The Information Status of Old English Constructions with Titles and Proper Names*

Elżbieta Sielanko-Byford

Centre for Foreign Language Teacher Training and European Education of the University of Warsaw, Poland

Abstract

The paper examines the information status of Old English structures consisting of proper names and titles. The nominal constructions under discussion fall into three categories: the *Ælfred cyning* type of structure, where the title appears without any determiner and follows the proper name, the *Ælfred se cyning* type, where the title appears with a determiner and follows the proper name, and the *se cyning Ælfred* type, where the title with a determiner precedes the proper name. It is demonstrated that the *se cyning Ælfred* construction is mainly used anaphorically: an overwhelming majority of the examples of the structure in the Old English texts examined here refer back to an entity mentioned in the preceding discourse. Moreover, most of the antecedents of the *se cyning Ælfred* structures appear to be local, that is they occur in the same or in the immediately preceding structural unit. It is argued that the anaphoric nature of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions may be responsible for their distribution in Old English texts.

Keywords: information status, discourse, Discourse-old, Discourse-new, anaphors, Inferrables, antecedent

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to investigate the information status of Old English structures consisting of proper names and titles.

Old English texts such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* abound in constructions in which one element is a proper name and the other one a common noun which, as a rule, denotes rank or title. In such structures the name either precedes or follows the common noun. When the name precedes the common noun, the noun

---

can appear with or without a determiner (cf. Carlton 1970: 50 and Mitchell 1985: § 1461). When the name follows the common noun, the noun is always accompanied by a determiner.[1] We thus have three kinds of structure with proper names, which we can call respectively the *Ælfred cyning*, *Ælfred se cyning* and *se cyning Ælfred* types. All three types are usually regarded as appositions (see, for instance, Mitchell 1985, Peltola 1960, Shannon 1964, Shores 1971, or Sprockel 1973). However, the first of the three structure types is argued not to be appositional in Sielanko-Byford (2013).

Scholars doubt whether we will ever be able to discover the difference in meaning and function between the three construction types, since this is impossible without native speaker informants (see Mitchell 1985: §§ 1462 and 1463). Our insufficient knowledge of the addressee of Old English texts as well as the lack of native speaker informants may well prevent us from ever discovering any differences in meaning between the constructions. The texts themselves, however, should provide enough clues as to some possible differences in the use of the structures in discourse. For instance, there might have been a preference for using one construction to introduce a new referent into the discourse. Another construction might have been preferred when the referent had been mentioned or implied before. In other words, there may have been some – potentially important – differences between the information status of the three construction types. And the question of whether such differences existed and, if so, what they were, is precisely what this paper aims to find out.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we examine the information status of the three construction types, in Section 3 structures which have an antecedent earlier in the discourse are considered more closely, Section 4 is devoted to constructions without an antecedent which are, however, linked to a 'trigger' entity that appears earlier in the discourse. In Section 5 conclusions and implications for further research are presented.

1.1. The data

The Old English data used in this article were drawn from the following texts in the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*: Manuscripts A and E of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Old English Orosius* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*.

All our data come from the texts in the 2000 Release of the Dictionary of Old English (=DOE). The texts of *Chronicle* A and *Chronicle* E used in the 2000 Release of the DOE are from the edition by Earle and Plummer. In the online version of the DOE they were later replaced by Bately's (1986) edition of Manuscript A and Irvine's (2004) edition of Manuscript E.

---

[1]   The term 'determiner' in relation to the Old English *se* 'the/that', is used pre-theoretically here. It is irrelevant to our analysis what the exact status of *se* was, namely whether it was a demonstrative or a 'true' determiner in the sense of, for example, Giusti (1997).

2. Information status of Old English constructions with titles and proper names

2.1. *Different types of information status*

Prince (1992) distinguishes between different kinds of 'old/new' information:

> discourse entities may be considered old or new with respect to the hearer, or Hearer-old/Hearer-new. Second, they may be considered old or new with respect to the discourse, or Discourse-old/Discourse-new. […] Third, discourse entities may be of a third category, Inferrable, where they are technically Hearer-new and Discourse-new, but depend upon beliefs assumed to be Hearer-old, and where these beliefs crucially involve some trigger entity […].
>
> (Prince 1992: 309)

In the case of Old English texts, it might not be easy to decide which entities should be regarded as Hearer-old and which as Hearer-new. As Traugott and Pintzuk (2008: 75) state, 'it must always be recalled that our access to the information status of ancient texts will be limited [among others] by the impossibility of fully understanding the encyclopedic knowledge of authors and audiences in the past.' They also point out that

> work on information status relies on inferences about what addressees may be expected to treat as 'shared' information […], and these inferences are less robustly recovered for a society that flourished over a millennium ago. […]. [Therefore,] we must pay close attention to the discourse context in order to make reasonable interpretations. In other words, we are more reliant on textual evidence than may be customary for analyzing information structure in contemporary languages […].
>
> (Traugott and Pintzuk 2008: 63)

Our inability to predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy what constituted the 'encyclopedic' knowledge or 'shared' information for writers and (intended) readers of Old English texts will make identifying an entity as Hearer-old or Hearer-new a difficult task. For the same reason, it will not always be easy, either, to identify a discourse entity as an Inferrable. However, we should be able to decide quite easily which entities in an Old English text are Discourse-old and which are Discourse-new.

