine (grammatical gender)	77 (72%)	12 (11%)	18 (17%)
Feminine (grammatical gender)	34 (56%)	16 (26%)	11 (18%)
Neuter (grammatical gender)	53 (47%)	7 (6%)	52 (47%)

Table 4 gives an analysis of usage when the antecedent is an inanimate singular noun (antecedents other than nouns have been excluded, since classification by grammatical gender is usually irrelevant to them); this shows that *þe* occurs most often when the antecedent noun is masculine in grammatical gender (e.g. *horn*, *nome*, *wæi*), *þa* when it is feminine (e.g. *blisse*, *boc*, *luue*), and *þat* when it is neuter (e.g. *gomen*, *lond*, *water*).[13] Clearly there is far from being an exclusive association of any pronoun with one particular gender: *þe* remains the commonest of the pronouns following feminine nouns, and is as common as *þat* following neuter nouns; and *þa*, though found most frequently when the antecedent is a feminine noun, nevertheless occurs in only a quarter of such instances. Despite these qualifications, however, grammatical gender undoubtedly has an influence on the choice of relative pronouns following inanimate singular antecedents; there is a discernible association of *þe*, *þa*, and *þat* with nouns of masculine, feminine, and neuter genders respectively.[14]

Establishing the connection of *þat* with antecedents of neuter grammatical gender allows a more exact assessment of the extent to which its use is linked also with inanimateness of the antecedent. Neuter nouns predominantly denote inanimate objects; therefore a pronoun that has an association with antecedents of neuter gender will as a consequence be found frequently following inanimate antecedents. Because of this it is in principle possible for the apparent link of *þat* with inanimate

singular antecedents that was shown in Table 2 to be simply a consequence of the association of *þat* with antecedents of neuter gender. In fact this is not so, however, for the influence of grammatical gender is insufficient to account for the frequency with which *þat* is found following inanimate singular antecedents. This becomes evident if we eliminate from consideration nouns of neuter gender, and analyse the pattern of usage following the remaining singular antecedents (excluding, as before, the antecedents *al* and *hit*, and cases in which the relative pronoun has an adverbial function). The results of this are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Antecedent (sing. non-neuter)	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Animate	484 (76%)	59 (9%)	91 (14%)
Inanimate	128 (63%)	28 (14%)	46 (23%)

Even when antecedents of neuter gender are excluded, as Table 5 shows, *þat* still occurs more frequently with inanimate than with animate antecedents: following animate antecedents *þat* is found in 14% of instances, whereas following inanimate antecedents it is found in 23% (and the greater frequency of *þat* following inanimate antecedents is statistically significant).[15] Evidently, then, *þat* does have an association with inanimate singular antecedents, as well as with those of neuter grammatical gender. But it is also apparent that the strength of this association is exaggerated by an analysis of the kind presented in Table 2, and that the frequency with which *þat* was shown in Table 2 as occurring with inanimate singular antecedents was the product of two distinct (though convergent) factors: while deriving in part from a tendency to use *þat* more commonly when the antecedent is inanimate, it also arose in some measure from the association of *þat* with neuter antecedents.

The association of *þat* with neuter antecedents that was shown in Tables 3 and 4, however, is itself the product of a combination of factors, for it derives in some degree from a tendency to use the relative pronoun *þat* more often when the determiner *þat* is present in the antecedent, as in:

Him þat lond to dale com þat Cambrie wes ihaten (1059)

To gladien þat burhfolc þat ofte weoren bisie. (8458)

In the language of the Caligula text the determiner *þat* is still very largely a neuter form, and antecedents with the determiner *þat* are normally neuter nouns (e.g. 5038 *þat gode þing*, 10670 *þat sweord*, 11400 *þat cun*).[16] Because of their neuter gender, we should expect antecedents with the determiner *þat* to be followed more commonly by the relative *þat*; but the frequency with which *þat* is found following antecedents of this kind cannot be explained by the influence of gender alone, as the figures in Table 6 indicate.

Table 6

Antecedent (neuter sing. nouns)	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
With determiner *þat*	21 (35%)	2 (3%)	38 (62%)
Others	60 (52%)	14 (12%)	41 (36%)

Table 6 provides an analysis of usage when the antecedent is a singular noun (animate or inanimate) of neuter grammatical gender; this shows that the relative *þat* is markedly more common following neuter antecedents with the determiner *þat* than following other neuter singular antecedents (the relative *þat* is found in 62% of instances with the determiner *þat*, and in 36% of the remaining instances). The association of the relative *þat* with neuter antecedents that was shown in Tables 3 and 4 is therefore not due wholly to the influence of gender; it is a product of the influence of neuter gender combined with that of the determiner *þat*. These factors reinforce one another and converge in their outcome, however, since the determiner *þat* is with few exceptions a neuter form in the Caligula text.

This tendency to match the form of the relative pronoun with that of a determiner present in the antecedent is shown also by *þa*, for in the plural the relative *þa* is more commonly used when the antecedent contains the determiner *þa*, as in:

Heo nomen þa seeldes þan leien in þan feldes (2101)

Þa sumnede he þa richen þa wel cuðen ræden. (7695)

Table 7 provides an analysis of usage following plural antecedents, distinguishing from the rest those cases in which the antecedent contains the determiner *þa*.

Table 7

Antecedent (plural)	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
With determiner *þa*	72 (51%)	57 (40%)	12 (9%)
Others	213 (52%)	124 (31%)	70 (17%)

This shows that in the plural *þa* is used as a relative pronoun more often, and *þat* less often, when the determiner *þa* is present in the antecedent. What is involved is clearly no more than a minor point of usage, but the changes in the frequency of *þa* and *þat* that are associated with the presence of *þa* in the antecedent, though small, are statistically significant.[17] In the singular there are many fewer antecedents with the determiner *þa*, and it cannot be established that the presence of *þa* had any influence on the choice of singular relative pronouns; nor is there evidence that the use of *þe* as a relative pronoun, singular or plural, was more common following antecedents with the determiner *þe*. The tendency to match the form of the relative pronoun with that of a determiner present in the antecedent was therefore of limited extent, though evidently a factor in the use of both *þa* and *þat*.[18]

In discussing features of the antecedent that may influence the choice of relative pronoun I have so far left aside as special cases the antecedents *al* and *hit*, which are distinctive by virtue of having an almost exclusive association with the relative *þat*.[19] *Hit*, used as the antecedent of a relative clause on thirty-eight occasions in the Caligula text, is followed only by *þat* (e.g. 1537, 2706, 2708, 6742, 7973, 9926, 12443). Although *hit* most often simply means "it", it can on occasion be used with a generalizing personal sense, meaning "they, those", e.g.

