



Further remarks on the deflexion and grammaticalization of the Old English past participle with *habban*

JAVIER MARTÍN ARISTA
Universidad de La Rioja (Spain)

Received: 22/10/2019. Accepted: 06/05/2020.

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the transitive construction involving *habban* and the past participle in Old English, and focuses on the loss of the adjectival segment of the participial inflection. The analysis is based on data retrieved from the *York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*. Inflectional morphology and constituent order, including the relative and the absolute position of the past participle, are considered. The data indicate that the reanalysis the *habban*+past participle construction is nearly over by the end of the period.

KEYWORDS: Old English, participle, *habban*, deflexion.

1. AIM AND SCOPE

The Old English past participle can be found in two constructions, one involving the past participle and the verb *habban* ‘to have’ and the other comprising this non–finite form of the verb and the copula *bēon* ‘to be’. In both constructions, the non–finite form can be inflected as adjective. Of the two constructions, the past participle with *bēon* has drawn more attention, above all from the perspective of the grammaticalisation of the passive.

Regarding the past participle with *habban*, Ringe and Taylor (2014: 435) support the view “that a non–adjectival reading of HAVE+PPLE is already in place in the earliest OE

**Address for correspondence:* Universidad de La Rioja, Departamento de Filologías Modernas. Logroño 26004, Spain; e-mail: javier.martin@unirioja.es

texts, i.e. that OE has a periphrastic perfect with auxiliary HAVE.” On the inflection of the past participle with *habban*, these linguists point out that “none of the authors that discuss this issue lay out an objective way to distinguish these cases, nor provide any frequencies” (Ringe & Taylor, 2014: 436, ft. 16–17). A study in the question that makes reference to specific authors and texts is also pending. Martín Arista and Ojanguren López (2018a, b) conduct a corpus-based study on the participle with *bēon* ‘to be’ that puts the adjectival inflection of the past participle down to its modifier function, but no similar analysis of the past participle with *habban* has been carried out so far.

In order to contribute to bridging this gap, this article deals with the participle in Old English and focuses on the loss of the adjectival segment of its inflection. More specifically, the aims of this research are (i) to quantify the instances of the explicit adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban* in transitive constructions; (ii) to assess the progress of its deflexion; and (iii) to offer some paths of explanation for the pervicence of the adjectival segment of the inflection of the past participle with *habban*. The analysis is based on the *York–Toronto–Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (Taylor *et al.*, 2003; hereafter YCOE).¹

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews previous findings in the area of the past participle with *bēon* and *habban*. Section 3 presents the evidence for the inflected past participle with *habban*. The method is unfolded in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the results of the analysis of the adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban* by text genre, period, dialect, and author. Section 6 considers the question at stake from the perspective of constituent order. To round off, Section 7 draws the main conclusions of the work, which insist on the co-relation between inflection and constituent order.

2. REVIEW

This section reviews previous findings in the area of the past participle and the verbs *bēon* and *habban*. In general, more attention has been drawn by the copulative verb, in particular with respect to the grammaticalisation of the passive.

The main mechanisms of grammaticalisation are reanalysis and analogy (Hopper & Traugott 2003). According to Brinton and Traugott (2005: 7), there are three types of reanalysis: change in constituency (syntactic or morphological bracketing), change in category labels (as in main verb > auxiliary) and boundary loss (as in *going to* > *gonna*). Thus described, the adjectival past participle with *habban* grammaticalises as the Present-day English perfect, while the adjectival participle with *bēon* is grammaticalised as the syntactic passive. This grammaticalisation represents the ultimate stage of an evolution from the morphologically adjectival Proto-Germanic participle. In this respect, Los (2015: 82) notes that the passive “may well be the earliest of the verbal periphrases in Germanic”.

For some authors, the adjectival construction consisting of *bēon* ‘to be’ and the past participle is reanalysed, at least partially, in Old English (Traugott, 1992; Denison, 1993). Other authors hold that this construction is not grammaticalised in Old English (Petré & Cuyckens, 2008, 2009) or even that it remains fully analysable in this period (Jones & MacLeod, 2018). The following arguments have been put forward in favour of the grammaticalisation of the passive construction: the existence of explicit agreement between the subject and the past participle (Traugott, 1992: 192), the expression of syntactic agents (Denison, 1993: 423), the development of the *have*-perfect (Toyota, 2008: 43) and the avoidance of coordination between adjectives and passive participles in the same copulative construction (Petré, 2014: 122).

As regards the adjectival inflection of the past participle in Old English, Kilpiö (2007: 329) gives the following figures: 11.6% of inflected participles in the texts written between 850-950 and 5.9% in 950-1050. Wojtyś (2009) dates the loss of the adjectival inflection to the Middle English period (13th century).

On the specific construction of *habban* in combination with the past participle of the lexical verb, Traugott (1992: 192) states that *habban* and the participle appear “to have been reanalysed as a verbal complex” by Old English. Denison (1993: 414) concurs that “it might be possible to correlate lack of agreement in participles with a possible reanalysis from copula BE + participial adjective to auxiliary BE + lexical verb.” Denison (1993: 341) also describes the necessary changes to constituent order (continuity of the verbal phrase) and to inflection (invariable past participle). Łęcki (2010: 169) points out that “OE HABBAN + past participle structure (...) functioned as a well-developed perfect already in the Old English period’ and gives several arguments in favour of the completion of this process: the subject of *habban* becomes an agent and can be inanimate or abstract; *habban* can be used impersonally, ellipted and negated, in negative formations semantically incompatible with a resultative reading of *habban*. Turning to analogy, Łęcki (2010: 151-152) notes that “with neuter singular, non-accusative, clausal object or when the object is absent, past participles did not take adjectival inflections (...) The absence of overt marking (...) has been seen as an analogical factor that contributed to the eventual loss of inflected participles in English”. Finally, Ringe and Taylor (2014: 437) agree that Old English has a periphrastic perfect with the auxiliary *habban* and the past participle.