What Prince (1992) calls Discourse-old entities, that is entities for which an antecedent can be found in prior text, are usually called anaphora in other sources (e.g. Huang 2006, Schwarz-Friesel 2007, Strube 2007, see also Traugott and Pintzuk 2008). They are, more precisely, 'direct' anaphora and can be distinguished from 'indirect' anaphora. Indirect anaphors have no explicit antecedent in the preceding text but are linked to a 'trigger' entity, or anchor, which has already been evoked in the discourse (see Schwarz-Friesel 2007: 7-8). Schwarz-Friesel (2007: 7) argues that the term 'indirect anaphora' is more general than terms such as 'inferrables' or 'associative anaphors', because not all indirect anaphors are based on inferences and not many are the result of an activation of associations. However, the type of relationship between the trigger entity and the anaphor is not relevant to our study. Therefore, the term indirect anaphora will be used as an alternative to Prince's (1992) term 'Inferrables' in this paper.

2.2. Information status of the se cyning Ælfred costructions

Let us now examine the constructions in which the proper name follows the title in respect of their information status. For reasons outlined in Section 2.1 above, we have concentrated on their discourse status and identified them as either Discourse-old or Discourse-new. We have also attempted to identify Inferrables.

The data for the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions are presented in the four tables below. The first three tables show data for each of the three texts which are the sources of our Old English data, namely *Orosius*, *Bede* and the *Chronicle*. The fourth table shows the figures for all three texts. Table 1 and the following tables include data for the structures in which the common noun was preceded either by the determiner *se* alone or by *se* and a pre-modifying adjective.

Table 4 shows that only about 6 percent of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions are Discourse-new. The remaining 94 percent are either Discourse-old or Inferrable, in other words, they are – respectively – direct and indirect anaphors. This suggests that *se cyning Ælfred* constructions are anaphoric in nature.

As for the Discourse-new constructions, 4 out of the 10.5 such structures which occur in Bede's *History*, are in the *Preface*. The first one of those, 2/1 *ðone leofastan cyning Ceolwulf* 'the-acc.masc.sg. dearest king Ceolwuld', appears in the greeting at the very beginning of the *Preface*

Table 1: *Se cyning Ælfred constructions in Orosius*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	6	2	0
consul	2.5*	0	1.5
cwen	3	0	0
casere	1	0	0
latteow	1	0	0
Total	13.5	2	1.5
	(including 5. 5 constructions with adjectives)		(including 0.5 constructions with adjectives)

* Halves appear whenever a plural construction contains two proper names, one of which is Discourse-old and the other Discourse-new or Inferrable.

Table 2: *Se cyning Ælfred constructions in Bede*

	Discourse-Old	Discourse-New
cyning	9.5	2.5
biscop	26	2
papa	12	2
abbud	5	2
arcebiscop	6	0
casere	2	0
cwen	0	1
(mæsse)preost	0	1
ealdormon	1	0
Total	61.5	10.5
	(includes 43 constructions with adjectives)	(includes 4 constructions with adjectives)

Table 3: *Se cyning Ælfred constructions in the Chronicle*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	E: 122	E: 1	E: 0
	A: 6	A: 0	A: 0
eorl	E: 24	E: 0	E: 3
	A: 2	A: 0	A: 0
biscop	E: 16	E: 0	E: 2
	A: 1	A: 1	A:0
ærcebiscop	E: 15	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
ealdorman	E: 3	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 0
abbod	E: 13	E: 1	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
æðeling	E: 4	E: 2	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
papa	E: 8	E: 2	E: 1
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 1
cwen	E: 3	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
casere	E: 1	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 0
Total	E: 209	E: 6	E: 7
	(includes 12 constructions with adjectives)	A: 1 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)	(includes 1 construction with an adjective)
	A:12 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)		A: 1 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)

Table 4: *Se cyning Ælfred constructions in Orosius, Bede and the Chronicle*

Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New	Total
296 (c. 91%)	9 (c. 3%)	20 (c. 6%)	325

and refers to king Ceolwuld, who is the addressee of the letter. It can thus be regarded as a deictic expression in the same way that the phrase which opens the *Preface* is, namely 2/1 *Ic Beda Cristes þeow and mæssepreost* 'I, Bede, Christ's servant and priest'. The structure 2/1 *ðone leofastan cyning Ceolwulf* 'the-acc.masc.sg. dearest king Ceolwuld', then, is an exophor, 'the 'antecedent' of [which] […] lies outside what is said or written' (Huang 2006: 231). The other three Discourse-new constructions which appear in the Preface, that is 2/16 *se arwurða abbad Albinus* 'the-nom.masc.sg. venerable abbot Albinus', 2/22 *þæs eadigan papan Sancte Gregories* 'the-gen.masc.sg. blessed-gen.masc.sg. pope-gen.masc.sg. Saint-gen.masc.sg. Gregory-gen.masc.sg.', and 4/22 *ðæs arwurðan biscopes Cynebyrhtes* 'the-gen.masc.sg. venerable-gen.masc.sg. bishop-gen.masc.sg. Cynebyrht-gen.masc.sg.', all refer to well-known figures of the day and as such can most probably be assumed to be known to the addressee, in other words Hearer-old. Pope Gregory the Great is without a doubt the most important and well-known pope of the Middle Ages. Moreover, he is also the pope who sent St Augustine and his monks to the kingdom of Kent with the mission of bringing Christianity to the Anglo-Saxons. We can be

certain, therefore, that although it was Discourse-new, the translator of the Latin text of *Historia Ecclesiastica* must have assumed the structure *þæs eadigan papan Sancte Gregories* to constitute old information, as it was Hearer-old. Abbot Albinus of Canterbury, who encouraged Bede to write the *History*, is called *betst gelæred on Angelcynne* 'the best scholar in England' in the Old English version of the text. Moreover, a letter to the same abbot Albinus accompanied the original version of *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Bishop Cynebyrht was Bishop of Lindsey at the time when Bede was writing his *History*. He was also one of Bede's sources of information for *Historia Ecclesiastica*. We can thus assume that the translator would have presented both *se arwurða abbad Albinus* and *ðæs arwurðan biscopes Cynebyrhte* as Hearer-old.