Þa com hit al togadere þat hæhst wes on londe,
Eorles & beornes & boc-ilarede men (9893-4)

Þa wes hit al stille þat wuneden inne halle. (12423)

In these two examples *hit* occurs in collocation with *al*, and this is so in eighteen of the thirty-eight instances in which *hit* is used as an antecedent (e.g. 1940, 4537, 8099, 9520). The presence of *al* may have been a further influence promoting the use of *þat* in these cases; in general, however, the presence of attributive *al* within an antecedent is not associated with a more frequent use of *þat* (evidence for this will be given below, p.46).

When the antecedent is *al* (singular) "everyone, everything" the relative pronoun almost always used in the Caligula text is *þat*, in animate and inanimate cases alike. As an animate antecedent (meaning "everyone") *al* is followed by *þat* in thirty-five instances (e.g. 777, 4625, 9217, 9409, 10794, 14517), and as an inanimate antecedent (meaning "everything") in seventy-six instances (e.g. 1420, 2209, 4477, 5019, 6707, 8411). *Al* is followed by *þe* only twice, one instance being animate (2401) and the other inanimate (2813):

& al leouede þeone king þe quic wes an londe (2401)

& al ham iwurden þe Belin heom toȝernde. (2813)

It is noticeable that the two instances in which *al* is followed by *þe* share the characteristic that the antecedent is separated from the relative pronoun by intervening material, and possibly this separation between antecedent and relative pronoun weakened the connection between the two, facilitating the use of *þe* in place of the normal *þat*; but in circumstances of this kind, in which the relative pronoun is separated from the antecedent *al*, the form usually chosen is still *þat* (e.g. 5255, 6728, 7125, 10437, 10794). *Þa* is not found following singular *al*; though 14230 *þa* has as its antecedent *alle*, understood as singular in 14229, *alle* evidently shifts to a plural interpretation as antecedent of 14230 *þa*:

Arður sende sonde ȝeond al his kinelonde,
And to cumen alle hehte þat quic wes on londe,
Þa to uihte oht weoren, wepnen to beren. (14228-30)

Of the 113 instances in which singular *al* is used as the antecedent of a relative

clause, therefore, all but two are followed by *þat*.

The strong association between singular *al* and the relative *þat* does not extend to the plural *alle*, which is followed by *þe* or *þa* more often than by *þat*. *Alle* "all (people)" occurs as the antecedent of a relative clause in twenty-seven instances, of which seven are followed by *þe* (e.g. 2064, 5138, 7202), thirteen by *þa* (e.g 3198, 8851, 12650), and seven by *þat* (e.g. 754, 5139, 10906). This is a somewhat higher frequency of *þat* than is found following animate plural antecedents in general, for *þat* occurs in 13% of all instances involving animate plural antecedents (see Table 2 above), and in 26% of instances following *alle*; but clearly the special link between singular *al* and the relative *þat* does not extend to the plural *alle*.

The presence of attributive *al*(*le*) within an antecedent does not appear to lead to a more frequent use of *þat*. Singular antecedents with attributive *al* (excluding instances of *al hit*, *hit al*) are followed by *þat* in 22% of instances (ten cases out of forty-five, e.g. 3494, 4119, 8928); and plural antecedents with attributive *alle* are followed by *þat* in 13% of instances (fifteen cases out of 112, e.g. 2692, 8545, 14109). These are virtually the same as the proportions in which *þat* is found following antecedents without *al*(*le*), where *þat* occurs in 21% of instances in the singular and 15% in the plural. It is true that animate singular antecedents with *al* are followed by *þat* more often than animate singular antecedents of other kinds: following animate singular antecedents in general *þat* is found in 17% of instances (see Table 2 above), whereas following those with attributive *al* it is found in six instances out of a total of twenty, a proportion of 30%. The reason for this, however, is likely to lie in the headwords of the antecedents involved, rather than in the presence of attributive *al*. Of the twenty animate singular antecedents with attributive *al*, more than half have as headwords the nouns *folc* or *cun* (or its compound *moncun*), which are of neuter gender and therefore favour the use of *þat*; and in fact *folc* and *moncun* provide the headwords of the six animate singular antecedents with attributive *al* that are followed by *þat* (845, 3494, 7305, 7335, 8928, 12050). In all probability, therefore, the use of *þat* following animate singular antecedents with *al* arises from the nature of the headwords involved, not from the presence of attributive *al*.

It is suggested by Bourcier that certain pronominal antecedents other than *al* and *hit* were probably followed regularly by one relative pronoun; in particular, he thinks that the antecedents *he*, *ȝe*, and *an* may have been followed only by *þe*, and he remarks that in the part of the text examined by him *nan* is followed only by *þat*.[20] But the evidence does not support these conclusions. *Þe* is not the only

relative pronoun used with *he*, for although *he* (or its oblique forms *hine*, *him*) is followed by *þe* in twenty-two instances (e.g. 1802, 1929, 3823, 8952, 12945), it is also followed by *þa* on three occasions (339, 9423, 10559) and once by *þat* (13932). Usage following *he* therefore appears to be similar to that following other masculine singular antecedents, in that *þe* is the relative pronoun predominantly but not exclusively employed. Evidence of usage following *ȝe* and *an* is very sparse. The nominative *ȝe* is found once as the antecedent of a relative clause, and is followed by *þa* (15782); its oblique form *eow*, also used once as an antecedent, is followed by *þe* (497). The antecedent *an* occurs once, and is followed by *þe* (3511); there are also instances of the antecedents *þes anes* (904), *þa an* (12213), and *þe an* (14706), followed respectively by *þa*, *þe*, and *þat*. The evidence concerning *ȝe* and *an* is, then, very slight, and partly in conflict with the assumption that these antecedents were regularly followed by *þe*. Following *nan*, *þat* is used in three instances to introduce clauses that are certainly relative (4511, 6370, 6769), and in two instances to introduce clauses that may be relative or adverbial consecutive (802, 6609; 496 *þat*, regarded as a relative pronoun by Bourcier, is better analysed as a conjunction introducing an adverbial consecutive clause); but *nan* is also followed once by *þa* (460-1). *Þat* was evidently not the only relative pronoun used after *nan*, though it may have been the one commonly chosen; but the evidence is insufficient to establish this.