With respect to the question of the deflexion of the participle, this term refers to “the loss of inflectional categories, not necessarily to the loss of all inflections” (Norde, 2001: 240). Allen (2003: 3) stresses the importance of deflexion in Early Middle English, usually known as the period of the levelling of inflections. Ogura (2009), in the same line, points out that, due to their phonemic resemblance, the endings *-ende* and *-enne* became interchangeable in late Old English. Martín Arista and Ojanguren López (2018a) relate the inflection of the participle in Old English to its syntactic function, in such a way that

adjectival participles are inflected as adjectives more frequently than verbal participles. As regards *habban* and the past participle, Łęcki (2010: 150) remarks that “a majority of scholars endorse the view that English perfect has its origin in the structure containing HABBAN, past participle of transitive verb functioning as an adjective and object (...) The participle accompanying HABBAN originally assumed an adjectival inflection, in conformity with the object it modified.” Mitchell (1985: 283) states that it is less consistent than *bēon* in taking an inflected participle, but he does not offer any quantitative data.

While concurring with the arguments in favour of the existence of a perfective construction with *habban* in Old English, I would like to finish this section by pointing out some facts that suggest that the process has not been fully completed yet in this period. This point has already been made by Kilpiö (2007: 341), who doubts that the process is complete in Old English, given that “at the end of this period there are still layered instances of the earlier type of construction that formed the starting point for the development.” These layered instances may include, on the structural side, the fluctuation in the order of constituents, which may display, according to Mitchell (1985: 283), “all possible arrangements of the three elements concerned”; and, on the functional side, the lack of *habban* as a perfect auxiliary of *habban* itself (acknowledged by Łęcki, 2010: 171), the variation in the auxiliarisation of motion verbs between *bēon* and *habban* (Ogura 2018: 2), and the existence in Old English of only one example of passive of the type *Ic hæbbe on fulluhte beon gefullod* ‘I have been baptised in the true faith’ (cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp]:12.50.4721).³ With this state of play, it may be helpful to provide additional criteria for assessing the progress of this process of grammaticalisation, including the comparison with *bēon* and the relation between inflection and constituent order.

3. DATA AND SOURCES

This study is based on the textual evidence available from the YCOE, which comprises 1.5 million words, annotated for part of speech and parsed for syntax.

The witnesses to the adjectival inflection of the past participle with the verb *habban* are listed and described in the Appendix. They can be classified, in terms of textual genre and, when relevant, author/translator into seven categories: Alfredian translations; The Bible; Gospels and Apocrypha; Other translations from Latin; Legal prose; Religious prose; Historical prose; and Ælfrician prose. Diachronic and dialectal aspects are also taken into account when available.

From the chronological point of view, evidence for the adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban* has been found in early, classical and late texts, although most of them correspond to the 11th century. The earliest texts (9th century), according to the YCOE dating system, include *Cura Pastoralis*, *Laws of Alfred*, *Alfred’s Introduction to Laws*, *Charters and Wills* and *Anglo–Saxon Chronicle A*. *Vercelli Homilies*, *Boethius*, *Consolation*

of *Philosophy*, *Bald's Leechbook*, while *Orosius* can be dated to the 10th century. *Laws of Æthelred*, *Martyrology*, *Blickling Homilies*, *Ælfric's Homilies Supplemental*, and *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies* (I and II) are dated by the YCOE to the turn of the 11th century. To the 11th century belong *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, *Laws of Cnut*, *Laws of Æthelred* (V and VI), *Northumbra Preosta Lagu*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle C*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D*, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, *The Seven Sleepers*, *Martyrology*, *Vercelli Homilies*, *Heptateuch*, *West-Saxon Gospels*, *Gospel of Nichodemus* (partly), *Chrodegang of Metz*, *Gregory's Dialogues*, *Apollonius of Tyre*, and *Herbarium*. *Vindicta Salvatoris*, *Gerefa* and the *Laws of Ine* are dated by the YCOE to the transition from the 11th to the 12th century. Finally, the *Laws of William*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle E (Peterborough Chronicle)*, *Gospel of Nichodemus* (partly) and *St. Augustine's Soliloquies* belong in the 12th century.

From the dialectal point of view, the prose texts in which adjectivally inflected past participles with *habban* have been found are written in the West Saxon dialect, according to the information provided by the YCOE, except *Charters* and *Wills* (Anglian Mercian/Kentish/West Saxon), *Martyrology* (West Saxon/Anglian Mercian), *Blickling Homilies* (West Saxon/Anglian), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History* (West Saxon/Anglian Mercian), *Gregory's Dialogues* (West Saxon/Anglian Mercian), *Herbarium* (West Saxon/Anglian), and *Bald's Leechbook* (West Saxon/Anglian).

4. METHOD

Three main searches have been launched in the YCOE to carry out this analysis of *habban* and the past participle. The poetry segment of the York corpora has not been considered because structural aspects like adjacency and absolute order may be unpredictable in poetry for stylistic or metrical reasons.

Firstly, the YCOE has been searched for all the instances of *habban* and past participle. Example (1) presents the query, which has turned out a total of 1570 instances.

- (1) node: IP*
 query: (IP* idoms *HVI|*HVP*|*HVD*)
 AND (IP* idoms *BEN*|*HVN*|*AXN*|*VBN*)

Example (2) illustrates the phenomenon under analysis. The finite verb *habban* 'to have', the accusative NP *þas word* 'that word' and the past participle *gesprečen* 'said' are directly dominated by the node IP.

- (2) *Ða ða Drihten hæfde þas word gesprečen. Þa wearð he genumen to heofonum* (cocathom1,+ACHom_I,_21:348.105.4188) 'When the Lord had said this word, he was taken to heaven.'