Most of the referents of the remaining 6.5 Discourse-new structures in *Bede*, all of which occur in Chapter Headings, are kings, popes, abbots or bishops with whom the addressee was probably familiar. Nevertheless, as has been mentioned, we cannot be completely sure about what constituted either the encyclopedic or 'shared' knowledge of 'authors and audiences from the past' and thus we cannot say with absolute certainty that the structures in question are Hearer-old. On the other hand, since they are all used in Chapter Headings, which precede, but at the same time, sum up a given chapter, the constructions can be regarded as cataphoric, similarly to definite noun phrases used in the titles of novels, plays, films, etc. in Modern English (e.g. *The Secret Agent, The Crucible, The Pianist* and so on). Cataphora, together with anaphora, 'can be subsumed under the term 'endophora' […], referring to the relation in which the anaphor/cataphor and its antecedent are within what is said or written' (Huang 2006: 231).

One of the 1.5 Discourse-new structures in *Orosius* also appears in Chapter Headings and can therefore be regarded as cataphoric. However, none of the 8 examples of the Discourse-new *se cyning Ælfred* structures in Manuscripts A and E of the *Chronicle* can be interpreted as either cataphoric or deictic. With the possible exception of one example (see below), there is no reason to believe, either, that they constituted 'old' information in the sense that they can be assumed to be old with respect to the hearer's beliefs. Does this mean, then, that unlike the overwhelming majority the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions they should be regarded as constituting 'new' information?

There is some evidence to suggest that at least some of the examples may not have been intended to represent new information. For example, where *Chronicle A* in the entry for the year 885 has an antecedentless structure, *se goda papa Marinus*, *Chronicles* E, C and D all have an anaphoric construction whose antecedent appears in the entry for 883 (884 in *Chronicles* C and D):

(1)   a. ChronA 885.28[2] *þy   ilcan   geare   forþferde   se   goda   papa   Marinus*
                        the   same   year   died   the   good   pope   Martin
                        'The same year the good pope, Martin, died,'[3]

where the structure *se goda papa Marinus* evokes an entity which has not been mentioned in the prior discourse,

---

[2]   The examples from the *Chronicle* are cited by Short Title (ChronA, ChronE) and year following edition (Earle and Plummer 1952). Long entries are also cited by line no. assigned by the DOE.

[3]   Unless otherwise stated, the translations are my own.

b. ChronE 885.17 (=D, C 886) *Ðy   ilcan   geare   forðferde   se   goda   papa   Marinus*
the   same   year   died   the   good   pope   Martin
'The same year the good pope, Martin, died,'

where the structure *se goda papa Marinus* refers back to an entity that has been evoked by *Marinus papa* in a previous entry:

c. ChronE 883.1 (=D, C884) *Marinus   papa   sende   þa   lignum   domini   Ælfrede   cynge*
Martin   pope   sent   then   lignum   domini   Alfred   king
'Pope Martin sent King Alfred the "lignum domini"'

As we can see, A is the only manuscript which omits the information about Pope Marinus in the entry for 883, thus leaving the construction *se goda papa Marinus* in the 885 entry without an antecedent. It seems reasonable to assume that the author(s) of the original text had intended the phrase *se goda papa Marinus* in 885 to be anaphoric and to refer back to *Marinus papa* in 883. However, through the omission of the relevant material in 883, the scribe responsible for the entries in question in Manuscript A may have accidentally left the structure without an antecedent. The structure *se goda papa Marinus* in ChronA 79(855) could also be interpreted as Hearer-old, since Marinus would have been pope during the lifetime of the compiler(s) of the 'first chronicle'.[4]

Two of the 'antecedentless' *se cyning Ælfred* structures in Chronicle E appear in the Peterborough Interpolations, which are post-1121 additions to Chronicle E. The first one of these is in the entry for the year 777:

(2)   ChronE 777.11 *At   þis   gewitnesse   wæs   seo   kining   Offa.   &   seo   kining   Egferð.*
at   this   testimony   was   the   king   Offa   and   the   king   Everth

&   seo   ærcebiscop   Hygeberht.   &   Ceolwulf   biscop.   [...]
and   the   archbishop   Hibbert   and   Ceolwulf   bishop

&   feola   oþre   biscopes   &   abbots
and   many   other   bishops   and   abbots

'King Offa, King Everth, Archbishop Hibbert, Bishop Ceolwulf, and many other bishops and abbots were witnesses to this'

Archbishop Hibbert appears again in *Chronicle* E (also in *Chronicles* D and C) in the annal for 785:

(3)   ChronE(=C, D) 785.1 *Ianberht   ercebiscop   forlet   sumne   dæl   his   biscopdomes.*
Eanbert   archbishop   forsook   some   part   his   bishopric

&   fram   Offan   cininge   Hygebriht   wes   gecoren
and   from   Offa   king   Hibbert   was   chosen

'Archbishop Eanbert resigned from some part of his bishopric and King Offa appointed Hibbert'

---

[4] It is generally agreed that the annals up until at least 890 belong to the first compilation. Some scholars consider either the annal for the year 891 or the one for 892 as the last entry in the 'original chronicle.' (see, for instance Bately 1985: 7-9).