III

Syntactic function, though considerably less important than the nature of the antecedent, has some influence on the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text of the *Brut*. The case in which this influence is most strongly apparent, though the number of instances is small, is that of relative pronouns used adverbially, with the sense "on which, in which, at which", e.g.

> Þa com þe ilke dæi þat þe king dæd læi (5026)
>
> Hit com to þan time þat þe king gon forð liðe (7121)
>
> Nu is icumen þe ilke dæi þe Drihten us helpen mai. (9744)

Determining the number of instances in which relative pronouns are used adverbially involves some difficulties of analysis. Whether *þa* was used as an

adverbial relative is uncertain, for in the two possible instances that occur the form is ambiguous in interpretation, and may be the conjunction *þa* "when":

> Þa feouwer wiken weoren aʒonged þa Arður wes þær atstonden,
> Þæ wes inne burʒe vnimete sorʒe (11756-7)

> Nu tomarʒen bið þe dæi þa þu scalt do þe i þene wæi. (14728)

Because of their ambiguity I have not included these instances in the figures of usage for the relative *þa*. I have also excluded from the figures for relative pronouns those cases in which a phrase containing *while* functions as a conjunction, e.g.

> & þus he lædde his lif þe while þe hit ilæste (3497)

> Þa while þa heo of griðe speken Saxes i scipe leopen. (7372)

In principle instances such as these could be regarded as showing relative clauses following the antecedent *while*; and I have adopted an analysis of this kind in the case of 15304 *alle þa while þe*, where the antecedent has been expanded by the inclusion of *alle*:

> Þat alle þa while þe Pelluz weore alife
> No mihte Cadwaðlan comen to þissen londe. (15304-5)

But it seems preferable to analyse unexpanded locutions such as *þe while þe* and *þa while þa* as phrasal conjunctions. At any rate such phrases have the function of a conjunction, and in form they show differences from instances in which an antecedent is followed by a relative pronoun used adverbially. The most common form of the phrasal conjunction in the Caligula text is *þe/þa while þe* (e.g. 1121, 1629, 2357, 3131, 4439, 4730, 5031, 6450, 9407, 11852, 13802), and *þa while þa* is also found on a number of occasions (e.g. 2274, 7052, 7372, 7421, 12059, 13152); but *þe/þa while þat* is comparatively rare (4496, 5641, 6416, 13804), though in cases other than this the relative pronoun preferred in adverbial use is *þat*. Moreover, the phrasal conjunction commonly has the form *þe while* or *þa while*, with no further element (e.g. 1221, 3261, 4133, 5574, 7624, 8471, 9117, 13906, 15907), whereas omission of a relative pronoun is exceptional. Considerations of function and form, then, support the analysis of *þe while þe* and its variants as

instances of a phrasal conjunction.[21]

If we exclude phrases such as *þe while þe*, and ambiguous cases with *þa*, the number of instances of relative pronouns used adverbially is small; but the evidence, though limited, suggests that the form mainly used in an adverbial function was *þat*. Of the twenty-eight adverbial instances that I have noted, *þat* is found in twenty-four (e.g. 1397, 1858, 1937, 3461, 6735, 7576); the remaining instances show *þe* (2073, 9744, 13557, 15304). Though the instances are few in number, in this situation syntactic function appears to have a marked influence on the choice of relative pronoun.

Assessing the role of syntactic function in the choice of relative pronouns is a more complex matter when the pronoun is used as subject or object, or is dependent on a preposition. Certainly both *þe* and *þat* vary in frequency in these different syntactic functions, as the figures in Table 8 demonstrate:

Table 8

Function	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Subject	831 (64%)	213 (16%)	256 (20%)
Object	129 (37%)	64 (18%)	156 (45%)
Dependent on preposition	20 (32%)	7 (11%)	35 (57%)

þe is more common when the pronoun is the subject of its clause, and *þat* more common when it is the object or dependent on a preposition. But this is not in itself sufficient to establish that syntactic function influenced the choice of relative pronoun, for the extent to which a pronoun is used in one function rather another is in some measure dependent upon the types of antecedent which it follows. The most striking illustration of this is provided by the antecedents *al* and *hit*, which are followed by relative pronouns with the function of subject far less often than are other antecedents. This is shown by the figures in Table 9, giving the functions of relative pronouns following *al*, *hit*, and other antecedents.

Table 9

Antecedent	Subject	Object	Dependent on prep.
Al	28 (25%)	68 (60%)	17 (15%)
Hit	8 (21%)	26 (68%)	4 (11%)
Others	1264 (81%)	255 (16%)	41 (3%)

As Table 9 makes clear, there is a very marked functional contrast between relative pronouns following *al* and *hit*, of which only a quarter are used as subject, and those following other antecedents, of which four-fifths have the function of subject. Since *al* and *hit* also have the characteristic (as we have already seen) of being followed almost always by *þat*, the outcome is that relative clauses with these antecedents provide a sizeable group of instances in which *þat* is used predominantly as object or in dependence upon a preposition; and this arises, not because *þat* has in itself any special propensity for use in these functions, but rather because it is the pronoun normally employed with *al* and *hit*, which in turn are predominantly followed by relative pronouns used as object or in dependence on a preposition. If the role of syntactic function in the choice of relative pronouns is to be accurately assessed, allowance must be made for the distinctive characteristics of the antecedents *al* and *hit*.

Al and *hit* are in some degree special cases, both in the infrequency with which they are followed by relative pronouns used as subject and in their almost exclusive link with the pronoun *þat*; but they are not the only cases in which there is a connection between the nature of the antecedent and the function of the relative pronoun. Table 10 provides an analysis of the functions of relative pronouns following antecedents other than *al* and *hit*.

Table 10

Antecedent	Subject	Object	Dependent on prep.
Animate	987 (91%)	79 (7%)	23 (2%)
Inanimate	277 (59%)	176 (37%)	18 (4%)

In these instances, as the figures in Table 10 show, the proportion of relative pronouns used as subject is considerably higher when the antecedent is animate than when it is inanimate: following animate antecedents nine-tenths of relative pronouns are used as subject, but following inanimate antecedents the proportion falls to six-tenths. This is a point of some importance in assessing the evidence for a link between syntactic function and the choice of relative pronoun, for it demonstrates that we cannot rely simply on overall statistics of the use of pronouns in one function rather than another, even after allowance has been made for the special cases of the antecedents *al* and *hit*. Differences of usage apparent in overall statistics may arise merely from the fact that the pronouns involved vary in the extent to which they are found following animate and inanimate antecedents, and as a consequence vary also in the extent to which they are employed in particular syntactic functions. To make an accurate assessment of the influence of syntactic function on the choice of relative pronouns it is necessary to compile separate statistics for use following animate and inanimate antecedents, after first discounting instances following *al* and *hit*.

