THE GENITIVE IN *ANE RESONYNG OF ANE SCOTTIS* AND *INGLIS MERCHAND BETUIX ROWAND AND LIONIS*

The Early Modern English period is characterised by great variety in syntax. As Salmon (1987: 268) points out:

> It should be noted that the Elizabethan Englishman had at his command a wider choice than ever before or since, as structures were still available to him which had functioned in Old English, and are now obsolete, while at the same time he was aware of those which have replaced them at the present day.

This variety is seen, for instance, in the genitive, with the so-called split genitive, group genitive, double genitive, *his*-genitive or zero genitive, apart from its syntactic variant, the *of*-construction.

The most exhaustive studies on these constructions in the Early Modern English period have been carried out by den Breejen (1937) and Altenberg (1982). Den Breejen analyses the genitive and its *of*-equivalent in 29 prose texts written in the latter half of the sixteenth century, representing different genres (sermons, essays, travel accounts, letters) and, therefore, 'both colloquial and more literary language' (p. 4). He studies different types of constructions, such as subjective, objective, possessive, descriptive and partitive genitives, but he does not examine the frequency of occurrence of the genitive and the *of*-periphrasis in each of them, neither does he separate compounds and fixed collocations from ordinary phrases, so that his results are difficult to interpret.

Altenberg (1982), on the other hand, analyses the two constructions in 30 seventeenth-century texts (a corpus of approximately 444,000 words) representing eight different genres: comedy, diary/correspondence and travel (described as informal prose and representing 57% of the whole material)[1], essays, sermons and religious prose (described as prose of a more formal kind and accounting for 16% of the corpus), and tragedy and poetry (verse texts—23%). He distinguishes six kinds of factors: phonetic, morphological, syntactic, lexical, relational and communicative; and he analyses each of them separately on the basis of a controlled subset of the corpus in which the influence of other conditioning factors has been eliminated as far as possible (p. 32).

Nothing comparable exists for Scots. What is found in most grammars are some passing remarks, especially about zero genitives. Thus, Smith

---

[1] Of these, the comedy (nearly 40%) is considered of special interest, since it reflects most accurately the spoken language of the period (Altenberg 1982: 35).

(1902) mentions that 'there are many examples in Middle Scots of the... undeclined possessive, as *fadir broder* (=father's brother), *a fure lenth* (a furrow's length)' (p. xxxii). Similar information is given in more modern accounts. Macafee (1992/1993 and 2002), for example, points out that in Older Scots there are occasional survivals of zero genitives in nouns of relationship ending in -*r* (e.g. *sister son* 'nephew on the sister's side', *brother dochter* 'niece on the brother's side'). Zero genitives are also found with personal names and with titles (e.g. *to the erl of Herfurd cosyne*) (p. cvi). With regard to the periphrastic genitive, she states that it becomes the most common type in Scots by the fourteenth century and that it is more strongly favoured in prose than in poetry in the early stages, which is suggestive of Romance influence (p. cvii). She also mentions the split genitive construction, and points out that 'when a noun phrase to be put into the genitive itself contains another *of* phrase, split genitives are an alternative' as in *the Kingis dochter of Nuby* (p. cvii). The same information is given by King (1997), who simply expands a bit on the zero genitive and mentions that some examples 'continue to exist in Modern Scots, such as *mither side, sister bairn* or *sister son*' (p. 165).

The present essay studies the genitive in *Ane Resonyng of ane Scottis and Inglis Merchand betuix Rowand and Lionis*,[2] a Scottish prose text written in 1549 by William Lamb. *Ane Resonyng* is a reply to the English propaganda campaign in support of their war against Scotland (1542–49). Of little literary value, this argumentative text or pamphlet (following Meurman-Solin's terminology) is, however, important from a linguistic point of view, since it is 'the earliest surviving prose dialogue in Scots' (Lyall 1985: xxxiii). In this paper, special attention will be paid to the realisation of the genitive inflection in *Ane Resonyng*, as well as to complex structures, such as the split, the group and the double genitive. Finally, the rules that govern the choice between the genitive and the *of*-construction in this work will be briefly examined. The results will be compared to those obtained by den Breejen and Altenberg in order to establish whether Scots and English differ in any way with respect to these constructions.

1   THE GENITIVE

1.1 The regular genitive

In eModE the genitive singular of a noun is formed by adding -*(e)s* to the base. In the plural only irregular nouns add the inflection. The apostrophe is introduced in this period: according to Görlach (1993: 82), it is optional from 1500 onwards, frequent in the seventeenth century, and becomes established by the end of that century (1690–1700). Altenberg

---

[2]   Henceforth *Ane Resonyng*. The edition used for the present study is that by Lyall (1985).

(1982), however, states that in the first half of the seventeenth century 'the apostrophe, if used at all, had predominantly been looked upon as a sign of elision' (p. 55), as shown by the fact that it was occasionally used for the plural. It was towards the last third of that century that the apostrophe was beginning to acquire its modern function as a case marker in the singular. However, by 1700 the usage still varied a great deal, and complete regularity was not achieved until the eighteenth century (p. 57).[3]

With regard to the orthographic realisation of the genitive inflection, -*s* and -*es* are found to alternate with nouns ending in a non-sibilant sound in Altenberg's corpus, which seems to indicate that the -*es*-forms did not reflect a syllabic pronunciation, but were merely conservative spellings. The pronunciation of the singular form in the seventeenth century, therefore, must have been the same as in PdE: /ɪz/ after nouns ending in a sibilant, and /s, z/ in the other cases (p. 43). In Scots, -*is* and -*ys* became established in the fourteenth century because of the sound change that took place in the northern dialects according to which /ə/ followed by a consonant in a final unstressed syllable became /ɪ/. As in English, by the middle of the sixteenth century these spellings had ceased to be syllabic in Scots, at least in prose, although -*is* was still dominant at the beginning of the seventeenth century (Murray 1873: 155–57).

In *Ane Resonyng* the apostrophe is not used at all, the genitive inflection being normally realised as -*is*, as in the following examples:

> Alexanderis, brotheris, Carris, Conqueroris, crownis, Dauidis, Edwardis, Henryis, kyngis, mannis, nephewis, Polidoris, Robertis, Scotlandis, Sterrettis, weris.[4]

The spelling -*s* is common in this work with nouns ending in a vowel: *vncles, Annas*. In this context, however, -*is* is also found, as in 'þe last *Malcolmeis* brothir and þe first *Macolmes* sone' (p. 85), where the nouns *Malcolme* and *Macolme* select different spellings.[5]

In four cases the spelling -*us* is found in *Ane Resonyng* to represent the genitive inflection, all of them with the noun *Polidor*, which alternates -*us* and -*is* in that function:[6]

---

[3] This applies to the singular. In the genitive plural the apostrophe is very rare in the corpus analysed by Altenberg. (p.57)

[4] This is also the inflection found for the genitive plural of irregular nouns:

to all mennis knawlege (p. 9),
be Inglis-mennis selffis (p. 43),
Inglis mennis incursionis (p. 81).