A possible explanation for the antecedentless structure *seo ærcebiscop Hygeberht* is the following: the 'archbishop', like the two kings mentioned before him (King Offa and King Everth), is presented as an important figure, one of the key witnesses to the granting of land to a nobleman by Beonna, abbot of Medeshamstede (that is Peterborough). Being an important figure, the archbishop is obviously assumed to be well-known to the reader. It follows that the discourse entity that represents him can be assumed to constitute Hearer-old information. Hence the use of a *se cyning Ælfred* construction. By contrast, in the same entry constructions of the type *Ælfred cyning* are employed to refer to the less well-known men of the church who were also witnesses at the same event: *Ceolwulf biscop. & Inwona biscop. & Beonna abbot.*

The other Discourse-new structure which appears in an Interpolation, namely *se cining Burhred*, seems to have been used in the same way. The Mercian king is presented as the most important witness to the signing of an agreement between Abbot Ceolred and the monks of Medeshamstede and a person called Wulfred:

(4)   ChronE 852.9   *Her   wæs   wið   se   cining   Burhred.   &   Ceolred   ærcebiscop*   […]
                        here   was   with   the   king   Burhred   and   Ceolred   archbishop

                        &   Berhtred   biscop.   […]   *&   feola   oðre.*
                        and   Berhtre   bishop   and   many   others

                        'King Burhred, Archbishop Ceolred, Bishop Berhtre and many others were present'

Another Discourse-new entity in *Chronicle* E, namely *se eorl Walðeaf*, appears in the annal for 1069:

(5)   ChronE 1069.5   *þa   ferde   se   eorl   Walðeaf   ut.   &   com   he   &   Eadgar   æðeling*
                          then   went   the   earl   Waltheof   out   and   came   he   and   Edgar   prince
                          'Then Earl Waltheof rode out and he and Prince Edgar arrived'

Chronicle D gives the same information about the earl in the annal for 1068. However, an *Ælfred cyning* structure, namely *Waldþeof eorl*, is used to represent the Discourse-new entity:

(6)   ChronD 1068.29   *heom   com   þær   togenes   Eadgar   cild   &   Waldþeof   eorl*
                           them   came   there   against   Edgar   child   and   Waltheof   earl
                           'Prince Edgar and Earl Waltheof came [with an army] and faced them'

The next time the eorl is mentioned, in both *Chronicle* E and *Chronicle* D a *se cyning Ælfred* construction is used:

(7)   ChronE 1070.1 (=D 1071)   *Her   se   eorl   Walþeof   griðede   wið   þone   cyng.*
                                    here   the   earl   Waltheof   made peace   with   the   king
                                    'In this year Earl Waltheof made peace with the king'

The contrast between the two chronicles in the use of structures representing a Discourse-new entity in (5) and (6) above suggests that the *se cyning Ælfred* construction in *Chronicle* E might have been a mistake: the scribe may have overlooked the fact that the structure *se eorl Walðeaf* referred to an entity that had not been evoked before.

There seems to be no readily available explanation for the remaining 4 Discourse-new structures in Chronicle E.

Summing up, the vast majority of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions in all the texts that have been examined are used anaphorically, 91 percent are direct and 3 percent are indirect anaphors. The remaining 6 percent are Discourse-new. As we have seen, though, most of them are either cataphoric or deictic, or else can be interpreted as Hearer-old.

2.3. Information status of the *Ælfred se cyning* constructions

Let us now consider the information status of the *Ælfred se cyning* constructions in the texts of *Orosius,* Bede's *History* and the *Chronicle* (Manuscripts A and E). The data for each text are given in separate tables, namely in Tables 5, 6 and 7 below. Table 8 shows the combined data for all three texts. The tables include data for the structures in which the common noun was preceded either by *se* alone or by *se* and a pre-modifying adjective.

Table 8 shows that, in contrast to the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions, only 6 percent of which were Discourse-new, there are quite a few Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* structures – 26.9 percent of the total number of *Ælfred se cyning* structures in the three texts.

Table 5: *Ælfred se cyning structures in Orosius*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
consul	52,5	0	49,5
cyning	31	3	23
casere	10	0	4
cwene	1	0	3
latteow	0	0	2
ðegn	1	0	0
ealdormon	1	0	0
nunne	0	0	1
Total	96.5	3	82.5
	(includes 7 constructions with adjectives)		(includes 9 constructions with adjectives)

Table 6: *Ælfred se cyning structures in Bede's History*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	104	1	8
biscop	57	0	9
papa	11	4	4
abbud	9	2	1
abbudisse	2	0	2
arcebiscop	10	0	1
casere	13	0	6
cwen	6	2	0
(mæsse)preost	2	0	0
ealdorman	2	0	1
Total	216	9	32
	(includes 13 constructions with adjectives)	(includes 1 construction with an adjective)	(includes 10 constructions with adjectives)

Table 7: *Ælfred se cyning structures in the Chronicle*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	E: 4	E: 1	E: 2
	A: 2	A: 1	A: 1
eorl	E: 2	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
biscop	E: 2	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 2	A: 0	A: 1
ærcebiscop	E: 2	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 0
ealdorman	E: 0	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 1
abbod	E: 1	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
æðeling	E: 1	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 1
papa	E: 4	E: 2	E: 3
	A: 1	A: 1	A: 1
casere	E: 0	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 2
cwen	E: 2	E: 0	E: 0
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
þegn	E: 0	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
Total	E: 18 (includes 9 constructions with adjectives)	E: 3	E: 9 (includes 5 constructions with adjectives)
	A: 7 (includes 3 constructions with adjectives)	A: 2	A: 7 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)

Table 8: *Ælfred se cyning structures in Orosius, Bede and the Chronicle*

Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New	Total
337.5 (69.6%)	17 (3.5%)	130.5 (26.9%)	485

None of the 16 Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* structures in Manuscripts A and E of the *Chronicle* can be interpreted as either cataphoric or deictic. Neither do they seem likely to have been mistakes on the part of the scribes. Except for one example in *Chronicle* E, they all have Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* equivalents in other manuscripts.[5]

28 out of the 82.5 Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* constructions in the *Orosius* and 16 out of the 32 Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* structures in Bede's *History* appear in Chapter Headings. Therefore, for the reasons outlined in Section 2.2, they can be regarded as cataphors. This means that 44 out of 130.5 Discourse-new *Ælfred se cyning* structures in our texts, which is about 34 percent, can be interpreted as cataphoric.