The results of an analysis of this kind are presented in Table 11, from which it emerges that the influence of syntactic function on the choice of relative pronouns was rather slight.

Table 11

Function	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Animate antecedent:			
Subject	678 (69%)	161 (16%)	148 (15%)
Object	35 (44%)	29 (37%)	15 (19%)
Dependent on prep.	10 (44%)	6 (26%)	7 (30%)
Inanimate antecedent:			
Subject	152 (55%)	52 (19%)	73 (26%)
Object	93 (53%)	35 (20%)	48 (27%)
Dependent on prep.	10 (55.5%)	1 (5.5%)	7 (39%)

Following animate antecedents, *þe* is more common as subject than as object, and *þa* more common as object than as subject; but this is not so following inanimate antecedents, where both *þe* and *þa* occur in almost uniform proportions as subject and as object. *Þat* shows no particular association with use as subject or as object, for it occurs in very similar proportions in the two functions, following both animate and inanimate antecedents. *Þat* is found in a somewhat higher proportion of instances when dependent on a preposition than when used as subject or as object; but this may not be significant, since the difference in proportions is not very great and the number of instances involved is small, so that the evidence is imperfect. The picture of usage that emerges from Table 11 is noticeably different from that given by Table 8, in which the analysis of syntactic function was made without regard to the types of antecedent involved; in particular, Table 8 attributed to *þat* an association with the function of object that is not borne out by Table 11, and showed patterns of usage for *þe* and *þa* that are only partly borne out by Table 11. These differences indicate that the picture of usage given by Table 8 was in part a product of the types of antecedent with which the different pronouns are found, and not a reflection of the influence of syntactic function on the choice of relative pronoun.[22]

IV

There is evidence, set out in Table 12, which at first sight suggests that the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text of the *Brut* was influenced by the restrictive or non-restrictive character of the relative clause.

Table 12

Type of clause	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Restrictive	523 (49.5%)	174 (16.5%)	358 (34%)
Non-restrictive	365 (70%)	68 (13%)	89 (17%)
Ambiguous	96	42	24

Though a number of clauses are ambiguous in interpretation, the analysis presented in Table 12 shows that the proportion of instances with *þe* is higher in non-restrictive than in restrictive clauses, and that the proportion with *þat* is higher in restrictive clauses than in non-restrictive (the proportion of instances with *þa*, however, varies little in the two types of clause). Apparently, then, Table 12 shows that there was a tendency to use *þe* more often in clauses that were non-restrictive in character, and to use *þat* more often in those that were restrictive. But in giving this impression Table 12 is misleading, for it is the connection of *þe* and *þat* with certain types of antecedent that is the source of their apparent association with non-restrictive and restrictive clauses respectively; and if this is recognized, it can be shown that neither *þe* nor *þat* has any particular link with use in restrictive or non-restrictive clauses.

The antecedents that give rise to an apparent association of *þe* and *þat* with non-restrictive and restrictive clauses respectively are *al*, *hit*, and singular proper names. The antecedents *al* and *hit*, with which *þat* is the relative pronoun almost always used, also have the characteristic of being followed normally by a restrictive rather than a non-restrictive relative clause. The reason for this lies in the fact that restrictive clauses serve to define their antecedents, whereas non-restrictive clauses do not. Characteristically, therefore, restrictive relative clauses have as their antecedents elements that are not specific in reference, to which a defining clause may appropriately be added; and non-restrictive clauses have as their antecedents elements that are already specific in reference, for which further definition is unnecessary. *Al* and *hit* are indefinite in reference; if they are used as antecedents, therefore, the relative clauses that follow them will normally be restrictive in character, e.g.

& þe king heom ȝette al þat heo ȝeorenden	(5019)
Heo nomen orf, heo nomen corn, & al þat heo quic funden	(7642)
Þa hit alles up brac hit wes vuel þat he spac	(1537)
Þa wes hit iwurðen þat Merlin seide whilen.	(14288)

Since it is also usual for *al* and *hit* to be followed by the relative pronoun *þat*, the result is that relative clauses with these antecedents provide a group of restrictive clauses in which the relative pronoun employed is almost always *þat*. But clearly this is not evidence that in restrictive clauses *þat* was the preferred relative pronoun; what it reflects is rather the combined outcome of the association of *þat* with the

antecedents *al* and *hit* and of the fact that relative clauses following *al* and *hit* are normally restrictive in character. For a true assessment of the extent to which the choice of *þat* may have been influenced by the restrictive or non-restrictive character of the clause it is necessary to discount instances following the antecedents *al* and *hit.*

Singular proper names are another type of antecedent which must be discounted in assessing the influence which the character of the relative clause may have had on the choice of pronoun. Proper names are inherently specific in reference, since they denote particular individuals; defining the reference of a proper name by the addition of a restrictive relative clause is therefore usually inappropriate, and relative clauses with a proper name as antecedent are generally non-restrictive in character, e.g.

> Derneliche þu scalt don þeos ilka deda,
> Þat hit nute Belin, þe is þin aȝene broðer (2192-3)
>
> Octauus þat iherde, þe king wes an ærde (5621)
>
> Þa answarede Vortigerne, þe wes swike ful deorne. (6805)

In Laȝamon's *Brut* many antecedents are proper names, and because of the martial and dynastic concerns of the poem these names are predominantly masculine. We have already seen that following masculine singular antecedents in the Caligula text *þe* is the relative pronoun used in approximately four instances out of every five. Antecedents that are masculine singular proper names are therefore followed by relative clauses that are normally non-restrictive (since the antecedent is a proper name) and that are predominantly introduced by *þe* (since the antecedent is masculine singular). The outcome of these factors is that relative clauses with a proper name as antecedent provide a group of non-restrictive clauses in which *þe* is the pronoun chiefly employed; but this is not evidence that *þe* was preferred in non-restrictive clauses, for it is the combined effect of the association of *þe* with masculine singular antecedents, of the regular use of non-restrictive clauses following antecedents that are proper names, and of the fact that proper names in Laȝamon's *Brut* are for the most part masculine. Relative clauses whose antecedent is a singular proper name, like those with the antecedents *al* and *hit*, must therefore be discounted in assessing the extent to which the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text may have been influenced by the restrictive or non-restrictive character of the clause; clauses of this kind do not provide satisfactory evidence.