[5] Cf. the form *Malcolmis* (p. 89), where the final unstressed vowel has changed from -*e* to -*i* and the genitive inflection is -*s*.

[6] *Polidor* is the regular base form of this noun in *Ane Resonyng*: 'Polidor in his xij. buik sayis' (p. 93), 'as Polidor says' (pp. 93–95), 'betuix Polidor and ȝour buik' (p. 95), etc. Only in one instance *Polidorus* is found in that function: 'Polidorus, cullerand this humane deid of Edward the Thrid, sayis …' (p. 121).

Polidorus vi. and viij. buik (p. 75),
Polidorus calculing (p. 99),
Polidorus xvij. buik (p. 139),
Polidorus writing (p. 151);
Polidoris awin wordis (p. 71),
Polidoris calculing (p. 97)

In the phrases 'in Brutus tyme' (p. 61), or 'þis ground of Brutus monarchie' (ibid.), the genitive inflection may be *-us* or ø, since the base form of this noun has two different realisations in *Ane Resonyng: Bruit* (p. 59) and *Brutus* (ibid.). With other nouns ending in *-us*, a distinction is made between the base and the genitive form by changing the final unstressed vowel: *Antonius Sabilicus*, for instance, becomes *Sabillikis* in 'in all Sabillikis workis' (p. 65). In other cases, however, Lamb is not consistent: although *-is* is selected for the genitive ['þe tent ʒeir of Kyng *Ruffis* regne' (p. 89)], both *-us* and *-is* are found to alternate for the base form ['be Kyng Ruffus' (p. 85), 'to William Ruffis' (pp. 85, 87)].

1.2 Zero genitive
In some cases in eModE nouns are not inflected for the genitive singular. In *Ane Resonyng*, the zero genitive is found under five conditions. It is the rule with nouns ending in /s, z/, as the following examples illustrate:

ʒour quene *heretrice* mariage with our nobill kyng Edwart (pp. 7–9),
Kyng *Francise* lyiftyme (p. 37),
be Schir Robert *Bowis* talkin (p. 51),
in *Brutus* tyme (p. 61),
þis ground of *Brutus* monarchie (pp. 61, 63).

Although in den Breejen's material the inflection is omitted 'as a rule ... when the noun ends in a hissing-sound' (p. 6), there are other options available. *-es* may be found as well, first and oftenest with the nouns *grace* and *prince*, and occasionally with *horse, Countess, Saint George, fish*; *his* also occurs after a sibilant, especially after masculine proper names (pp. 6–7). The situation is similar in the seventeenth century, according to Altenberg. Thus, of a total of 77 cases in his corpus, the zero form occurs 47 times, the *his*-form 16 times, and the *-es* suffix 14 times (p. 46). With some exceptions, the zero genitive is restricted in the seventeenth-century corpus to polysyllabic nouns with a final unstressed syllable, whereas *-es* or *his* are the normal options for monosyllabic nouns (pp. 46–47).

In *Ane Resonyng*, on the other hand, the zero genitive is the only choice after /s, z/. That seems to be the case in other sixteenth-century Scottish texts as well. Thus, in his study on Bellenden's language, Sheppard states that 'in the case of nouns ending in *-s*, the inflectional syllable is suppressed' (1936: 257), and Van Buuren exemplifies the fact that 'some

genitives have no ending' with nouns ending in a sibilant (*burges, emprys, empryce, hors*) (1982: 75).[7] The different results obtained between *Ane Resonyng* and den Breejen's and Altenberg's corpora seem to be due, partly, to diatopic reasons, but partly also to diachronic ones, as shown by the fact that in the seventeenth-century material there is, according to Altenberg, a significant tendency away from the zero form towards the marked form (i.e. *-es* or *his*) between Period I and Period II (i.e. first and second half of the century) (p. 47).

The omission of the genitive inflection is also found before nouns beginning with /s, z/. In this context the zero genitive occurs four times in *Ane Resonyng*, all of them before *self*:

> be þe *deid* selfe freslie done (p. 17),
> nedis na vthir pruif þan the *deid* selff (p. 31),
> the *deid* self previs þis (p. 45),
> þe *buik* selff on þir weris declaratioun (p. 167).

In the remaining cases (13x),[8] however, the noun is inflected for genitive, even before *self(e)*, as the following examples illustrate:

> This *Carris* slauchtir (p. 23),
> *Edgaris* sistir (p. 91),
> *Matildis* sone (p. 93),
> Henrye the *Secundis* sone (p. 99),
> to Kyng Henry þe *Secundis* selfe (p. 101).

In Altenberg's corpus the omission of the genitive inflection before /s, z/ is also restricted to a particular noun, *sake*, and even before it the use of the inflection predominates (p. 49). Den Breejen offers many examples of genitives before *sake*, and all of them are inflected (pp. 56–57). He gives, however, some instances of zero genitive in this context, most of them before the noun *skin*, although he considers them as compounds (p. 63).

Occasionally the genitive inflection is also omitted, for historical reasons, with nouns of relationship which belonged to the *-r* declension in Old English.[9] In *Ane Resonyng* there are two instances of the zero form with these nouns:

> Athilstane, þair awin *mothir* brothir (p. 71),
> his *sistir*-sone of Scotland (p. 27).[10]

The inflected form is found, however, in: 'a man salbe his *brotheris* father' (p. 85), maybe because this is not a 'natural' or 'normal' kinship degree.

---

[7]   Kuipers offers just an example with a commentary: '*Polycarpus* (with the suffix absorbed in the final sibilant)' (1964: 93).

[8]   Five of these are examples of group genitive.

[9]   One of the features of these nouns is that they added no inflection in the genitive singular.

[10] In this example the construction is taken as a compound.

In Altenberg's material there are also instances of the zero genitive with this kind of noun. Finally, he mentions a fourth condition under which the inflection may be omitted in certain texts, and that is for the sake of brevity in private correspondence and journals. That does not apply to *Ane Resonyng*, however, since it does not belong to those genres. In this work, nonetheless, the zero genitive is found in two other cases not mentioned by Altenberg: with proper names, and as an alternative to the group genitive.