---

[5]   The exception is *Chronicle* E 1066 *Harold se Norrena cyng*, where *Chronicles* C and D have 1066 *Harold cyning of Norwegan*.

Table 9: *Ælfred cyning constructions with titles in the Chronicle*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	E: 142	E: 1	E: 13
	A: 95	A: 0	A: 16
eorl	E: 78	E: 0	E: 22
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 11
biscop	E: 41	E: 0	E: 45
	A: 1 0	A: 0	A: 19
ærcebiscop	E: 55	E: 0	E: 8
	A: 22	A: 0	A: 5
ealdorman	E: 29	E: 0	E: 33
	A: 8	A: 0	A: 21
abbod	E: 13	E: 0	E: 18
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 7
æðeling	E: 11	E: 0	E: 7
	A: 1	A: 0	A: 4
papa	E: 10	E: 0	E: 3
	A: 3	A: 0	A: 3
(mæsse)preost	E: 2	E: 0	E: 6
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 6
cwen	E: 0	E: 0	E: 2
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 3
abboðessa	E: 0	E: 0	E: 1
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 1
munuc	E: 0	E: 0	E: 2
	A: 0	A: 0	A: 0
Total	E: 381	E: 1	E: 160
	A: 140	A: 0	A: 96

Table 10: *Ælfred cyning constructions with titles in Bede*

	Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New
cyning	15	0	0
Biscop	42	0	2
arcebiscop	11	0	0
casere	5	0	2
(mæsse)preost	3	0	2
abbud	3	0	1
abbudisse	3	0	1
papa	2	1	0
munuc	1	0	1
Total	85	1	9

2.4. Information status of the Ælfred cyning constructions

In the *Ælfred cyning* type of structure the common noun appears on its own, without a determiner or a pre-modifying adjective. The data for the constructions come solely from the *Chronicle* and Bede's *History*, because in the whole text of *Orosius* there is only one example of an *Ælfred cyning* structure (see Sielanko-Byford 2013).

Table 11 shows that, as in the case of the *Ælfred se cyning* constructions, about 30 percent of the *Ælfred cyning* structures are Discourse-new. Only one of those appears in Chapter Headings in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and can, possibly, be interpreted as cataphoric.

Table 11: Ælfred cyning *constructions with titles in the Chronicle and in Bede*

Discourse-Old	Inferrable	Discourse-New	Total
606	2	265	873
(c. 70%)		(c. 30%)	

2.5. Summary

As can be seen from the data presented in the preceding sub-sections, all three construction types with proper names and titles, that is the *Ælfred cyning*, *Ælfred se cyning* and *se cyning Ælfred* constructions, tend to be used to refer to an entity which occurs earlier in the discourse, that is they are as a rule Discourse-old. In other words, they tend to function as anaphors. Out of the three types, the *se cyning Ælfred* construction, seems to be the most anaphoric one, with 91 percent of such structures used as direct anaphors and 3 percent as indirect anaphors, or Inferrables, and only 6 percent are Discourse-new. We also observed that most of the Discourse-new *se cyning Ælfred* constructions are either cataphoric or deictic.

3. Discourse-old structures

In this section we examine more closely the Discourse-old structures in our texts. We have been referring to them as anaphors since they all have 'antecedents' in preceding discourse. However, some of them are separated from their 'antecedents' by a considerable amount of text. The question is: can they still be treated as anaphors? After all, anaphora – both direct and indirect – are devices used for establishing 'the local coherence of a discourse' (Strube 2007: 207).

What will need to be decided, then, is which of the Discourse-old constructions have local antecedents and can therefore be described as anaphoric and which cannot be viewed as such because the previous mention of the referent is too distant for us to be able to regard it as the antecedent.

Traugott and Pintzuk's (2008: 68) test for anaphoricity restricts the text to the preceding ten finite clauses in their coding system used for Old English data. Such an approach, however, takes into account only the linear distance between the two mentions of the same referent. This, in turn, implies that

> discourse is made up of an undifferentiated string of clauses which follow one another in time but do not form larger units that could perform communicative functions in relation to one another. […] Text structure and attention flow must thus be flat and undifferentiated in this model of discourse.
>
> (Fox 1987: 158-159)

In the present paper, the antecedent will be considered local if it occurs either in the same or the preceding chapter in the case of Bede's *History* and *Orosius* and in the same or the preceding entry in the case of the *Chronicle*. If the 'antecedent' appears further away, it is considered to be distant and as such too remote for a relation of anaphoricity to exist between the previous and the next mention of the referent. Such an approach will enable us to take into account not only linear distance but also the hierarchy of discourse. This is important because

there is a difference between an antecedent appearing, for instance, three or four entries away from the next mention of the referent and an antecedent appearing in the same or the immediately preceding entry, even when the linear distance is the same, say six or seven sentences. In the former case the focus will have shifted and so the 'anaphor' can no longer be easily associated with the 'antecedent'. In other words, they are in different anchoring domains (cf. Schwartz-Friesel 2007: 16). When they occur in the same entry or in the immediately preceding one, they are much more likely to be in the same anchoring domain.[6]

Of course, neither 'the linear-distance approach' nor 'the hierarchy approach' is perfect. If we adopt 'the hierarchy approach' there is, at least theoretically, a risk of classifying a construction as anaphoric, because the antecedent appears in the same or in the preceding entry or chapter and so it is regarded as local, even when the antecedent is very distant, for instance some twenty or thirty sentences away from the next mention of the referent. However, as shown later in the text, our data demonstrates that there is a strong correlation between the linear distance and the locality of the antecedent decided about on the basis of the hierarchy of discourse.