((IP-SUB (NP-NOM (NR^N Drihten))
 (HVD h+afde)
 (NP-ACC (D^A +tas) (N^A word))
 (VBN gesprecen))
 (ID cocathom1,+ACHom_I,_21:348.105.4188))

Secondly, all inflected past participles have been obtained with the query shown in example (3). A total of 136 inflected past participles with *habban* have been found. The figure of participles in the texts in which there are inflected past participles with *habban* rises to 1410.

- (3) node: IP*
 query: (IP* idoms NP-ACC|NP-ACC-|NP-ACC-RSP|NP-ACC-RSP-|NP-ACC-RFL|NP-ACC-RFL-|NP-DAT|NP-DAT-|NP-DAT-RSP|NP-DAT-RSP-|NP-DAT-RFL|NP-DAT-RFL-|NP-GEN|NP-GEN-|NP-GEN-RSP|NP-GEN-RSP-|NP-GEN-RFL|NP-GEN-RFL-|NP|NP-|NP-RSP|NP-RSP-|NP-RFL|NP-RFL-)

Avoiding the nominative case, the query in (3) excludes the instances in which the zero inflectional ending may be mistaken for an uninflected past participle. As for the accusative, the YCOE tagging puts aside inflectionally unmarked past participles, which are tagged as VBN rather than as VBN^A.

Example (4) shows an instance of the finite verb *habban* together with a past participle with adjectival inflection (*beswicenne* ‘eluded’) that agrees in case, number and gender with the pronoun in the accusative noun phrase (*þe* ‘you’).

- (4) *þu cwist ðæt we hæbban þe beswicenne* (coboeth,Bo:7.19.16.314)
 ‘You say that we have eluded you’
 ((IP-SUB-SPE (NP-NOM (PRO^N we))
 (HVPS h+abban)
 (NP (PRO +te))
 (VBN^A beswicenne))
 (ID coboeth,Bo:7.19.16.314))

Approximately, ten percent of the past participles are inflected not only as non-finite forms of the verb (*-ed/-od/-en*) but also as adjectives (with the strong or weak adjectival inflection). Additional searches are launched in these results so as to take further steps of

analysis, including the absolute position of the past participle with *habban* (non-final vs. final) and its relative position (adjacent to the object).

Thirdly, the results are compared with those evinced by *bēon* and the past participle. Example (5) shows the relevant nodes and the query.

- (5) node: IP*|PTP*
 query: ((IP* idoms BED*|BEP*)
 AND (IP* idoms *VBN^*|*HVN^*|*BEN^*))
 OR (PTP* idoms *VBN^*|*HVN^*|*BEN^*))

As can be seen in (6), the nominative noun phrase (*ealle þing* ‘all things’) agrees in plural number with the finite verb (*syndon* ‘are’). It also agrees in case, number and gender with the past participle (*gesceapene* ‘shaped’).

- (6) *Ealle þing syndon gesceapene þurh þæt Word*
 (coaelhom,+AHom_1:31.15) ‘All things are shaped by that Word.’
 ((IP–MAT (NP–NOM (Q^N Ealle) (N^N +ting))
 (BEPI syndon)
 (VBN^N gesceapene)
 (PP (P +turh)
 (NP–ACC (D^A +t+at) (N^A Word))))
 (. ,))
 (21 ID coaelhom,+AHom_1:31.15))

In spite of the structural similarities that arise between the instances in (4) and (6), the past participle is far more frequent with *bēon* than with *habban*, and gets adjectival inflectional morphemes more frequently. The number of past participles with *bēon* in the texts in which there are past participles with *habban* is in the area of eighteen thousand, approximately one third of which are inflected as adjectives. This figure plunges to less than ten percent in the participles with *habban*. These aspects are discussed in more detail in the following section.

5. RESULTS

This section discusses the data found in the text groups presented in Section 3 (see also Appendix).

Beginning with the group of Alfredian translations, the mean of adjectivally inflected past participles with *habban* is around ten percent. Interestingly, the mean of this group is very similar to the one of the corpus of analysis (9.6 percent). *Boethius* evinces a percentage

of inflection slightly under the mean, while *Bede* is over. *Gregory's Dialogues* and *Orosius* show rates of inflection clearly below average, around five percent. The comparison with *bēon* is relevant in relative terms and, above all, in absolute terms. In relative terms, the mean of adjectivally inflected past participles with *bēon* is almost three times the one of *habban*. In absolute terms, the figure of past participles with *bēon* (both uninflected and inflected) is ten times as much as the corresponding figure with *habban*. These figures are tabulated in Table 1.

	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
Alfredian translations						
cobede	399	1645	24.2	6	46	13
coboeth	89	301	29.5	18	181	9.9
cocura	307	1114	27.5	19	105	18
coorosiu	120	650	18.4	7	148	4.7
cosolilo	9	49	18.3	8	44	18.1
cogregd	692	2188	31.6	4	69	5.7
Total	1616	5947	27.1	62	593	10.4

Table 1. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Alfredian translations.

The translations throw rates of adjectival inflection of the participle in the area of ten percent. The group of Other Latin translations is over the mean, whereas The Bible, Gospels and Apocrypha is under the mean. In the latter group, the rates of adjectival inflection are very low in *The Gospel of Nichodemus* (3.4 percent) and in the *Heptateuch* (4.9 percent). While *Vindicta Salvatoris* is above the mean, the *West Saxon Gospels* triplicate the mean, but this rate has to be taken with caution because the absolute figures are very low. It is worth commenting, with respect to this group, that the four texts evince similar rates of inflection of the past participle with *bēon*. On the side of *habban*, although the texts with absolute figures under fifty occurrences were put aside, the rates would range between 3.4 and 8.6 percent. The total number of past participles with *habban* is approximately one tenth of the participles with *bēon*, a proportion similar to the one holding in Alfredian translations. These figures are summarised in Table 2.

	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
The Bible, Gospels, and Apocrypha						
cootest	186	538	34.5	3	61	4.9
cowgosp	328	1059	30.9	6	18	33.3
conicod	68	205	33.1	2	58	3.4

covinsal	17	46	36.9	2	14	14.2
Total	599	1848	32.4	13	151	8.6

Table 2. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in The Bible, Gospels and Apocrypha.