The omission of the genitive inflection with proper names seems to be restricted to the northern dialects. Mustanoja (1960: 72), for example, states for the Middle English period that 'the use of the *s*-less genitive in many proper names and other personal nouns is mainly northern' and he quotes examples such as: *sent Robert bok*; *my lord of Gloucester gud grace*; *in this Herry dayes*. Burrow (1992: 24) also mentions that 'proper names in Northern texts often have no genitive inflection, as in *Hengyst dawes*, 'Hengest's days', *Adam kynde*, 'Adam's kindred'.[11] Sheppard (1936: 267–68) does not refer specifically to proper names, but claims that 'omission of the genitive inflection in other than nouns ending in -*s*, or nouns in which the uninflected form is etymologically justified, is a characteristic of the Northern dialects'. Fifteen examples of this practice have been found in *Ane Resonyng* out of a total of 72, most of them (12x) with names ending in /s, z/:

> The birning of *Jedburgh* abbay and castellis (p. 31),
> þe *Ingland* kyngis superioritie (p. 55),
> Tuball *Cain* werkis (p. 165),
> *Brutus* parliament (p. 149),
> *Pithagoras* opinionis (p. 171).

This practice of omitting the genitive inflection with proper names survived into the nineteenth century on both sides of the Border. Thus, Murray in his description of the dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland mentions that 'proper names scarcely ever take an -*s*' and quotes examples such as: '*Lazar* saule, *Lazar* fynger ende, *Abraham* bosom' (1873: 166). In a footnote he adds:

> This is still a characteristic of the dialect of the Northern English counties. 'One peculiarity of our dialect is that *we have no Genitive*, or rather, possessive case, especially in proper names. A servant would speak of "Mr. Atkinson boots"; a boy would say, "that is John book"; a man would write on the fly-leaf of a book, "John Smith book". In

---

[11]   Allen (1998: 131) explains that 'endingless genitives were already sometimes found with proper nouns in Old English (especially those of Greek or Latin origin [...]) and noninflection of proper nouns seems to have increased in Middle English in more southerly dialects also, although this increase was much greater in the north'.

> short, I never remember hearing 's from an uneducated Cumbrian.' –
> *Rev. J. Hetherington in letter to Mr. Ellis, on Cumberland Dialect.*
> (Murray 1873: 166).

The omission of the inflection is also found in *Ane Resonyng* with complex proper names consisting of a noun phrase and a postmodifying ordinal or prepositional phrase, a context in which the group genitive (or a similar construction) is used elsewhere. There are seven instances of this practice in *Ane Resonyng*, as against seventeen in which the genitive is inflected. The following are some examples:

> be Kyng Henry the vij. testament (p. 27),
> the maner of Kyng Henry þe viij. proceding at þis tyme and his deidis (p. 39),
> in Kyng Henry þe viij. tyme (p. 41),
> þe childring quhilk come of Erle Dauid of Huntingtoun thre dochteris (p. 113).

Table 1. Zero genitive vs. inflected genitive in *Ane Resonyng*[12]

	Zero genitive	% Zero genitive	Inflected genitive	Total
Nouns ending in /s, z/	12	100	0	12
Before words beginning with /s, z/	4	23.53	13	17
Nouns of relationship	2	66.67	1	3
Proper names	15	20.83	57	72
Complex noun phrases	7	29.17	17	24

1.3 *His*-genitive

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the genitive is frequently expressed by an uninflected noun and the possessive of a third person pronoun (*his, her, their*): *Ferdinando his friend; Mrs. Bacon her howse; Estrangers their ships and mariners.*[13] This construction dates back to Old English, when it occurred with foreign proper names, as in: *Nilus seo ea hire æwielme; Affrica and Asia hiera land-gemircu onginnaþ of Alexandria.*[14]

The construction is also recorded in Middle English, although, according to Mustanoja (1960: 161), until the fifteenth century it 'is very rare in the North and infrequent in the whole country. Only in two south-western texts, Lawman B and Trevisa's translation of Higden's

---

Polychronicon ... is it common.' Both in this period and in eModE *his* is preferred in this construction, regardless of the gender of the antecedent (as in *Gwenayfer his love*, where it occurs after a feminine personal noun). The fact that in unstressed position *his* lost its initial /h/ and sounded identical to the genitive inflection *-es* probably accounts for the popularity of the *his*-genitive from the fifteenth century onwards. The alternation of *his* with the regular inflection, its use after feminine nouns and the commentaries made by some grammarians seem to confirm this assumption.[15]

With regard to the use of the construction in eModE, den Breejen points out that in the latter half of the sixteenth century 'it is often used after masculine proper names ending in a hissing-sound or a vowel' (1937: 7), after 'strange unfamiliar nouns or proper names' or 'after excessively long groups of words' (as in *my brother in law his going to London*) (p. 8). In the seventeenth century the *his*-genitive is mainly used as a variant of the syllabic *-es* inflection, occurring in most cases after a final sibilant: thus, of the 31 *his*-genitives found in Altenberg's corpus, 26 are of this type (1982: 43–44). The construction seems to have had the same frequency throughout the century and, although with some authors (e.g. Ben Jonson, Katherine Paston, Earle, Dryden and Lyttleton) it was sometimes more frequent than the *-es* inflection, Altenberg concludes that 'its use was individual and sporadic rather than general', since only nine of the twenty-three writers employed it at all (p. 45).

Ane Resonyng has no instance of the *his*-genitive, but uses the zero form as an alternative to the inflection in the contexts mentioned by den Breejen (i.e. after a final sibilant, proper names and nouns with a postmodification). The construction does not occur either in other sixteenth-century Scottish texts, such as *The Complaynt of Scotland*. It is not mentioned by Sheppard (1936) in his exhaustive study on Bellenden's language, nor by Kuipers (1964) or Van Buuren (1982) in their linguistic analyses of the sixteenth-century texts they edited. *A Dictionary of the*

---

[15]   In the eighteenth century Mittaire, for example, points out:

> The genitive [...] is expressed by *-s* at the end of the word as: *the childrens bread, the daughters husband, its glory.* The *s*, if it stands for *his*, may be marked an apostrophus: e.g. *for Christ's sake*, and sometimes *his* is spoken and written at length, e.g. *for Christ his sake*.
> (Cited from Kisbye 1972:117).

Dr. Johnson, on the other hand, explains:

> These genitives are always written with a mark of elision, *master's, scholar's*, according to an opinion long received, that the *'s* is a contraction of *his*, as *the soldier's valour*, for *the soldier his valour*: but this cannot be the true original, because *'s* is put to female nouns [...] and collective nouns [...] in all these cases it is apparent that *his* cannot be understood.

(In the Grammar prefaced to his *Dictionary*, no page, section entitled 'Of Nouns Substantives').

Older Scottish Tongue offers only five instances of this construction, from the end of the fifteenth to the seventeenth century (s.v. *he* pers. pron. 3 c).[16] Two occur in proceedings and the remainder in specialised texts. The *his*-genitive, therefore, appears to have been rare in Scots before and after the fifteenth century, and the few examples found seem to be confined to formal registers.