If we proceed on this basis, discounting instances following *al*, *hit*, and singular proper names, then the distribution of relative pronouns in restrictive and non-restrictive clauses in the Caligula text is as set out in Table 13.

Table 13

Type of clause	*þe*	*þa*	*þat*
Restrictive	521 (58%)	174 (19%)	209 (23%)
Non-restrictive	129 (56.5%)	47 (20.5%)	52 (23%)
Ambiguous	96	42	24

What emerges from Table 13 is a picture substantially different from that given by Table 12, in which instances following all antecedents were included. The apparent association of *þe* with non-restrictive and of *þat* with restrictive clauses that was shown in Table 12 is absent from Table 13, where *þe* and *þat*, like *þa*, occur in proportions that vary little in the two types of clause; the source of those apparent characteristics of *þe* and *þat*, shown in Table 12, must lie simply in usage following *al*, *hit*, and singular proper names. None of the three pronouns, therefore, shows any significant association with use in one type of clause rather than the other; in so far as the pronouns occur more often in restrictive or in non-restrictive clauses, this is merely a consequence of their association with particular types of antecedent.[23]

V

In addition to the main relative pronouns *þe*, *þa*, and *þat*, there are in the Caligula text of the *Brut* also a small number of instances of the forms *þæ*, *þea*, *þeo*, *þæt*, and *þet*. *Þæt* and *þet*, found on three and on thirteen occasions respectively, have simply been included in the figures already given for *þat*, of which they are merely variant forms. The instances of *þæt* occur at 9496, 9699, and 12531; instances of *þet* include those at 1636, 1977, 2189, 9346, and 14358.

Þæ is used as a relative pronoun on thirty-two occasions, e.g. 6089, 6379,

7212, 7416, 8615, 9146, 9511, and 12439. Though not found before line 6089, the form is then distributed fairly evenly throughout the remainder of the text; in the use of *þæ* there is thus a division to be drawn approximately at line 6000, where there is also a change in the use of the main relative pronouns in the Caligula text (see Table 1 above, p.34). In a minor way, therefore, *þæ* is illustrative of the variability in the choice of relative pronouns that is a feature of the Caligula text. In the language of Caligula the spelling *æ* may alternate with both *a* and *e*, and so in principle it is possible for *þæ* to be a variant form of either *þe* or *þa*; and in practice this is consistent with the pattern of usage which *þæ* displays. Of the thirty-two antecedents followed by *þæ*, ten are animate singular (nine masculine and one feminine in natural gender), ten animate plural, six inanimate singular (three masculine, two feminine, and one neuter in grammatical gender), and six inanimate plural. The antecedents of *þæ* are thus not identical in character with those of *þe* or *þa*, for *þæ* occurs with plural antecedents proportionately more often than *þe* but less often than *þa*: the antecedents of *þæ* are equally divided between the singular and the plural, whereas those of *þe* are more often singular than plural, and those of *þa* more often plural than singular (see Table 2 above, p.36). In so far as judgement may be made from a small number of instances, it seems reasonable to regard *þæ* as a variant of both *þe* and *þa*, which in the character of its antecedents therefore matches neither exactly, but lies somewhere between the two.

Þeo, though sometimes ambiguous between interpretation as a relative and as a demonstrative pronoun, occurs in eighteen instances in which it is clearly or probably a relative pronoun, e.g. 1498, 3550, 6267, 11081, and 14774. Of these eighteen instances, thirteen follow plural antecedents (all animate) and five singular antecedents (four animate, of which two are masculine and two feminine in natural gender; and one inanimate, of masculine grammatical gender). In occurring more often with plural than with singular antecedents *þeo* resembles *þa*, and the form is probably best regarded as a rare alternative of *þa*; in a comparable way the determiner *þeo* is occasionally used as an alternative of the commoner form *þa* in the feminine singular and the plural.[24]

The form *þea* occurs as a relative pronoun on only one occasion, following a plural antecedent (292). *Nea* is found in this part of the Caligula text as a spelling of the negative *ne* (779), and in a similar way *þea* is probably simply a spelling of *þe*.

VI

Usage in the Otho text of Laȝamon's *Brut* is very much simpler than in Caligula. In Otho *þat* is the only relative pronoun frequently used, for besides numerous instances of *þat* there are some forty-seven of *þe* and two of *þa* (and none of such forms as *þæ* and *þeo*, occasionally found in Caligula). The place of *þat* as the chief relative pronoun in the language of Otho is apparent not only from its overall preponderance, but also from usage in cases in which the Otho text shows a relative pronoun, but Caligula does not. In most such cases the relative pronoun must have been introduced in Otho, as part of the reshaping of the text carried out by the Otho reviser; and these instances are therefore likely to reflect natural usage in the language of Otho, rather than usage influenced by that of the exemplar, as may be the case where Caligula and Otho are in agreement in showing a relative pronoun. In cases in which a relative pronoun is peculiar to Otho the form used is almost always *þat*, which is found in 175 such instances (e.g. 1476, 1956, 3615, 5956, 7084, 9853, 10294, 12426); *þe* is found in only three instances of this kind (858, 926, 16043), and *þa* in none. The predominant use of *þat* in these cases confirms that in the language of Otho the normal relative pronoun was *þat*, and that *þe* was little used. It is also noticeable that *þe* is more common in the early part of the Otho text than later, for whereas twenty-eight instances of *þe* are found in lines 1-2000, only nineteen appear in lines 2001-16079. The likely explanation of this unequal distribution is that in the early part of the text the Otho reviser was more readily influenced by the linguistic forms of his exemplar, and that as he proceeded he became more fully independent; in the customary language of the Otho reviser, therefore, *þe* was probably used only with the extreme infrequency found in the greater part of the poem, and the somewhat more common use present in the early part of the text was prompted by the language of the exemplar. There is some evidence, however, that *þe* may on occasion have been used in Otho where the exemplar did not show a similar form (either *þe* itself, or *þa*, *þæ*, or *þeo*). There are three cases in which Otho has *þe* where there is no relative pronoun in Caligula (858, 926, 16043); and although at 858 the text might originally have included *þe*, which has been retained in Otho and omitted in Caligula, at 926 and 16043 *þe* was probably introduced in Otho. There are also eight instances in which Otho has *þe* and Caligula *þat* (236, 359, 845, 1470, 1650, 2350, 6019, 11823), and in these cases it may well be that *þe* was introduced in Otho; but since grammatical usage in Caligula has apparently been subject to some degree of scribal adaptation, it is possible that the form originally used in at least some of these instances was *þe*,