3.1. Discourse-old structures of the type *se cyning Ælfred*

Let us consider the data for Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* constructions in *Orosius*, Bede's *History*, and in *Chronicles* A and E:

Table 12: Discourse-old se cyning Ælfred structures in Orosius, Bede and the Chronicle

	Local antecedent		Distant 'antecedent'
	Antecedent in the same chapter/entry	Antecedent in the preceding chapter/entry	Previous mention more remote
Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* structures in *Orosius*	11 (includes 4 constructions with adjectives)	0	2.5
Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* structures in *Bede*	30.5 (includes 26 constructions with adjectives)	11.5 (includes 6 constructions with adjectives)	19.5 (includes 11 constructions with adjectives)
Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* structures in the *Chronicle*	E: 112 (includes 4 constructions with adjectives) A: 5 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)	E: 61 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives) A: 2	E: 35 (includes 6 constructions with adjectives) A: 4 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)
Total of Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* structures in *Orosius, Bede* and the *Chronicle*: 294	158.5 Local antecedent: 233 (79.2%)	74.5	Distant 'antecedent': 61 (20.7%)

---

[6] One could argue, of course, that when the 'antecedent' appears in the preceding entry or chapter it is no longer in the same anchoring domain as the 'anaphor'. However, there is often a continuation of the same subject matter from one entry (or chapter) to the next (see Sielanko-Byford 2013: 158-159).

The data in Table 12 show that an overwhelming majority of Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* constructions (almost 80 percent) have a local antecedent and can therefore be considered anaphoric. What is more, the 158.5 examples which have an antecedent in the same structural unit, that is in the same chapter or entry, constitute over 50 percent of all the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions in our three texts. We thus get further confirmation of the anaphoric nature of such structures.

3.2. *Discourse-old structures of the type Ælfred se cyning*

The findings for Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* structures in the three texts examined are as follows:

Table 13: Discourse-old Ælfred se cyning structures in Orosius, Bede and the Chronicle

	Local antecedent		Distant 'antecedent'
	Antecedent in the same chapter/entry	Antecedent in the preceding chapter/entry	Previous mention more remote
Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* structures in *Orosius*	47.5 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)	11 (includes 3 constructions with adjectives)	38 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)
Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* structures in *Bede*	97 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)	40 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)	79 (includes 10 constructions with adjectives)
Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* Structures in the *Chronicle*	E: 1 A: 0	E: 5 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives) A: 4 (includes 1 construction with an adjective)	E: 12 (includes 7 constructions with adjectives) A: 3 (includes 2 constructions with adjectives)
Total of Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* structures in *Orosius, Bede* and the *Chronicle*: 337.5	145.5 Local antecedent: 205.5 (c. 61%)	60	Distant 'antecedent': 132 (c. 39%)

As we can see, a considerable number of Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* constructions have a local antecedent, namely 61 percent. Nevertheless, the percentage is lower than that of Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* structures, almost 80 percent of which have local antecedents. The percentage of Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* structures which have an antecedent in the same structural unit is also lower than was the case with the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions: they constitute 30 percent of the total of the *Ælfred se cyning* structures found in all the three texts.

3.3. *Discourse-old structures of the type Ælfred cyning*

The data for Discourse-old the *Ælfred cyning* structures are presented in Table 14 below:

Table 14: *Discourse-old Ælfred cyning structures in Bede and the Chronicle*

	Local antecedent		Distant 'antecedent'
	Antecedent in the same chapter/entry	Antecedent in the preceding chapter/entry	Previous mention more remote
Discourse-old *Ælfred cyning* structures in *Bede*	34	10	41
Discourse-old *Ælfred cyning* structures in the *Chronicle*	E: 108 A: 33	E: 88 A: 32	E: 185 A: 75
Total of Discourse-old *Ælfred cyning* structures in *Bede* and the *Chronicle*: 606	175 Local antecedent: 305 (50.3%)	130	Distant 'antecedent': 301 (49.7%)

The data in Table 14 show that of all the three structure types the lowest percentage of the *Ælfred cyning* structures have local antecedents. The percentage of Discourse-old *Ælfred cyning* structures which have an antecedent in the same structural unit is also quite low: they constitute less than 30 percent of the total of the *Ælfred cyning* structures found in all the three texts.

3.4. Linear distance between the structures and their antecedents

Our data show a strong correlation between the locality of the antecedent as determined by the hierarchy of discourse and the linear distance between a given construction and the previous mention of the referent.

The majority of the constructions which we classified as anaphoric taking into account the structure of discourse occur less than 10 sentences away from the previous mention of the referent. For 93 percent of constructions with an antecedent in the same entry or chapter the distance between the antecedent and the anaphor is 10 sentences or less. Moreover, almost half of these structures have an antecedent in the same or adjacent clause. As for constructions with the antecedent in the previous entry or chapter, for 82 percent of them the distance between the antecedent and the anaphor is 10 sentences or less. Therefore, all these structures would also be regarded as anaphors if the linear distance was used as a criterion for anaphoricity.

The results for structures with an 'antecedent' in a more distant entry or chapter, as might have been expected, are in complete contrast to what we found for those with local antecedents: only in the case of 18 percent of the constructions whose 'antecedent' we have considered 'hierarchically distant' does the previous mention appear within the 10 preceding sentences.