The absolute figures of the group of Other Latin translations are very low for *habban* and must be taken with caution. As is tabulated in Table 3, there is a wide gap between the occurrences of the past participle with the two verbs. As in the groups described so far, the ratio *habban*: *bēon* is approximately 1: 10 on average, but the difference is even bigger in texts like *Bald's Leechbook*, whose rate of adjectival inflection of the past participle with *bēon* is over sixty percent. This rate is completely unrivaled in the context of the results of this study.

Other Latin translations	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
cochdrul	80	202	39.6	1	20	5
coherbar	214	468	31.6	3	7	42.8
colaece	222	362	61.3	1	5	20
coapollo	21	89	23.5	1	17	0.5
Total	537	1121	47.9	6	49	12.2

Table 3. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Other Latin translations.

The group of Legal prose has the lowest rate of adjectival inflection of the past participle in the textual selection. The absolute figures are not very high, neither for *habban* nor for *bēon*. The details can be seen in Table 4.

Legal prose	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
colaw	13	90	14.4	1	39	2.5
codocu	14	55	25.4	1	25	4
Total	27	145	18.6	2	64	3.1

Table 4. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Legal prose.

As is the case with Legal prose, there is not much evidence for the inflected past participle in Religious prose. Even the figure of past participles with *bēon* is low if compared with the results of this verb. At the same time, Religious prose evinces the highest rate of adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban*, as can be seen in Table 5.

Religious	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%

prose						
comart	72	468	15.3	1	11	9.1
coblick	149	536	27.7	7	43	16.2
coverhom	226	679	33.2	9	61	14.7
cowulf	82	245	33.4	6	31	19.3
Total	529	1928	27.4	23	146	15.7

Table 5. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Religious prose.

A similar problem arises with respect to Historical prose, as is tabulated in Table 6. Nevertheless, there is a decrease in the adjectival inflection of the past participle if the A and the E part of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are compared. This is in accordance with the datation of these texts (9th. vs. 12th century); with the total data of the analysis presented in this work, which shows a decrease between two reliable groups of texts such as Alfredian translations (9th century) and Ælfrician prose (10–11th century); and with the parallel evolution of the past participle with *bēon*, which clearly decreases between the A and the E texts of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

Historical	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
prose						
cochronA	37	170	21.7	4	31	12.9
cochronC	39	244	15.9	6	44	16.6
cochronD	52	291	17.8	5	54	9.2
cochronE	77	461	16.7	6	55	10.9
Total	205	1166	17.5	21	184	11.4

Table 6. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Historical prose.

Ælfrician prose is the most consistent group and, as such, the most reliable when it comes to interpreting the data. This group is restricted to one textual genre, one idiolect, one dialect and a well-defined time span. Furthermore, the word count of the four texts together is well over 275,000 words, around one sixth of the YCOE. For qualitative and quantitative reasons, then, this segment of the data is remarkably representative of the written records of Old English as a whole. Leaving aside Legal prose, Ælfrician prose evinces the lowest rate of adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban*. It seems that Ælfric the grammarian (or the purist) prefers the adjectivally inflected past participle in the passive construction with *bēon* and the adjectivally uninflected past participle in the transitive construction with *habban*. This is rather unexpected, considering that other religious works clearly favour the adjectivally past participle with *habban*. Indeed, the *Blickling Homilies*, the *Vercelli Homilies* and the *Homilies of Wulfstan* quadruplicate or even quintuplicate the rate of inflection found in Ælfric. Ælfric and Wulfstan are practically coetaneous and, while the former inflects as

adjectives four past participles in one hundred, the latter declines as adjectives nearly twenty percent of the past participles. Although more research is needed in this area, this difference could be attributed to Wulfstan's preference for formulae and repetitions, which, according to Beechy (2010: 61), define his homyletic style. Focusing on *habban*, there is a remarkable reduction in the rate of the inflected past participle between Alfredian translations (around ten percent) and Ælfrician prose (four percent). The figures for the latter are presented in Table 7.

Ælfrician prose	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
coaelhom	271	700	38.7	1	31	3.22
cocathom	1138	3219	35.3	5	106	4.71
coaelive	541	1431	37.8	2	67	2.9
cosevensl	41	78	52.5	1	19	5.2
Total	1991	5428	36.6	9	223	4

Table 7. Adjectival inflection of the past participle in Ælfrician prose.

As can be seen in Table 8, early texts show higher rates of adjectival inflection of the past participle with *habban*. For instance, the *Cura Pastoralis* (9th century) presents a rate of eighteen percent while Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (11th century) is under five percent. The same can be said with respect to *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Part A of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (9th century) evinces a rate of inflection of the past participle with *habban* of 12.9 percent whereas Part D (11th century) has a rate of 9.2 percent. These remarks may represent trends rather than well defined lines of evolution, though.

Summary	PtPp with <i>bēon</i>			PtPp with <i>habban</i>		
	Inflected	Total	%	Inflected	Total	%
Alfredian translations	1616	5947	27.1	62	593	10.4
The Bible, Gospels	599	1848	32.4	13	151	8.6
Other Latin translations	537	1121	47.9	6	49	12.2
Legal prose	27	145	18.6	2	64	3.1
Religious prose	529	1928	27.4	23	146	15.7
Historical prose	205	1166	17.5	21	184	11.4
Ælfrician prose	1991	5428	36.6	9	223	4

Total	5504	17583	31.3	136	1410	9.6
--------------	------	-------	------	-----	------	-----

Table 8. Adjectival inflection of the past participle by text type.