from which Caligula has diverged but which has been maintained in Otho. No clear pattern is evident in the types of antecedent with which *þe* is found in the Otho text; the antecedents are animate singular in fifteen instances, animate plural in nineteen, inanimate singular in eleven, and inanimate plural in two. Illustrative examples of *þe* in the Otho text are found at 198, 217, 547, 712, 1087, 1414, 1527, 1802, 3115, 6420, 12880, and 13134. The two instances of the relative pronoun *þa* that I have noted in the Otho text occur at 11882 and 13278; the antecedents are both plural, and in the corresponding passages in the Caligula text the forms used are *þeo* and *þe* respectively.

VII

The main conclusions of this study concern usage in the Caligula version of the *Brut*. It is evident that there are marked fluctuations in the frequency of *þe* and *þa* in different parts of the Caligula text, but the circumstances in which the main relative pronouns, *þe*, *þa*, and *þat*, are most commonly used remain broadly constant throughout; what chiefly varies is the proportion in which the pronouns occur, not the other characteristics of their use. It is also apparent that the primary factor influencing the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text is the nature of the antecedent. *þe*, as well as being the relative pronoun most commonly used overall, shows in the singular an association with masculine antecedents, for it is found with particular frequency following animate singular antecedents that are masculine in natural gender or are treated grammatically as masculine, and following inanimate singular antecedents that are masculine in grammatical gender. *þa* is used more often with plural than with singular antecedents, and in the plural it is somewhat more common when the determiner *þa* is present in the antecedent; in the singular *þa* shows an association with the feminine gender, occurring more often with animate singular antecedents when they are feminine in natural gender and with inanimate singular antecedents when they are feminine in grammatical gender. *þat* occurs with greater frequency in the singular when the antecedent is inanimate or of neuter grammatical gender, and when the determiner *þat* is present in the antecedent; *þat* is also the pronoun normally employed with the antecedents *al* "everyone, everything" and *hit* "it", and in the plural it is found somewhat more frequently following *alle* "all (people)" than with other animate antecedents. The function of the relative pronoun within its clause exercises only a small influence on the choice of relative pronouns, though when the pronoun is adverbial in function *þat* is the

form mainly employed, and following animate antecedents there is some tendency to use *þe* more often when the pronoun is the subject of its clause and *þa* more often when it is the object. The choice of relative pronoun is seemingly unaffected by the restrictive or non-restrictive character of the clause in which it is used; for although *þe* is more common in non-restrictive and *þat* in restrictive clauses, this is simply an outcome of the association of *þe* and *þat* with particular types of antecedent, and the character of the clause appears to have no independent influence on the choice of relative pronouns. It is, then, the nature of the antecedent that is the chief factor influencing the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text of the *Brut*.

The pattern of usage shown by the main relative pronouns in the Caligula text is in a number of ways reflective of their sources in Old English. The fact that in Caligula *þe* is widely found following antecedents of all kinds indicates (as indeed we should expect) that it is derived in part from the OE indeclinable relative *þe*, which was used after antecedents of all kinds. But *þe* in the Caligula text must also be drawn in part from the masculine singular form *se* of the OE declinable relative, *se, seo, þæt*. Just as the determiner *se* could in early ME evolve to *þe*, by generalization of initial *þ-* from elsewhere in the paradigm, so also could the relative *se*; and a process of this kind must be assumed to have contributed to the development of the relative *þe* in the language of Caligula, in order to account for its association in the singular with masculine antecedents. The sources of *þe* in the language of Caligula are therefore twofold; it is derived both from OE indeclinable *þe* and from the masculine form *se*.

The sources of *þa* are also twofold, comprising both OE plural *þa* and OE feminine accusative singular *þa*. The fact that in Caligula *þa* is used more often with plural than with singular antecedents points to its being derived in part from the OE plural form. In the singular, *þa* is used more frequently in the Caligula text when the antecedent is feminine in gender, indicating that the form is also derived in part from OE feminine singular *þa*. In OE the singular form *þa* was accusative in case, and this may partly account for the fact that in Laȝamon *þa*, following animate antecedents, is found somewhat more often as object than as subject (though it does not explain why this point of usage is apparent only following animate antecedents). The OE restriction of feminine singular *þa* to the accusative case, however, is not maintained in Laȝamon, where *þa* is also found as subject following singular antecedents that are feminine in natural or grammatical gender (e.g. Caligula 609, 1841, 2457, 2507, 5504, 6256, 7649, 8003, 8972). In this respect the relative pronoun *þa* in Laȝamon resembles the determiner *þa*, which in the singular was likewise the accusative feminine form in OE, but which in the Caligula text of the

Brut is a common feminine form in the nominative as well.[25]

It is likely on general grounds that the ME relative *þat* was derived in part from the OE conjunction *þæt*, as well as from the neuter form of the OE declined relative pronoun *se, seo, þæt*.[26] In the Caligula text of Laȝamon, however, what is chiefly apparent is the source of *þat* in the OE neuter pronoun, strongly reflected in the association of *þat* with singular antecedents of neuter gender.

In its use of relative pronouns, as in other features of its language, the Caligula text of Laȝamon's *Brut* is markedly archaic. Those varieties of early ME in which *þe* is retained as a relative pronoun in addition to *þat* (or *þet*) give evidence of two broad tendencies in usage: one is for *þe* to become the preferred form following animate antecedents, and *þat* (or *þet*) the form preferred when the antecedent is inanimate; the other is to employ *þe* chiefly in the function of subject, while using *þat* (or *þet*) freely both as subject and as object.[27] These tendencies of usage are very little in evidence in the Caligula version of the *Brut*. It is true that in the Caligula text *þat* shows a link in the singular with inanimate antecedents, and that there is some indication of a more frequent use of *þe* as subject than as object, though only following animate antecedents. But what is noticeable in the Caligula text is not so much the presence of usages characteristic of ME, but rather the preservation of OE features of usage. *Þe* in the Caligula text has not yet developed an association with animate antecedents as such, retaining instead a link with masculine singular antecedents (both animate and inanimate) that has been carried forward from OE *se*. Gender, indeed, remains a significant factor in the use of all three of the main relative pronouns in the Caligula text, with the distinction of masculine, feminine, and neuter being substantially preserved, rather than transmuted into a distinction between animate and inanimate. *Þa* also retains, in addition to its link with feminine singular antecedents, its OE characteristic of being used as a plural relative pronoun with antecedents of any kind. In these various ways, then, usage in the Caligula text shows the preservation of features of the OE system of relative pronouns; patterns of usage found in other varieties of early ME, such as the language of the Final Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* and the AB language, have scarcely emerged in the language of the Caligula text. This retention of archaic features in the use of relative pronouns in Caligula is of course in accordance with other characteristics of the language of the text; in particular, the continuing role of grammatical gender in the choice of relative pronouns is consistent with the extensive preservation of grammatical gender that is apparent in other ways in the language of the Caligula text.