As was the case with 'hierarchical distance', when we take linear distance into account, the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions also seem to have more 'local' antecedents: 60 percent of the 158.5 constructions whose antecedents appear in the same structural unit have

antecedents which occur in the same or in the adjacent sentence, or are separated from the anaphor by one sentence only. In contrast, only 38 percent of such *Ælfred se cyning* and 31 percent of such *Ælfred cyning* structures have equally 'close' antecedents.

3.5. Summary

In this section we have examined the Discourse-old structures found in the three Old English texts examined here. Almost 80 percent of Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* constructions were found to have a local antecedent, which confirmed their anaphoric nature. A smaller proportion of Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* and *Ælfred cyning* structures had local antecedents, around 60 and 50 percent respectively.

It was also mentioned that a higher proportion of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions than of structures of the other two types had an antecedent in the same structural unit and a higher proportion of those antecedents had closer antecedents when linear distance was considered.

4. Inferrables

Among the constraints on the associability of indirect anaphors mentioned by Schwarz-Friesel (2007: 16) is 'associability within one anchoring domain.' In other words, the trigger (or anchor), that is the element in relation to which the inferrable is interpreted, should be local.

It should be noted that all the 28 examples of the *Ælfred cyning*, *Ælfred se cyning* and *se cyning Ælfred* constructions classified as Inferrables in Tables 1-11 above have local triggers; the anchor always appears in the same chapter or entry. Moreover, in 24 out of the 27 examples, the anchoring element is either intrasentential, that is it appears in the same sentence as the Inferrable (examples 8 and 9), or else it occurs in the immediately preceding sentence (example 10). For instance:

(8)   Bede2 16.150.5[7] *Hæfdon heo swylce mid him Eanflæde Eadwines dohtor & Wuscfrean his sunu, swylce eac Yffe his suna sunu Osfriðes, ða eft seo modor æfter þon onsende for Eadbaldes ege & Oswaldes þara cyninga in **Gallia rice** to fedanne **Dægbrehte þæm cyninge**, se wæs hire freond.*[8]

        'They had also with them Eanfleda daughter of Eadwine and his son Wuscfrea, as well as Yffe his son Osfrith's son. These their mother afterwards, for fear of the kings Eadbald and Oswald, sent to **Gaul** to be brought up by **king Dagobert**, who was her friend.' (translation taken from Miller 1890-98: 151)

(9)   ChronE 1137.68 *he for to **Rome**. & þær wæs wæl underfangen fram **þe pape Eugenie**.*
        'He went to **Rome** and was well received by **Pope Eugenius** there.'

(10)   Bede3 21.248.14 *Þa he þa Wigheard **to Rome** becwom, ær þon he to biscophade becuman meahte, wæs mid deaðe forgripen & þær fordferde. 21.248.17 Ða sende **Uitalius se papa** Osweo Seaxna cyninge lufsumlic ærendgewrit, þa he onget his aarfæstnesse willan & his hate Godes lufan […].*

---

[7]   The examples from *Bede* are cited by Short Title, which includes Book number (e.g. Bede1), chapter, page, and line number following the edition (Miller 1890-98).

[8]   In all the examples, the trigger and the anaphor appear in bold type.

'On Wigheard's arrival in **Rome**, before he could be made bishop, he was there attacked by mortal illness and died. Then **pope Vitalius** sent a loving letter to Oswio, king of the Saxons, as he understood his pious devotion and his warm love to God[...].' (translation taken from Miller 1890-98: 249)

In the remaining 3 examples the anchoring element is separated from the Inferrable by between 1 to 4 sentences (example 11 below):

(11)   Bede5 17.454.27 *mid þy he þa fela monþa þær gesæligum gelesum geornlice abysegad wæs, þa hwearf he eft on **Gallia rice** to Dalfino þam bysceope his freonde, & þreo winter wæs mid him wuniende.17.454.30 & he wæs to preoste besceoren fram him, & on swa micelre lufan hæfd wæs, þæt he þohte hine him to yrfewearde gedon.17.456.2 Ac þæt hwæþere swa wesan ne mihte, forðon se bysceop wæs forgripen mid wællhreowe deaðe, & Willfrið wæs ma gehealden Angelþeode to bysceope.17.456.4 Sende **Balthild seo cwen** mycel weorod, & het þone bysceop ofslean.*

'And when he had zealously occupied himself for many months there in successful study, he returned again to **Gaul** to his friend bishop Dalfinus and remained with him for three years. And from him he received priestly tonsure, and was treated with such affection that the bishop intended to make him his heir. But yet this might not be, for the bishop was carried off by a cruel death, and Wilfrid was reserved instead to be bishop to the English. **Queen Balthild** sent a large force and ordered the bishop to be slain.' (translation taken from Miller 1890-98: 455, 457)

All the examples of indirect anaphora presented here as well as the other examples found in our data are what Schwarz-Friesel (2007: 8-9) calls conceptual anaphors, since their interpretation involves 'the processing of [...] general world knowledge' rather than 'the activation of knowledge in the mental lexicon', as is the case with semantic indirect anaphora. In (8) and (11) above the interpretation of the anaphor requires the activation of script-knowledge or the frame that a kingdom has a king or a queen (cf. Heusinger 2007: 142). For the interpretation of (9) and (10) some 'encyclopedic' knowledge is necessary to enable the reader to associate a pope with Rome (cf. Heusinger 2007: 142).

Summing up our findings, all of the Inferrables found in our texts have local triggers and can therefore be considered anaphors, although indirect ones.