With the exception of the *West Saxon Gospels*, which shows the same rate of inflection of the past participle with *bēon* and with *habban*, the rest of the texts in the YCOE selection diverge in this respect. This divergence can be assessed in terms of the ratio *habban* : *bēon*. The maximal divergence corresponds to Ælfrician prose (ratio *habban* : *bēon* = 0.1) and Legal prose (0.16). The translations from Latin diverge moderately. The ratio *habban* : *bēon* is 0.38 in Alfredian translations, 0.26 in The Bible, Gospels and Apocrypha, and 0.25 in Other translations. Two groups of vernacular prose show the minimal divergence as to the inflection with *habban* and *bēon*: Historical prose (0.65) and Religious prose (0.57). The divergences just noted can be the result of the high absolute figure of past participles with *bēon*, as is the case with Alfredian prose and Ælfrician prose; or a consequence of the low absolute number of participles with *habban*, as happens to Legal prose and Other Latin translations.

All in all, two main categories of texts can be distinguished: translations from Latin and vernacular prose. While the groups comprising translations from Latin are homogeneous and present rates of adjectival inflection with *habban* not far from the mean (the range is 8.6–12.2 percent, and the mean 9.6 percent), the groups of vernacular prose are divergent in that they show the lowest and the highest rates of adjectival inflection. The group of Legal prose has 3.1 percent and Ælfrician prose has 4 percent. On the other hand, Historical prose presents a rate of adjectival inflection of 11.4 percent and Religious prose evinces the highest rate, 15.7 percent (approximately five percent above the mean).

These convergences, however, are not enough to explain the inflection of the past participle with *habban* either on a dialectal or on a diachronic basis. In the following section, the phenomenon under scrutiny is discussed from the angle of constituent order.

6. DISCUSSION

Given that the past participle with *habban* plays a necessarily verbal role, the paths of explanation for the evidence presented so far are sought in the syntax of the language. The point of departure of this explanation is the structural reanalysis that, according to Denison (1993: 341), has led to the Present-day English perfect: “from a sentence brace in main clauses, with non-adjacency of finite HAVE and non-finite V, and accusative adjectival inflection on V; to adjacency of HAVE and V and no adjectival inflection on V.” The completion of this pattern of reanalysis may indicate that the grammaticalisation of the perfect is over, notwithstanding the semantic differences between the Old English and the Present-day English construction, which are underlined by Denison (1993: 352) and Ringe & Taylor (2014: 437). As is shown below, the analysis of the relative order of the finite verb

and the past participle, when applied to *bēon*, turns out similar results, which reinforces the explanatory character of adjacency.

In the remainder of this section, constituent order is considered with respect to relative position (the adjacency of the past participle and the accusative noun phrase that complements *habban*) and absolute position (the past participle in the final position of the clause, which is aligned as a braced construction that displays, in this order, the finite verb, the accusative noun phrase and the past participle).

731 uninflected past participles with *habban* appear in non-adjacent constructions, whereas 410 can be found in adjacent constructions NP–PtPp or PtPp–NP. In percentual terms, adjacent participles represent thirty-six percent of uninflected past participles, non-adjacent being sixty-four percent of uninflected participles. The main patterns of constituent order in which adjacent uninflected past participles appear are: firstly, the past participle preceding the finite form of the verb in the final position of a dependent clause (230 instances), as is the case with *asæd hæfde* in *Ða se Wisdom ða þis spell asæd hæfde, þa ongon he singan* (coboeth,Bo:40.141.9.2817) ‘After Wisdom had made this speech, he started singing’; secondly, the brace HABBAN–NP–PtPp in main clauses (fifty-seven instances), such as *He hæfde ænne licðrowere belocen on anum clyfan* (coalive,+ALS_[Basil]:480.795) ‘They had locked a leper in a cubiculum’; thirdly, the completely modern order HABBAN–PtPp–NP (fifty-one instances), as can be seen in *Ac heo hæfde gecoren Crist hyre to brydguman* (coalive,+ALS_[Eugenia]:349.401) ‘But she had chosen Christ for her as bridegroom’; and fourthly, the brace HABBAN–NP–PtPp in dependent clauses (twenty-nine instances). The braced construction, both in main and dependent clauses, reaches a total of eighty-six instances, which represents twenty-one percent of non-adjacent uninflected past participles with *habban*.

Out of the 136 past participles with *habban* that show adjectival inflection (see Table 8), eighty are adjacent to the accusative noun phrase, either in NP–PtPp or PtPp–NP order. This is the case, for instance, with *hine gereahne* in *Gif ænegu gesceaft tiohhode þæt hio wið his willan sceolde winnan, hwæt hio meahthe wið swa mihtigne swa we hine gereahne habbað?* (coboeth,Bo:35.98.13.1897) ‘If any creature thought that she should fight against his will, what might she do against such a mighty one as we have described him?’; and *me gedonne* in *Bearnleasne ge habbað me gedonne* (cootest,Gen:42.36.1793) ‘You have made me heirless’. Adjacent inflected past participles are mainly found in braced constructions (HABBAN–NP–PtPp), either in main clauses (thirty-six instances) or in dependent clauses (twenty-three instances). For example, *Pu hæfst me nu manega bysna gereiht* (cosolilo,Solil_3:66.26.926) ‘You have set many examples for me’ is a braced construction in a main clause; while *Pu cwist ðæt we hæbban þe beswicenne* (coboeth,Bo:7.19.16.314) ‘You say that we have deceived you’ illustrates the brace in dependent clauses. Braced constructions constitute two thirds of the occurrences of the adjacent inflected past participle.

The other frequent structural pattern in which adjacent inflected past participles occur is the dependent clause with final finite verb (NP–PtPp–HABBAN), of which there are twenty–three instances, such as *& hie alle on þone Cyning wærun feohtende oþ þæt hie hine ofslægene hæfdon* (cochronA–CC,ChronA_[Plummer]:755.16.522) ‘And they all would fight against the king, until they killed him’. The remaining forty–seven inflected past participles are non–adjacent, including *In patientia uestra possidebitis animas uestras; þæt is on engliscra spræce, On eowrum geðylde ge habbað eowre sawla soðlice gehealdene* (coalive,+ALS_[Memory_of_Saints]:334.3509) ‘In patientia uestra possidebitis animas uestras, which is in the English language in your patience you have certainly held your souls.’, and *Ðin agen geleafa þe hæfþ gehæledne* (coblick,HomS_8_[BIHom_2]:15.24.201) ‘You have kept your own belief.’ Overall, 65.4 percent of inflected past participles occur in adjacent constructions, with the corresponding 34.6 percent qualifying as non–adjacent to the accusative noun phrase.