In its use of relative pronouns the Caligula text is not, however, simply an

example of archaism, for the language of Caligula also gives evidence of the forces by which different patterns of usage could develop. The Caligula text shows clearly how, as a result of an association with one type of antecedent, a relative pronoun could develop a secondary or consequential association with use in other types of context. Thus the association of *þe* with masculine singular antecedents has the consequence that the pronoun is used more frequently with animate than with inanimate antecedents; and a relative pronoun used with animate antecedents will as a consequence occur as the subject of its clause more often than a pronoun used with inanimate antecedents. The association of *þe* with masculine singular antecedents that is apparent in the Caligula text of the *Brut* therefore contains within itself the potential for two developments found in other early ME texts, as a result of which *þe* came to be used predominantly with animate antecedents and in the function of subject. Though in a number of ways archaic, usage in the Caligula text of the *Brut* also contains within itself the sources of changes that were carried through in other varieties of early ME, and serves to illuminate the processes by which those changes could take place.

NOTES

1 Kirsti Kivimaa, *"Þe" and "Þat" as Clause Connectives in Early Middle English with Especial Consideration of the Emergence of the Pleonastic "Þat"*, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 39 (Helsinki, 1966) pp.53-5, 92-7; Georges Bourcier, *Les Propositions relatives en vieil-anglais* (Paris, 1977) pp.428-30, 454-62; François Chevillet, *Les Relatifs au début du moyen-anglais*, 2 vols. (Lille, 1981) I, pp.182-204, 214, 219, 224-5, 296-303, 305-6, 309-11, 313-15. Kivimaa takes account of lines 1-8020 of the *Brut*, but gives detailed statistics only for lines 1-555 of the Caligula text and lines 1-806 of Otho; Bourcier and Chevillet base their discussions on analysis of lines 1-8020. Kivimaa's study, though less detailed than those of Bourcier and Chevillet, is in my view the best of these accounts.

Since the term "relative pronoun" is familiar and widely used I employ it throughout, though one or more of the forms in question may be analysed as a particle, conjunction, or complementizer rather than as a pronoun. My use of the term is not intended to imply commitment on this point of analysis. For a general study of the issues involved, including consideration of OE and ME, see Johan van der Auwera, "Relative *That* – a Centennial Dispute", *Journal of Linguistics* 21 (1985) pp.149-79, where extensive references to earlier discussions are given.

2 Quotations from Laȝamon's *Brut* and line-references to the text follow the edition by G.L. Brook and R.F. Leslie, EETS OS 250 and 277 (London, 1963 and 1978), though in quotations I have modernized the punctuation, word-division, and use of capitals, and have used ampersand in place of the Tironian sign.

3 For further consideration of constructions of this kind see F.N.M. Diekstra, "Ambiguous *That*-Clauses in Old and Middle English", *English Studies* 65 (1984) pp.97-110, where references to other discussions are given.

4 On the scribal divisions within the Caligula MS see *Laȝamons Brut*, ed. Sir Frederic Madden, 3 vols. (London, 1847) I, p.xxxv, and Adolf Luhmann, *Die Überlieferung von Laȝamons Brut*, Studien zur englischen Philologie 22 (Halle, 1906) pp.11-12. N.R. Ker stated that the Caligula text of the *Brut* was "in other hands [than those of the remainder of the Caligula MS], probably two", but did not comment further (see his Introduction to the facsimile of the manuscripts of *The Owl and the Nightingale*, EETS OS 251 (London, 1963) p.xvi).

5 See Luhmann, *Die Überlieferung von Laȝamons Brut*, pp.13, 63.

6 I include in the category of animate antecedents collective terms such as *ferde* "army" and

hired "household". In the category of inanimate plural antecedents I include the few instances in which the antecedent comprises animate and inanimate items conjoined, e.g. 1587 *alle mine londe* and *alle mine leode*, conjoined as the antecedent of 1588 *þe*.

7 Kivimaa notes (p.95) that the use of *þat* in the Caligula text is more common following inanimate than animate antecedents, and (p.94) that *þa* is used more often with plural than with singular antecedents. Kivimaa also writes (p.94) that in the singular *þa* "is mostly used with animate antecedents"; but, as Table 2 indicates, one-third of the singular antecedents of *þa* are inanimate, and the proportions in which *þa* occurs in the singular (as in the plural) are virtually identical following animate and inanimate antecedents. The connection of *þat* with inanimate antecedents is apparent from the figures given by Bourcier (pp.454-62) and by Chevillet (I, pp.296-98); Chevillet also notes the greater frequency of *þa* in the plural (I, pp.298-303).

8 This conclusion is based on use of the χ^2 test. For the distribution of *þe*, *þa*, and *þat* following animate and inanimate plural antecedents, the value of χ^2 is 3.57, with two degrees of freedom, and the probability is greater than 0.05; this is not significant.

9 Kivimaa, Bourcier, and Chevillet all regard *þa* as partly an orthographic variant of *þe*. Kivimaa writes (p.95) that *þa* may be "partly, but not wholly, a spelling variant of *þe*", adding (p.134) that *þa* "would seem to be partly a declined relative and not merely a spelling variant of *þe*". Bourcier regards *þa* as being frequently a "variante graphique" of *þe* (pp.457, 459), but considers that on occasion it is "une forme indépendante" (p.461). Chevillet (I, p.299) takes a view similar to Bourcier's. Since *þe* and *þa* differ a good deal in their pattern of use, it seems unlikely that *þa* is to any large degree simply an orthographic variant of *þe*, though this may well be true in some instances. For the most part it fits the evidence better to regard *þa* as a form distinct from *þe*, but in the process of being lost from the system and therefore unstable in its frequency of use and liable often to be replaced by *þe*.