Conclusion

In the present paper we have investigated the information status of Old English constructions with proper names and titles. An overwhelming majority of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions (around 91 percent) were found to be Discourse-old, that is they referred back to an entity mentioned earlier in the discourse. Around 70 percent of both *Ælfred se cyning* and *Ælfred cyning* structures also turned out to be Discourse-old.

Almost 80 percent of the Discourse-old *se cyning Ælfred* constructions were found to have a local antecedent, which confirmed their anaphoric nature. A smaller proportion of the Discourse-old *Ælfred se cyning* and *Ælfred cyning* structures had local antecedents, around 60 and 50 percent respectively.

We also saw that a higher proportion of the *se cyning Ælfred* constructions than the structures of the other two types had an antecedent in the same structural unit and a higher

proportion of those constructions had closer antecedents when linear distance was considered.

This anaphoric nature of the *se cyning Ælfred* structures could provide an explanation for the very few examples of such constructions in *Chronicle* A, in the earlier entries of *Chronicle* E and in *Orosius*. In our data the *se cyning Ælfred* structures mainly appear in Bede's *History* and in later entries of *Chronicle* E (as well as in post-1121 interpolations). Bede's *History* and later entries of *Chronicle* E are full of longer descriptions featuring one or more main characters: kings, archbishops, bishops or other important people of the day. Anaphora are needed to refer back to an entity that appeared earlier in the text. Anaphoric chains are formed. Most of the entries of *Chronicle* A and earlier entries in E (except for the Interpolations, of course) are short, there is usually no opportunity for the same referent to appear more than once or – possibly – twice in the same entry. Most of the text of *Orosius* contains summaries of the main events at a given period in the history of ancient Rome. Unlike Bede's *History*, it does not contain long stories about saintly kings, queens, bishops and priests, stories in which the same character is mentioned repeatedly, requiring anaphoric expressions to be used. Therefore, there is no need for the use of *se cyning Ælfred* constructions either in *Orosius* or in *Chronicle* A.

Our findings related to the information status of the constructions with proper names and titles discussed in this study clearly show that there is a need for further research. Some results of our analysis of Discourse-old structures in particular demonstrate that there are interesting facts to be investigated in connection with anaphoric distribution in Old English. For example, we discovered over 50 percent of all *se cyning Ælfred* structures in our data had an antecedent in the same discourse structural unit. This seems to go against the central prediction of one of the main approaches to discourse anaphora, the hierarchical approach, which claims that reduced anaphoric expressions, not full noun phrases, are normally used for subsequent mentions within the same structural unit. While an investigation of anaphoric encoding in Old English lies outside the scope of the present study, there is clearly more research to be done in this area.

References

Bately, J. (ed.). 1980. *The Old English Orosius.* Early English Text Society Supplementary Series 6. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bately, J. 1985. The compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle once more. *Leeds Studies in English* 16: 7-26.

Bately, J. (ed.). 1986. *The Anglo Saxon Chronicle: A collaborative edition. Volume 3: Ms A.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Carlton, Charles 1970. *Descriptive syntax of the Old English charters.* The Hague: Mouton.

DOE Corpus = The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form, 2000 Release. Compiled by A. diPaolo Healey, J. Holland, I. McDougall, and P. T. Mielke. University of Toronto Center for Medieval Studies DOE Project. Distributed through the Oxford Text Archive.

Earle, J., and C. Plummer. 1892-9, reissued by D. Whitelock, 1952. *Two of the Saxon chronicles parallel*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fox, B.A. 1987. Anaphora in popular written English narratives. In R.S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, 157-174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Giusti, G. 1997. The categorial status of determiners. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *The new comparative syntax*, 95-123. London: Longman.

Heusinger, K. von. 2007. Accessibility and definite noun phrases. In M. Schwarz-Friesel, M. Consten, and M. Knees (eds.), *Anaphors in text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*, 123-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Huang, Y. 2006. Anaphora, cataphora, exophora, logophoricity. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, volume 1, 231-238. Oxford: Elsevier. 2nd edition.

Irvine, S. (ed.). 2004. *The Anglo Saxon chronicle: A collaborative edition. Volume 7: Ms E.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Miller, T. (ed. and trans.). 1890-98. *The Old English version of Bede's ecclesiastical history of the English people*, The Early English Text Society 79. London: Trubner & Co.

Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English syntax.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peltola, N. 1960. On appositional constructions in Old English prose. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 61: 159-203.

Prince, E. F. 1992. The ZPG Letter: Subjects, Definiteness, and Information-status. In W. C. Mann, and S. A. Thomson (eds.), *Discourse description: Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text*, 295-325. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schwarz-Friesel, M. 2007. Indirect anaphora in text. In M. Schwarz-Friesel, M. Consten, and M. Knees (eds.), *Anaphors in text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*, 3-20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shannon, A. 1964. *A descriptive syntax of the Parker manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 734 to 891.* The Hague: Mouton.

Shores, D. L. 1971. *A descriptive syntax of the Peterborough chronicle from 1122 to 1154.* The Hauge: Mouton.

Sielanko-Byford, E. 2013. Apposition in Old English. Ph.D. dissertation, Lublin, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II.

Sprockel C. 1973. *The language of the Parker chronicle*, 2 vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Strube, M. 2007. Corpus-based and machine learning approaches to coreference resolution. In M. Schwarz-Friesel, M. Consten, and M. Knees (eds.), *Anaphors in Text. Cognitive, formal and applied approaches to anaphoric reference*, 207-222. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, E. C., and S. Pintzuk. 2008. Coding the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose to investigate the syntax-pragmatics interface. In D. Minkova, and S. Fitzmaurice (eds.), *Empirical and analytical advances in the study of English language change*, 61-80. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.