These two claims are apparently confirmed by Janda and Murray's statements. The former, in his attempts to demonstrate that PdE *'s* is not an inflection but an enclitic particle, points out:

> in the north of England, where the *his* genitive was last to show up in written texts, [...] in *spoken* dialects, the genitive is generally marked by -ø, as in *the lad father stick* 'the lad's father's stick'. It is as if the genitive inflection *-es* had been lost everywhere except where it could be reanalyzed as *his*. (1980: 250).[17]

Murray, on the other hand, in his description of the dialect of the southern counties of Scotland in the nineteenth century, comments on the genitive of a noun with a postmodification and states:

> The *'s* is often separated from its noun by a word or clause, as in 'Thamson the Myller's cairt; Rob o' the Toor's kye...' Connected with this is the development of the *-s* into *his, in formal language*. 'Robert Laidlaw, quhilom of Haviesyde, his Executors'. (1873:166). [my italics]

2 SPLIT AND GROUP GENITIVE

In a genitive construction (N1's N2) where N1 is complex and has a NP or a PP modifying the head, the genitive inflection is added in PdE not to the head, but to the last element of the phrase. This construction, which is known as group genitive,[18] is found in Middle English but did not become frequent until eModE. In Old English the so-called split genitive was used instead: the genitive inflection was added to the head of N1, then came N2 and, finally, the NP or PP which modified the head of N1, as in:

---

[16] In the first example the *his*-genitive occurs after a sibilant and in the others after a proper name: (1496. *The Acts of the Lords of Council in Civil Causes*) Be ressone of tak... set be the Kingis hienes his commissionaris; (1596. Dalrymple, *The Historie of Scotland*) Gathel his people sa multiplied; (ibid.) Kennedie his lawis; (1606. *Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff*) Ombesetting of... Johne Irwin his way; (1672. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*) For grassing of ... Robert his work horse.

[17] Although Janda's statement refers to the north of England, it may be applied to Scots as well, since the northern dialects seem to have followed parallel developments with regard to the genitive construction.

[18] In this construction the genitive has been cliticised.

> Ælfredes sweostor cyninges,
> Malcolmes cynges dohter of Scotlande.[19]

The first group genitives occur in Middle English and, according to den Breejen (1937: 12), they all consist of a noun followed by one or more appositions. When the head of N1 is modified by a PP, however, the split genitive is preserved much longer.[20] In the latter half of the sixteenth century the group genitive is the rule, but there are still examples of the old construction, both with a postmodification consisting of a PP (*the kepars name of the house*; *she was a Magnificos daughter of Venice*) and a NP (*for our sisters sake Elizabeth*) (p. 13). There are also a few instances in which both the head and the apposition are inflected: *Diamant Castaldos the Magnificos wife*; *according to the Queenes Maiestyes injunctions* (pp. 15–16).

Ane Resonyng follows the pattern established by den Breejen (1937) for the sixteenth century, since the group genitive is the rule in this work.[21] Although there are no instances of the split genitive in *Ane Resonyng*, Lamb makes use of two constructions which may be regarded as intermediate between this and the group genitive. In one of them, the genitive inflection is added to the head of N1, then comes the apposition and, finally, N2. There are three instances of this construction in *Ane Resonyng*:

> þis Edgar was Macolmes þe First sone (p. 85),
> to Kyng Henryis Secund sone (p. 97),
> to Kyng Henryis þe Secund selff (p. 105).

In the other intermediate construction the genitive inflection is added both to the head of N1 and to the noun in apposition. There are four instances of this structure in *Ane Resonyng*:

> in Kyng Henryis the Secundis tyme (p. 89),
> to oure Kyng Henryis Secundis sone (p. 95),
> Kyng Edwardis þe Thridis proceding and sentence (p. 125),
> Johanna, Kyng Edwardis þe Secundis dochtir (p. 161).

---

[19] In late OE the NP in apposition to the head of N1 is not inflected for the genitive sometimes, and this is the norm in ME (*þuruh Julianes heste þe amperur*).

[20] For a more detailed explanation, see Fischer (1992: 229–30).

[21] The split genitive construction, although absent in *Ane Resonyng*, is found in other sixteenth-century Scottish texts. Sheppard (1936: 445–46), for example, mentions that in *Boece* both constructions are found when the head of N1 is modified by a PP, and he offers, among others, the following examples of the split genitive:

> to instruct þe nobillis childeryn of France in all science;
> with lx plegis of þe nobillis son of þat regeoun;
> to be nureist thair with vtheris siklyke princes sonnis of the realme.

The group genitive is, however, the rule in this work when N1 consists of two coordinated elements.

The word order in both constructions is that of the group genitive, but the inflection is added to the head of N1, as in the split genitive.

The group genitive is, nonetheless, more frequent in *Ane Resonyng* than these two intermediate constructions (there are ten instances). The following are some examples:[22]

> þe concurrence of Charlis þe Imperatouris weir aganis France (pp. 37–39),
> to Kyng Henrye the Secundis sone (p. 99),
> Kyng Henry þe Secundis selfe (p. 101),
> Kyng Williame þe Conqueroris lawis (p. 137),
> in tyme of Kyng James þe Fyftis minorite (p. 153).[23]

The group genitive is, moreover, found in some cases in which it would not be considered correct nowadays, as in

> quhilk Dauid becom Scottis kyng eftir Alexander his brothiris deceiss
> (p. 139),[24]

where in PdE the *of*-construction would be used [*after the decease of Alexander, his brother*], or a different word order within N1 [*after his brother Alexander's decease*].

Table 2. Split genitive vs. group genitive in *Ane Resonyng*

	Number of occurrences	%
Split genitive	0	0
Intermediate construction: head inflected for genitive	3	17.65
Intermediate construction: whole NP inflected for genitive	4	23.53
Group genitive	10	58.82

The group genitive is also the rule in *Ane Resonyng* when N1 consists of two coordinated elements, as in the following examples:

> bayth of Ingland and Scotlandis court (p. 25),
> þe last Kyng Richard of Ingland and his brotheris departing from þis
>   wardill (p. 39),
> in ȝour king Ethelred and Suenoyis tym (p. 89).

---

[22] Examples such as *at Kyng Henryis requeist* (p. 7), *in þis Kyng Edwardis tyme* (p. 69), very frequent in this work, have not been regarded as instances of the group genitive, since it may be argued that the head of N1 in these phrases is the proper name.

[23] In some cases, both the group genitive and one of those constructions regarded as intermediate can be found juxtaposed in a sentence, as in *the first to ȝour Kyng Henry þe Secundis sone, syn to Kyng Henryis þe Secund selff* (p. 105).