10 It is possible for a noun to be at once feminine in natural gender and neuter in grammatical gender (thus *mæiden*, *wif*). Relative pronouns following antecedents of this kind have been included twice in Table 3, once in each of the relevant categories; but the instances are few in number (41 *wif*, followed by *þa*; 1265 *wif*, followed by *þe*; 7057 *wiue*, followed by *þat*; and 15209 *mæidenne*, followed by *þat*). In compiling Table 3 I have classed as neuter those nouns which historically are of this gender; those that occur as animate singular antecedents in Laȝamon are *bærn*, *child*, *cun*, *folc*, *hustinge*, *mæiden*, *orf*, *þing* (in the sense "creature"), *wif*, and compounds having one of these nouns as the second element, e.g. *moncun*.

11 For the distribution shown in Table 3 the value of χ^2 is 61.49, with four degrees of freedom, and the probability is less than 0.001; this is significant.

12 Kivimaa (p.94) suggests that the plural sense of a neuter collective noun such as *folc* may give rise to the use of *þa*.

13 In compiling Table 4 I have generally classified nouns according to their historical gender, excluding any of uncertain or varying gender. But a few nouns that are historically of varying gender give evidence of one gender in Laȝamon, and these I have classified according to their apparent gender in Laȝamon (e.g. *flod*, which appears to be masculine in Laȝamon's usage, though in OE it is both masculine and neuter). As evidence of the gender of nouns in Laȝamon I have relied solely on the anaphoric use of personal pronouns; and for information about this I have drawn chiefly upon the valuable analysis by Draginja Pervaz, "The Survival of Grammatical Gender in Laȝamon's *Brut*, the *Southern Legendary* and Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*", Ph.D. thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1958), though I have also consulted Paul Hoffmann, *Das grammatische Genus in Laȝamons Brut*, Studien zur englischen Philologie 36 (Halle, 1909), and Ernst Meissgeier, "Beiträge zum grammatischen Geschlecht im Frühmittelenglischen, besonders bei Laȝamon", *Englische Studien* 56 (1922) pp.337-77. I have not used as evidence of gender the inflected forms of determiners and adjectives, for there are signs that these inflections were losing their strict association with gender, to become markers of case that could on occasion be used with any gender; this is convincingly shown by Charles Jones, "The Grammatical Category of Gender in Early Middle English", *English Studies* 48 (1967), pp.289-305.

14 For the distribution shown in Table 4 the value of χ^2 is 38.4, with four degrees of freedom, and the probability is less than 0.001; this is significant. The influence of grammatical gender on the choice of relative pronouns in early ME was observed and illuminatingly discussed by Angus McIntosh, "The Relative Pronouns *þe* and *þat* in Early Middle English", *English and Germanic Studies* 1 (1947-8) pp.73-87. Its role in the Caligula text is touched on by Kivimaa (pp.93-5), Bourcier (pp.455-6, 458-60), and Chevillet (I, pp.297-303). Kivimaa concludes that *þa* and *þat* have some association with the feminine and neuter genders respectively. Bourcier's view is not clearly stated, but he appears to allow that gender has some role in the choice of *þa* and *þat*. Chevillet recognizes that *þat* has a link with the neuter gender; and, though with some qualification, he notes that there is evidence of a connection of *þa* with the feminine gender.

15 For the distribution of *þat* shown in Table 5, tabulated with the combined distributions of *þe* and *þa* shown there, the value of χ^2 is 7.92, with one degree of freedom, and the probability is less than 0.005; this is significant.

16 On the neuter gender of the determiner *þat* in the Caligula text see Pervaz, "The Survival of Grammatical Gender in Laȝamon's *Brut*, the *Southern Legendary* and Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*", pp.19, 26, and Hoffmann, *Das grammatische Genus in Laȝamons Brut*, p.6.

17 For the distribution shown in Table 7 the value of χ^2 is 8.46, with two degrees of freedom, and the probability is less than 0.025; this is significant.

18 The greater frequency of *þa* following plural antecedents with the determiner *þa* is noted by Kivimaa (p.95).

19 The association between *al* and *þat* is noted by Kivimaa (p.95) and by Bourcier (pp.454, 458). Bourcier (p.454) also draws attention to the regular use of *þat* following *hit*.

20 Bourcier, p.454.

21 For a wider consideration of this topic, and a somewhat different view, see Adam Pasicki, "*While*-Clauses in Old and Early Middle English", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 4 (1983) pp.287-303, where references to other discussions are given.

22 The possible role of syntactic function in the choice of relative pronouns in the Caligula text is considered by Bourcier (pp.455, 460-2), who gives statistics for the use of relative pronouns in different functions following singular and plural animate antecedents in restrictive clauses, and following inanimate plural antecedents in restrictive clauses. But the significance of these statistics is uncertain, because of the omission of instances following inanimate singular antecedents in restrictive clauses and of all instances in non-restrictive clauses.

23 Bourcier, in his analysis of usage in the Caligula text (pp.454-62), distinguishes throughout between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses, and shows *þat* to be more common in restrictive clauses. But he does not attempt to determine how far this may be the outcome of other characteristics of the pronouns, rather than reflecting an association with use in restrictive or non-restrictive clauses. (The terms used by Bourcier are "relation forte", symbolized by a point, and "relation faible", symbolized by a plus-sign. "Relation forte" corresponds to the category "restrictive", and "relation faible" to the category "non-restrictive". See Bourcier, pp.11-15.)

24 On the determiner *þeo* see Hoffmann, *Das grammatische Genus in Laȝamons Brut*, p.9.

25 Statistics illustrating this are given by Pervaz, "The Survival of Grammatical Gender in

Laȝamon's *Brut*, the *Southern Legendary* and Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*", pp.19, 25; see also Hoffmann, pp.8-9.

26 See Kivimaa, p.138; Elizabeth Closs Traugott, *A History of English Syntax* (New York, 1972) p.153; and van der Auwera, "Relative *That* – a Centennial Dispute", pp.172-3, where references to other discussions of this point are given.

27 See McIntosh, "The Relative Pronouns *þe* and *þat* in Early Middle English"; Kivimaa, p.135; and my article, "Relative Pronouns in Language AB", *English Studies* 56 (1975) pp.100-7.