The figures of inflected past participles can be described as the complete reversal of the ones of uninflected past participles. On the one hand, if the accusative noun phrase and the past participle are adjacent, two thirds of the verbal forms are inflected. On the other hand, if there is no adjacency between the accusative noun phrase and the past participle, two thirds of the verbal forms are uninflected: there is a total of 499 adjacent past participles with *habban*, and 778 non–adjacent ones. Of the adjacent past participles, eighty–nine are inflected (21.7 percent) and 489 uninflected. Out of the total of 778 non–adjacent past participles, forty–seven display adjectival inflection (6.4 percent), whereas 731 qualify as uninflected. In sum, the rate of inflection of adjacent past participles nearly triplicates the rate of non–adjacent past participles.

The picture that emerges is twofold. While the low rate of inflection of the past participle indicates that the reanalysis into the Present–day perfect is nearly complete, the co–occurrence of the inflection of the non–finite form with its final position evidences that the total loss of inflection requires the rigidification of constituent order, with the past participle following the finite form of the verb and preceding the noun phrase.

Interestingly, the loss of the inflection in the construction involving *bēon* and the past participle evinces similar rates. It has to be borne in mind that the adjacency of the intransitive construction is restricted to the two verbal forms, whereas the transitive construction with *habban* displays two verbs and an accusative noun phrase. *Mutatis mutandis*, it turns out that approximately three fourths of the adjacent constructions *bēon–PtPp/PtPp–bēon* do not mark the adjectival inflection of the past participle, with the corresponding one fourth of inflected adjacent constructions. This can be seen in Table 9.

PtPp with <i>bēon</i>	
uninflected	inflected

Adjacency <i>bēon</i> - PtPp	Adjacency PtPp- <i>bēon</i>	Adjacency <i>bēon</i> - PtPp	Adjacency PtPp- <i>bēon</i>
4698	2424	1499	829
total	7122 (75.3%)	total	2328 (24.6%)
Grand total	9450		

Table 9. The past participle with *bēon* in the YCOE.

Three aspects deserve some attention if this reasoning is correct. Firstly, the order of constituents of the passive with *bēon* may also be explanatory, along with the function, as to the deflexion of the past participle. Secondly, the rate of deflexion of the past participle in adjacent configurations illustrates the faster pace of the reanalysis of *habban* with respect to *bēon*, although the difference is not wide. Thirdly, this work has not furnished enough evidence or arguments so as to make a claim of direct causal relation between order of constituents and deflexion. To a certain extent, I agree with Kilpiö's (2007: 341) remark that "loss of inflection and changes in word-order are not directly causally linked in the sense that one would trigger the other. They rather seem to be events that work towards the same goal, but not at the same pace". However, the parallelism between the past participle with *bēon* and *habban* probably indicates that the relative position and the adjectival marking of the past participle are not fully independent from each other.

7. CONCLUSION

This article has analysed the partial deflection of the past participle with *habban* on the grounds of data retrieved from the YCOE. The results have been presented by text and the explanation has been sought in the comparison with *bēon* and constituent order. Three types of conclusions can be drawn from this research.

On the quantitative side, there is a strong correlation between (lack of) inflection and (lack of) adjacency. Around two thirds of the uninflected participles are non-adjacent, while two thirds of the inflected participles are adjacent. This correlation is also present in adjacent constructions with *bēon*, in which the ratio of inflected to uninflected past participles is 1 : 4.

On the qualitative side, this analysis has evidenced that a grammarian no less than Ælfric of Eynsham opts for the adjectivally inflected past participle in the passive construction with *bēon* but clearly dislikes the adjectivally inflected past participle in the transitive construction with *habban*. This might indicate a demise of the adjectival inflection of the past participle.

On the explanatory side, the convergence of some results of the analysis of *bēon* and *habban* underlines the relevance of constituent order for the assessment of the grammaticalisation of the constructions with the past participle and highlights the relation between inflection and order. The data indicate that the reanalysis the *habban*+past participle construction is nearly over. Not even adjacent past participles are regularly inflected.

However, the low textual frequency of the construction points to regularisation, in the sense of automation, rather than to generalisation. It seems that a higher frequency of use is needed before grammaticalisation is complete, but more research is needed in this area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research has been funded through the grant FFI2017-83360-P, which is thankfully acknowledged.

NOTES

1. I would like to thank Susan Pintzuk for her help and guidance with the searches in the YCOE. Any errors or misconceptions remain entirely mine.
2. The YCOE was consulted in April 2018. The full inventory of tags used in the YCOE is available from http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang22/YCOE/doc/annotation/YcoeLite.htm#syntactic_labels.
3. The example is not uncontroversial, though. Visser (1984: §2161; in Toyota, 2009: 209) thinks that it is Old English, but Mitchell (1985: §753; in Toyota, 2009: 209) considers it Middle English.