[24] Cf. *be þe appoyntit deteyning of Jhone, duik of Albany in France* (p. 31), where the *of*-construction is used instead.

As against these three instances in which the genitive inflection is added to the last element of N1, there is only one example in this work in which it is added to both coordinated elements:[25]

> þe trewth of Platois and Pithagoras opinionis (p. 171).[26]

The usage found in *Ane Resonyng* seems to be typical of the period, since den Breejen (1937: 19) also mentions, for the latter half of the sixteenth century, examples of group genitives with NPs consisting of two coordinated elements, many of which would not be considered correct nowadays:

> the private bringing up in Ientlemen and Noblemens houses,
> by Homer and Platos iudgement,
> fine edge tooles in a fole or madmans hand.

The construction seems to have changed in the next century, since Altenberg points out that 'seventeenth-century usage does not seem to differ from that of PdE', and that 'in the great majority of cases (20/22 ex) the genitive suffix is added to each of the coordinated elements' (1982: 59–60). The group genitive is sometimes used in his corpus, but only when 'the coordinated elements are apprehended as a single idea or a collective unit with a joint relationship to the head noun' (p. 60).

In *Ane Resonyng* two other options are available as alternative to the group genitive when N1 is syntactically complex: the *of*-construction and the zero genitive. The following are some examples:

a) The birning of Jedburgh abbay and castellis (p. 31),
    be solistatioun of þe Erle of Kildare and Odoneill in Irland (p. 53),
    for þe langar leuear of þe vncle and nephew (p. 159),

b) be Kyng Henry the vij. testament (p. 27),
    the maner of Kyng Henry þe viij. proceding at þis tyme and his deidis
    (p. 39),
    þe childring quhilk come of Erle Dauid of Huntingtoun thre dochteris
    (p. 113).[27]

---

[25] In examples such as *in Brutus and his thre sonnis tyme* (p. 63), it is not possible to establish whether the first element is inflected or not, since *Brutus* occurs both as the base and as the genitive form.

[26] *Pithagoras* is an instance of zero genitive, since it ends in a sibilant.

[27] The evidence found in *Ane Resonyng* seems to refute Janda's claim that 'the spread of the *group* genitive exactly parallels the spread of the *his* genitive' (1980: 250): whereas the first construction is the rule in this work, the second is absent. As previously mentioned, this seems to apply not only to *Ane Resonyng* but to Middle Scots in general, since the *his*-genitive seems to have been rare in this variety.

3 DOUBLE GENITIVE

The double genitive, with the inflection and the *of*-periphrasis, is first found in the thirteenth century (see Fischer (1992: 232) and Mustanoja (1960: 165–66)). It can often be interpreted as partitive (*a friend of his (friends)*), and that is the reason why Fischer (1992), among many scholars, points out the partitive or 'ablating' origin of this construction: something taken out of a larger set.[28] A partitive interpretation, however, is often impossible after a demonstrative (*that courage of his*), and therefore, Altenberg (1982: 71), following Jespersen (1926), regards the double genitive as an appositive construction, so that *a friend of John's* is interpreted as *a friend who is John's (friend)*.

For the latter half of the sixteenth century den Breejen mentions some stylistic 'constraints' in the use of the construction. According to this author, the double genitive seems to have become so popular that 'many writers began to avoid it in more or less "formal" English' (p. 154).[29] Thus, whereas Latimer, Lever, Ascham and Bacon have very few instances of the double genitive, the informal prose of Hakluyt's collection of voyages abounds with them (p. 155). In that period, moreover, a distinction seems to have been made between 'of + Gen.' (*a friend of John's*) and 'of + poss. pron.' (*a friend of his*), the latter being considered less colloquial than the former (pp. 154–55).[30]

Altenberg (1982: 71), on the other hand, mentions three syntactic constraints on the use of the double genitive which seem to apply to PdE as well: a) the head must be indefinite (unless accompanied by a restrictive modification: *the friend of John's that you met yesterday*), b) the modifier must be definite, and c) the relation between both must be subjective. The three constraints are well illustrated in his corpus. Thus, in all the examples found, the genitive is subjective and in the majority (28/32 ex.) the head is indefinite (p. 71). In two of the remaining instances the head is preceded by a demonstrative (*this dotage of our Generals, this speede of Caesars*), and in the other two by the definite article (*the Jacke of Caesars, with the finest Side-saddle of any Womans in the Ward*) (p. 72).

---

[28] She claims that in the earliest ME examples the partitive interpretation is still obvious: the head word could be omitted since it refered to part of someone's property or household. That explains why the double genitive could occur with the definite article in this period (Fischer 1992: 232).

[29] In ME, however, it was relatively frequent in the legal language of the wills (Fischer 1992: 232).

[30] As an argument in favour of that distinction, den Breejen (1937: 155) points out: in some collections of letters: the Egerton Papers, the Stiffkey papers and especially in the Leicester Correspondence, which seem to represent the spoken language most nearly, the 'of + Gen.' type far exceeds its parallel in number.

The construction with the demonstrative is also found in PdE. It begins to occur, according to Kisbye (1972: 117), in late Middle English and is especially frequent in emotionally coloured contexts. The examples with the definite article, however, are unacceptable in PdE. They cannot be regarded as lapses, but rather as evidence that the double genitive in eModE was not so restricted as nowadays, despite Traugott's claim that 'from the first it has been limited to constructions with indefinite heads' (1972: 129). Thus, examples with the definite article are also quoted by den Breejen, who lists 21 instances of that structure for the latter half of the sixteenth century:[31]

> the monasterie of Saint Iohns,
> the most Honorable Privie Counsell of your Majesties,
> the churches of Westminster and Powles,
> the Elizabeth of M. Wattes was discharged,
> the Westerne Navigations and travailes of ours,
> the said messengers of yours,
> ...cary tents with them after the fashion of ours (pp. 148–49).

The situation found in *Ane Resonyng* is similar to that described by den Breejen and Altenberg. There are only three instances of the double genitive, one with an indefinite and two with a definite head. Of these two, the noun is preceded by a demonstrative in one case, and by the definite article in the other:

> cast doun nyn or ten castellis and haldis of his sistir-sonis (p. 31),
> how was this sone of Dauidis namit (p. 93),
> amangis vthir thingis we haue þe solempnit act and judiciale process of Kyng Edwardis þe First (p. 141).[32]

4   GENITIVE VS. *OF*-PERIPHRASIS

In Old English the position of the noun inflected for genitive was not fixed, and it could occur before or after the noun it modified. According to Mustanoja (1960: 176), the front position prevailed with proper names and personal nouns, that is, with those nouns that nowadays favour the genitive con-struction. The postpositive genitive, favoured with non-personal nouns, gradually became more and more restricted: whereas at the end of the tenth century it made up about a third of the genitive constructions in the written documents of the time, in the following two centuries its frequency decreased quickly and by the middle of the thirteenth century it had almost

---

[31]   Den Breejen (1937: 149) adds in a footnote:
        at the present day it is very unusual for 'the' to precede 'of + Gen. (poss. pron.)'. That is why some more examples of the definite article have been given.