REFERENCES

- Allen, C. (2003). Deflexion and the development of the genitive in English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–28.
- Bately, J. (1980). *The Old English Orosius*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beechy, T. (2010). *The Poetics of Old English*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Bethurum, D. (1957). *The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Blake, N. (1964). *The Phoenix*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Brinton, L. & Traugott, E. C. (2005). *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, J. (1959). *The Advent lyrics of the Exeter Book*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carnicelli, T. (1969). *King Alfred's version of St. Augustine's Soliloquies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Classen, E. & Harmer, F. (1926). *An Anglo-Saxon chronicle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Clemons, P. (1997). *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The first series*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cockayne, O. (1864–1866). *Leechdoms, wortcunning and starcraft of early England*. Rolls Series 35, vol. 1. 70–324. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Crawford, S. (1922). *The Old English version of the Heptateuch. Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cross, J. (1996). Two Old English apocrypha and their manuscript source: The Gospel of Nichodemus and The Avenging of the Saviour, with contributions by Denis Brearley, Julia

- Crick, Thomas Hall & Andy Orchard. *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 19, 139–247.
- de Vriend, H. (1984). *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de quadrupedibus*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Denison, D. (1993). *English historical syntax: Verbal constructions*. London: Longman.
- Dobbie, E. (1953). *Beowulf and Judith. The Anglo-Saxon poetic records, IV*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Endter, W. (1922). *König Alfreds des Grossen Bearbeitung der Soliloquien des Augustinus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Godden, M. (1979). *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The second series*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Goolden, P. (1958). *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gradon, P. (1958). *Cynewulf's Elene*. London: Methuen.
- Harmer, F. (1914). *Select English historical documents of the ninth and tenth centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Healey, A. diPaolo. (Ed.). 2016. *The Dictionary of Old English in electronic form A–H*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.
- Hecht, H. 1965 (1900–1907). *Bischof Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Herzfeld, G. (1973/1900). *An Old English Martyrology*. London: Trübner.
- Hill, J. (1994). *Old English minor heroic poems*. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hulme, W. (1903–4). The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus. *Modern Philology*, 1, 610–14.
- Jones, H. & Macleod, M. (2018). The status of passive constructions in Old English. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 116(1), 59–90.
- Kilpiö, M. (2007). Auxiliation in progress: Diachronic grammaticalisation changes in Old English and Early Middle English HAVE perfects. In M. Rissanen, M. Hintikka, L. Kahlas-Tarkka & R. McConchie (Eds.), *Change in Meaning and the Meaning of Change: Studies in Semantics and Grammar from Old to Present-Day English* (pp. 323–343). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Kotzor, G. (1981). *Das Alterenglische Martyrologium, vol. II*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Krapp, G. (1906). *Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Krapp, G. (1932). *The Vercelli Book. The Anglo-Saxon poetic records II*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Krapp, G. & Dobbie, E. (1936). *The Exeter Book. The Anglo-Saxon poetic records III*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lamont, G. (2015). The present participle as a marker of style and authorship in Old English biblical translation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Łęcki, A. (2010). *Grammaticalisation Paths of Have in English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Lieberman, F. (1903–16). *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. Halle.
- Los, B. (2015). *A historical syntax of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Magennis, H. (1994). *The Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers*. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.
- Martín Arista, J. & Ojanguren López, A. E. (2018a). The adjectival and verbal participle with *bēon* in Old English: A morpho–syntactic analysis. *SELIM*, 23, 27–53.
- Martín Arista, J. & Ojanguren López, A. E. (2018b). Grammaticalization and deflexion in progress. The past participle in the Old English passive. *Studia Neophilologica*, 90(2), 155–175.
- Miller, T. (1959–1963/1890–1898). *The Old English version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, B. (1985). *Old English syntax. Concord, the parts of speech and the sentence*, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morris, R. (1967/1880). *The Blickling Homilies*. London: Trübner.
- Napier, A. (1971/1916). *The Old English version, with the Latin original, of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang together with the Latin original*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Norde, M. (2001). Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences*, 23, 231–264.
- Ogura, M. (2009). The interchangeability of the endings *–ende* and *–enne* in Old and Early Middle English. *English Studies*, 90(6), 721–734.
- Ogura, M. (2018). *Periphrases in Medieval English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Petré, P. (2014). *Constructions and environments: Copular, passive, and related constructions in Old and Middle English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petré, P. & Cuyckens, H. (2008). The Old English copula *weorðan* and its replacement in Middle English. In M. Gotti, M. Dossena & R. Dury (Eds.), *English historical linguistics 2006*, vol 1 (pp. 23–48). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Petré, P. & Cuyckens, H. (2009). Constructional change in Old and Middle English copular constructions and its impact on the lexicon. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 30, 311–66.
- Plummer, C. (1965/1899). *Two of the Saxon chronicles parallel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pope, J. (1968). *Homilies of Ælfric, a supplementary collection*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ringe, D. & Taylor, A. (2014). *The Development of Old English. A Linguistic History of English, Volume II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robertson, A. (1956/1939). *Anglo–Saxon charters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rositzke, H. (1940). *The C–Text of the Old English chronicles*. Bochum–Langendreer: H. Pöppinghaus.
- Scragg, D. (1992). *The Vercelli Homilies and related texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sedgefield, W. 1899. *King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius de Consolatione Philosophiae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Skeat, W. (1871–1887). *The Four Gospels in Anglo–Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian versions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skeat, W. (1966/1900). *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Squires, A. (1988). *The Old English Physiologus*. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.
- Sweet, H. (1958/1871). *King Alfred's West–Saxon version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Taylor, A., Warner, A., Pintzuk, S. & Beths, F. (Eds.). (2003). *The York–Toronto–Helsinki parsed corpus of Old English prose*. Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York.
- Toyota, J. (2008). *Diachronic change in the English passive*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Toyota, J. (2009). Passive as a tense-aspectual construction revisited: the case of Germanic languages. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, 49, 200-214.
- Traugott, E. C. (1992). Syntax. In R. Hogg (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 1 (pp.186–201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitelock, D. (1930). *Anglo–Saxon wills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, B. (1966). *Gnomic poetry in Anglo–Saxon*. New York, NY: AMS Press.
- Williamson, C. (2013/1977). *The Old English riddles of the Exeter Book*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Wojtyś, A. (2009). Suffixal past participle marking in mediaeval English. *Anglica*, 18, 45–68.