[32]   Cf. the use of the *of*-construction in *for na requeist of þe guid-sone* (p.23).

disappeared, replaced by an analytic construction consisting of a NP preceded by *of* (Berndt 1989: 124).

The *of*-periphrasis goes back to Old English, when the preposition develops new uses from its original local meaning 'out of' which are similar to those of the genitive inflection, a process comparable to that taking place in Latin with the preposition *de* (Mustanoja 1960: 74). *Of* is especially frequent in Old English in partitive constructions (*dō mē swā ænne of þīnum ierðlinჳum; ðær wæron sume of ðæm bōcerum sittende*). In the course of the Middle English period, the *of*-periphrasis becomes more and more frequent and can be used to express almost all the relations expressed by the genitive inflection, coming to replace it in some of its original functions, such as the partitive genitive, the descriptive genitive and the genitive of definition. In the remaining functions both the synthetic and the analytic constructions can be found, although, according to Berndt (1989: 125), there is a growing tendency in the course of the Middle English period for inanimate nouns to be constructed with the *of*-periphrasis.

With regard to the structural differences between the synthetic and the analytic constructions, the former (N1's N2) consists of two NPs: N2 is the main one, and N1, which is inflected for genitive, is subordinated to N2 and functions as a determinative (ie. as a definite determiner).[33] Therefore, any element placed before N1 refers to the head of that phrase rather than to the head of N2.[34] In the *of*-periphrasis (N2 of N1), however, the main NP precedes the subordinate one, which acts as a postmodifier. In this construction, moreover, N2 may be either definite or indefinite.[35]

These features, established by Quirk et al. (1985) for PdE, apply, in general, to *Ane Resonyng*. However, in *þe Ingland kyngis superiorite in Scotland* (p. 55; 'the superiority of the kings of England in Scotland') we find a construction which would be ungrammatical in PdE.[36] This NP contains two genitive constructions (neither, however, is marked for genitive: the first being a proper noun and the second a plural noun) and its underlying structure is, therefore, N1's N2's N3. The definite article *þe*

---

[33]   There are two constructions, however, in which the NP inflected for genitive does not function as a determinative, but as a modifier: the descriptive genitive (*a girls' school*) and the genitive of measure (*an hour's delay*) (Quirk et al. 1985: 1276).

[34]   One exception arises when a predeterminer (*all, both* or *half*) precedes N1, since it may refer to the head of N1 [[*both the girls'*] *success*] or to the head of N2 [*both* [*the girl's*] *parents*] (Quirk et al. 1985: 327).

[35]   Thus, whereas [1] and [2] correspond to [1a] and [2a] respectively, [3] has no correspondent genitive construction:
        [1] *the funnel of the ship* → [1a] *the ship's funnel*
        [2] *the funnel of a ship* → [2a] *a ship's funnel*
        [3] *a funnel of the ship*

[36]   We would say instead *the English kings' superiority in Scotland*.

cannot qualify N1 (*Ingland*) and, therefore, must be interpreted as modifying N2 (*kyngis*) or N3 (*superiorite*). It may be an error, however, since this is a complex structure, containing a sequence of genitives, and infrequent in *Ane Resonyng*. Thus, although there are more examples in this work, as:

> the refusall of þe kyngis rebellis randering (p. 15),

in most cases Lamb combines both the analytic and the synthetic constructions, as in:

> þe puissance of his nephewis realme (p. 41),
> in vij. or viij. ʒeris persecutioun and scheddin of his awin subdittis bluid (p. 45),
> þe executouris of Kyng Edgaris testament (p. 79).[37]

With regard to the variation between the genitive construction and the *of*-periphrasis, the conditioning factors which apply in PdE are, in general, those established by Altenberg (1982) for seventeenth-century English: syntactic, lexical, relational and communicative. He also mentions phonetic and morphological factors, and explains that, 'in grammatically "neutral" contexts, nouns ending in a sibilant and regular plurals tend to promote the analytic construction, the first for reasons of euphony, the second to prevent ambiguity' (p. 299).

The syntactic constraints are not so powerful as the others (lexical, relational and communicative), and may be seen in the genitive preference in cases in which the head is complex (containing a postmodifying *of*-phrase or an apposition), and the preference for the analytic construction in cases where the modifier is complex (p. 298). The lexical factors are much more important: the genitive being generally preferred with animate nouns, especially with human individual nouns, and the *of*-periphrasis with inanimate nouns.[38] Their conditioning effect is especially clear at the inanimate end of the gender scale, where the *of*-construction is practically obligatory, except for quantifying expressions (*half a yeares time*), combinations with *for ... sake*, and, occasionally, temporal structures (*yesterday's foolery*) and combinations with *end* and *side* (p. 297).[39]

---

[37]   In some other cases there are sequences of *of*-periphrasis, as in *the contemptioun of þe slauchtir of þe Finnekis* (pp. 15–17).

[38]   There is, however, considerable variation within these broad categories. Within animate nouns, for example, the genitive is strongly preferred by human individual nouns (66%), relatively common with animal nouns (44%), but rejected by collective nouns (10%). Within inanimate nouns, on the other hand, abstract nouns have a higher genitive frequency (8%) than concrete ones (1%). [The percentages refer to prose.] (Altenberg 1982: 124).

[39]   Den Breejen (1937: 50ff) gives more than 170 examples of genitives with inanimate nouns. A great number of these are found in combination with *end, side* and *sake* and with nouns denoting time. In many other cases the nouns belong to 'the nautical language of the time'

The relational factors are also very important, objective constructions strongly promoting the *of*-periphrasis, even with animate nouns. A subjective relation has a weaker conditioning effect (in the direction of the genitive)[40] and often gives way to more powerful factors, such as animateness, so that inanimate nouns tend to select the analytic construction regardless of the subjective/objective relation (p. 298).[41]

Within communicative factors, the thematic organisation has an important conditioning effect, the genitive construction being favoured when the head has a higher communicative value than the modifier (i.e. when it contains new information), and the *of*-periphrasis when the distribution of given and new information within the phrase is the reverse (p. 299). With regard to the stylistic factors, the genitive is preferred in informal (i.e. private, intimate and personal) texts dealing with non-specialised (conversational, everyday) topics, and the *of*-construction in formal (i.e. public, distant, impersonal) texts with a specialised (religious, political, literary) subject-matter (p. 299).[42]

Of all these conditioning factors, the most powerful constraints are an inanimate (especially concrete) noun and an objective relation (both promoting the analytic construction), and the quantifying expressions and the *for … sake* combination (both favouring the synthetic construction) (p. 300).

In *Ane Resonyng* phonetic factors (i.e. nouns ending in a sibilant) do not seem to promote the *of*-periphrasis, but rather the zero genitive. Morphological factors, on the other hand, are not an important constraint on the choice of the construction in this work: although in some cases the *of*-periphrasis is found with regularly formed plural nouns (*þe homagis of ȝour princis* (p. 149)), the genitive is frequent, as the following examples illustrate:

> þe disapoynting of þe tway kyngis meting (p. 15),
> our Wardanis proclamatioun (p. 49),
> greit princis deidis (p. 149),

---

or are names of weapons.
[40] The only subjective construction that invariably selects the genitive in Altenberg's corpus is gerundive nominalisations (*the doctor's marrying my daughter*).
[41] Den Breejen also states that the *of*-periphrasis is 'far oftener used' than the genitive in subjective relations (p. 28). The synthetic construction is found, however, in his corpus with inanimate nouns such as *summer, winter, sun, nature, life, soul, reson, heart, ship, water, countrey, treatie, letter, clemencie*, etc. With proper names and nouns denoting persons, authors such as Hakluyt, Nashe, Greene, Lever, Lyly and Sidney seem to prefer the genitive, whereas Bacon, Ascham, Latimer and Awdeley seem to favour the analytic construction (p. 176). With regard to the objective constructions, he offers about 140 instances of the genitive with animate nouns and about 40 with inanimate nouns and, therefore, states that, although most of these relations were expressed by the *of*-periphrasis, 'Tudor English is much richer in objective genitives than has often been supposed' (p. 177).
[42] The analytic construction is particularly favoured in religious, especially biblical, prose.

þe auld philosophouris opinionis (p. 171).

With regard to the syntactic and thematic factors, the *of*-periphrasis is frequently found in *Ane Resonyng* when the modifier is complex or has a higher communicative value, as in the following examples:

> ane resonyng of Scottis and Inglis merchand (p. 3),
> be solistatioun of þe Erle of Kildare and Odoneill in Irland (p. 53),
> carfulnes of ʒour Kyng Henrie the viii (p. 157).

Nonetheless, the genitive, both with and without inflection, is also frequent with these constructions (see 1.2 and 2). The following example is especially revealing in that both the analytic and the synthetic construction appear juxtaposed: *xxiiij. ʒeiris in þe tym of Kyng Henrie þe vij., and also in Kyng Henrie þe viij. tym xxj. ʒeiris* (p. 153).

Ane Resonyng follows the pattern described by Altenberg for the lexical factors, the genitive being generally preferred with animate nouns, and the *of*-periphrasis with inanimate nouns. The former, however, is a weaker constraint than the latter, as is shown by the variation found with proper nouns other than *God*:[43]

> eftir Christis natiuitie (p. 67) vs. eftir þe natiuitie of Christ (p. 63);
> eftir Edgaris deceiss (p. 79) vs. þe deceiss of Macolme (p. 87), the deceis of his sone Dauid (p. 129).

Inanimate nouns promote the *of*-construction (a), except for quantifying expressions, which favour the genitive (b):

> a)   þe moneth of Julij (pp. 5, 15),
>   þe examinatioun of þe mater (p. 147),
>   þe tennour of þe forsaid instrument (p. 147),
>
> b)   þis forsaid ʒeiris homage (p. 91),
>   the perfite ending of xc ʒeiris strife (p. 113).

With a few inanimate nouns there is variation, although the analytic construction is more frequent. As in Altenberg's corpus, most of them are geographical names, the genitive having a locative function:

> a)   Scotlandis propriete (p. 125),
>   Scotlandis consent þarto (p. 147),
>   þe Ingland kyngis (p. 55),

---

[43]   The proper noun *God* tends to promote the *of*-periphrasis, especially in religious prose. The following examples occur in *Ane Resonyng*:
> be þe justnes of God (p. 51);
> be provitioun of God (p. 63);
> be þe werkis of God (p. 155).

Collective nouns also favour the analytic construction in this work, as in Altenberg's corpus:
> þe origin of Israelite peopill (p. 63);
> þe welcht and insolence of Inglis court (p. 167);
> þe excessius obedience of Inglis nobilitie (p. 167).

    b)   the heretrice of Scotland (p. 35),
           þe superiorite of Scotland (p. 113),
           fra þe propreitie of Scotland (p. 127),
           þe realme of Ingland (p. 151),
           nobilite of Ingland (p. 161).

Two other inanimate nouns, *war* and *book*, are found in this work with both the genitive and the *of*-periphrasis, the former being especially frequent:

    a)   ʒour buik vpone/of this weris declaratioun (pp. 73 (2x), 79),
           þe buik vpone þe weris declaratioun (pp. 75, 131),
           þe buik selff on þir weris declaratioun (p. 167),
           ʒour buikis calculatioun (p. 111),

    b)   þe/ane buik vpoun þe declaratioun of þis (present/instant)
           weir (pp. 5, 7, 21, 165, 167),
           in his Declaratioun of Weir (p. 151),
           þe calculatioun of ʒour buik (p. 111).

Relational factors are also important, subjective constructions favouring the genitive and objective constructions the *of*-periphrasis, as the following examples illustrate:

    a)   our quene heretrice mariage with our nobill kyng Edwart (pp. 7–9),
           This is þe vncles conducing of þe nepot to possessioun of reale
              estait (p. 33),[44]
           our kyngis hunting at þat tyme (p. 43),
           our Wardanis proclamatioun (p. 49),
           Inglis mennis incursionis (p. 81),
           Polidorus calculing (p. 99),
           Scotlandis consent þarto (p. 147),

    b)   the birning of Jedburgh abbay and castellis (p. 31),
           the mantenyng of þe Scottis nobillis fugitiveis (p. 33),
           the spuilʒe of ʒour kirkis, the extorsioun of þe ʒemanrie
              and gentillmen (p. 35),
           in greit contempnyng of our kyngis maiestie (p. 35),
           þe crowning of Edward Balliol (p. 121),
           þe image of þe Conqueror (p. 83).

There are some cases, however, in which the reverse situation is found, the *of*-periphrasis occurring with subjective relations and the genitive with objective ones. The majority of these (genitives) occur in combinations with animate nouns, which indicates the importance of the lexical factor:

    a)   This Carris slauchtir (p. 23),
           þe maner of Sterrettis heid-cutting and also convoying
              fra Durhame (p. 23),
           for this legacyis detentioun (p. 25),
           Annas heding (p. 41),

---

[44]   This instance combines both constructions: the genitive for the subjective relation and the *of*-periphrasis for the objective one.

this is provin be Schir Robert Bowis talkin[45] at Haldan Rig (p. 51),
Edwardis coronatioun (p. 109),

b)   the ryding and spuilʒeis of prevate Scottis and Inglis (p. 51),
     þe insurrectioun of þe commonis (p. 53),
     þis present homage of Kyng Alexander (p. 105),
     þe excessius obedience of Inglis nobilitie (p. 167).