APPENDIX. OLD ENGLISH WITNESSES TO THE ADJECTIVALLY INFLECTED PAST PARTICIPLE WITH *HABBAN*

This appendix lists and describes the texts from the YCOE in which evidence has been found for the adjectival inflection of the past participle with the verb *habban*. The sources are presented with the following format: Name of text (YCOE file name; *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) text name; word count; editor and year of edition).

Alfredian translations

Bede's History of the English Church (cobede.o2; 80,767; Miller 1959–1963).

Boethius, Consolation of Philosophy (coboeth.o2; 48,443; Sedgefield 1899).

Cura Pastoralis (cocura.o2; 68,556; Sweet 1958); Cura Pastoralis (cocuraC; 2,119; Sweet 1958).

Orosius (coorosiu.o2; Or; 51,020; Bately 1980).

St Augustine's Soliloquies (cosolilo; Solil; 15,856; Endter 1922).

Gregory's Dialogues (cogregdC.o24; GD (C); 91,553; Hecht 1965).

The Bible, Gospels and Apocrypha

Heptateuch (cootest.o3; Gen, Exod, Lev, Num, Deut, Josh, Judg; 59,524; Crawford 1922).

West-Saxon Gospels (cowsgosp.o3; Mt (WSCp), Mk (WSCp), Lk (WSCp), Jn (WSCp); 71,104; Skeat 1871–1887).

The Gospel of Nichodemus (conicodA; Nic (A); 8,197; Cross 1996); The Gospel of Nichodemus (conicodC; Nic (C); 4,629; Hulme 1903–1904); The Gospel of Nichodemus (conicodD; Nic (D); 1,798; Hulme 1903–1904); The Gospel of Nichodemus (conicodE; Nic (E); 1,588; Torkar, from ms. for *Dictionary of Old English Project*).

Vindicta Salvatoris (covinsal; VSal (1); 3,655; Cross 1996)

Other translations from Latin

Chrodegang of Metz (cochdrul; ChrodR 1; 18,386; Napier 1971).

Herbarium (coherbar; Lch I (Herb); 22,213; de Vriend 1984).

Bald's Leechbook (colaece.o2; Lch II (1), Lch II (2), Lch II (3); 34,727; Cockayne 1864–1866).

Apollonius of Tyre (coapollo.o3; ApT; 6,545; Goolden 1958)

Legal prose

Laws of Cnut (colaw1cn.o3; LawICn; 2,386; Lieberman 1903–16); Laws of Cnut (colaw2cn.o3; LawIICn; 4,761; Lieberman 1903–16).

-
- Laws of Æthelred V (colaw5atr.o3; LawVAtr; 1,228; Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Laws of Æthelred VI (colaw6atr.o3; LawVIATr; 2,096; Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Laws of Alfred (colawaf.o2; LawAf 1; 3,314; Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Alfred's Introduction to Laws (colawafint.o2; LawAfEl; 1,966; Lieberman 1903–16). Gerefa (colawger.o34; LawGer; 751; Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Laws of Ine (colawine.ox2; LawIne; 2,755 Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Northumbra Preosta Lagu (colawnorthu.o3; LawNorthu; 1,330 Lieberman 1903–16). Laws of William (colawllad.o4; LawWILad; 220; Lieberman 1903–16).
-
- Charters and Wills (codocu1.o1; 1,753; Harmer 1914; Robertson 1956); Charters and Wills (codocu2.o12; 253; Harmer 1914; Robertson 1956); Charters and Wills (codocu2.o2; 1,857; Harmer 1914; Robertson 1956); Charters and Wills (codocu3.o23; 679; Harmer 1914; Robertson 1956); Charters and Wills (codocu3.o3; 7,171; Robertson 1956; Whitelock 1930); Charters and Wills (codocu4; 193; Robertson 1956).
-

Religious prose

-
- Martyrology (comart1; Mart 1; 1,300; Herzfeld 1973; Kotzor 1981); Martyrology (comart2; 4,391; Herzfeld 1973; Kotzor 1981); Martyrology (comart3.o23; 25,781; Herzfeld 1973; Kotzor 1981).
-
- Blickling Homilies (coblick.o23; HomS (BIHom 2–7, 9, 11–12); HomU (BIHom 1, 8, 10); LS (BIHom 13–15, 17(MichaelMor), 17(MartinMor), 19); 42,506; Morris 1967).
-
- Vercelli Homilies (coverhom; HomS (ScraggVerc 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20); HomU (ScraggVerc 2, 4, 6, 7, 15, 22), HomM (ScraggVerc 14, 21), LS (ScraggVerc 17, 18); 45,674; Scragg 1992); Vercelli Homilies, Homily I (coverhomE; HomS 24.1 (Scragg); 4,463; Scragg 1992); Vercelli Homilies, Homily IX (coverhomL; HomU 15.1 (Scragg); 1,986 Scragg 1992).
-
- The Homilies of Wulfstan (cowulf.o34; WHom; 28,768; Bethurum 1957).
-
- The Seven Sleepers (cosevensl; LS 34; 9,143; Magennis 1994).
-

Historical prose

-
- Anglo–Saxon Chronicle A (cochronA.o23; ChronA; 14,583; Plummer 1965).
-
- Anglo–Saxon Chronicle C (cochronC; ChronC; 22,463; Rositzke 1967).
-
- Anglo–Saxon Chronicle D (cochronD; ChronD; 26,691; Classen and Harmer 1926).
-
- Anglo–Saxon Chronicle E (Peterborough Chronicle) (cochronE.o34; ChronE; 40,641; Plummer 1965).
-

Ælfrician prose

-
- Ælfric's Catholic Homilies I (cocathom1.o3; ÆCHom I; 106,173; Clemoes 1997).
-
- Ælfric's Catholic Homilies II (cocathom2.o3; ÆCHom II; 98,583; Godden 1979).
-
- Ælfric's Homilies Supplemental (coaelhom.o3; ÆHom; 62,669; Pope 1968).
-
- Ælfric's Lives of Saints (coaelive.o3; ÆLS; 100,193; Skeat 1966).
-