5   CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the genitive in
Ane Resonyng. The study reveals, on the one hand, the wider number of
options available in the sixteenth century, since structures going back to
Old English and lost nowadays, such as the split genitive, were still found.
Intermediate constructions between those of Old English and those which
have replaced them also occurred, such as those which shared features with
both the split and the group genitive. Finally, PdE constructions such as the
group or the double genitive were also found, although their use was not so
restricted as nowadays: the former, for instance, was frequent with
coordinated elements and the latter with definite heads.

Another important conclusion is that, despite the existing variety, the
usage is quite modern: the group genitive, for instance, is more frequent in
Ane Resonyng than the intermediate structures between it and the split
genitive, and the conditioning factors that govern the choice between the
synthetic and the analytic constructions in this work are basically those of
PdE (lexical (animateness), relational (subjective/objective structures),
syntactic and stylistic).

Finally, by comparing the results drawn from the analysis of *Ane
Resonyng* and other contemporary Scottish texts with Altenberg's study,
this paper has revealed some differences between Scots and southern
literary English with regard to this construction, such as the use of the zero
genitive in Scots with both proper names (*Tuball Cain werkis*) and complex
noun phrases (*in Kyng Henry þe viij. tyme*), or the near absence of the *his*-
genitive in this variety.[46] Other differences, however, seem to be due to
diachronic rather than diatopic reasons, as comparison with den Breejen's
study reveals. That is the case, for example, in the higher frequency in *Ane
Resonyng* of group genitives with coordinated elements. Finally, both

---

[45]   *Talkin* is a reverse spelling for *taking*.

[46]   Scots is opposed here to southern literary English. Northern English shares with Scots a
       higher frequency of uninflected or zero genitives.
       Polidor is the regular base form of this noun in *Ane Resonyng*: 'Polidor in his xij. buik
       sayis' (p. 93), 'as Polidor says' (pp. 93–95), 'betuix Polidor and ʒour buik' (p. 95), etc. Only
       in one instance *Polidorus* is found in that function: 'Polidorus, cullerand this humane deid
       of Edward the Thrid, sayis ...' (p. 121).

diachronic and diatopic reasons seem to account for the higher rate of occurrences in this work of zero genitives with nouns ending in a sibilant.

To conclude, other detailed studies of these constructions in contemporary Scottish prose texts are needed in order to establish whether the situation found in *Ane Resonyng* with regard to the genitive is the norm in sixteenth-century Scots or whether there are differences depending on genre or text-type.

REFERENCES

Allen, Cynthia L., 1998. 'Genitives and the Creolization Question'. *English Language and Linguistics* 2 (1). 129–35.

Altenberg, B., 1982. *The Genitive v. the of-Construction. A Study of Syntactic Variation in 17th-Century English.* Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Berndt, Rolf, 1989. *A History of the English Language.* Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Breejen, B., 1937. *The Genitive and its of-Equivalent in the Latter Half of the Sixteenth Century.* Amsterdam: H. J. Paris.

Burrow, J. A. and T. Turville-Petre, 1992. *A Book of Middle English.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Craigie, William, and A.J. Aitken, eds., 1931–2002. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth.* Chicago: U of Chicago P; London: Oxford UP.

Fischer, Olga, 1992. 'Syntax'. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language.* Vol. II: *1066-1476.* Norman Blake, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 207–408.

García García, Luisa, 2000. 'A Survey of the Historical Evolution of the Genitive and the *Of*-Construction in English'. In *Perspectives on the Genitive in English: Synchronic, Diachronic, Contrastive and Research.* A. Bruton, L. García García and J.J. Fernández Domínguez, eds. Universidad de Sevilla: Secretariado de Publicaciones. 51–85.

Görlach, Manfred, 1993. *Introduction to Early Modern English.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Janda, Richard D., 1980. 'On the Decline of Declensional Systems: The Overall Loss of OE Nominal Case Inflections and the Middle English Reanalysis of *-es* as *his*'. In *Papers from the 4th International Conference on Historical Linguistics.* Elizabeth Closs Traugott *et al.* eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 243–52.

Jespersen, O., 1926. 'On some Disputed Points in English Grammar'. *S.P.E. tracts* 25. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Johnson, S., 1755. *A Dictionary of the English Language.* London. Rpr. London: Times Books. 1983.

King, Anne, 1997. 'The Inflectional Morphology of Older Scots'. In *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language.* Charles Jones ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP. 156–81.

Kisbye, Torben, 1972. *An Historical Outline of English.* Part II. *Syntax.* Akademisk Boghandel.

Kuipers, C.H., 1964. 'Kennedy's Language'. In *Quintin Kennedy 1520–1564: Two Eucharistic Tracts. A Critical Edition.* Nijmegen: Drukkerij. 75–103.

Lyall, Roderick J., ed. 1985. *William Lamb. Ane Resonyng of ane Scottis and Inglis Merchand betuix Rowand and Lionis.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP.

Macafee, Caroline, 1992/93. 'A Short Grammar of Older Scots', *Scottish Language* 11/12. 10–36.

—— 2002. 'A History of Scots to 1700'. In *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* Vol. 12. Marace G. Dareau, Lorna Pike and Harry D. Watson, eds. Oxford: Oxford UP. xxix-clvii.

Meurman-Solin, Anneli, 1993. *Variation and Change in Early Scottish Prose. Studies Based on the Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Murray, James A.H., 1873. *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland.* London: Philological Society.

Mustanoja, T.F., 1960. *A Middle English Syntax.* Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.

Quirk, Randolph *et al.*, 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London and New York: Longman.

Salmon, Vivian, 1987. 'Sentence Structures in Colloquial Shakespearian English'. In *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama.* Vivian Salmon and Edwina Burness, eds. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 265–300.

Sheppard, E.A., 1936. 'Studies in the Language of Bellenden's *Boece*'. Dissertation, University of London.

Smith, G. Gregory, 1902. 'Introduction.' In *Specimens of Middle Scots.* Edinburgh: William Blackwood. xi–lxxv.

Stewart, A.M., ed., 1979. *The Complaynt of Scotland.* Edinburgh: The Scottish Text Society.

Traugott, Elizabeth, 1972. *The History of English Syntax.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Van Buuren, C., 1982. 'Introduction'. In *The Buke of the Sevyne Sagis.* Leiden: Leiden UP. 1–130.

Universidad de Sevilla