

The same history holds with the appositives of month. The native names of the month gave place in AS. to Latin names, used either alone: Ianuarius, *Menol.* (Fox), 19, Martius, *ib.*, 73, Maius, *ib.*, 155; or in apposition with monað: se sol-monað . . . Februarius, *ib.*, 31 ff.; monað . . . Iunius, *ib.*, 210 ff.; Aprelis monað, *ib.*, 112; Blotmonað . . . Nouembris, *ib.*, 387 f. The genitive is rare, if indeed this be not a variant analogical nom.: monað to tunc Decembris, *ib.*, 436 f. The new MidE. usage, following the introduction of the OFr. names, is: the monthe of Aueril, R. G., *Ch.*, 506; the monþe of feurer, *ib.*, 8238; þe monþ of June, *Libeaus Des.*, 1303.

This imitates OFr.: Le mois de Mars, Berry, *Rec. de N.*, 239. Le meis d'Avril, *Troie*, 23249. El meis de Averil, Gaimar, 3247. Le maye de August, Pierre de L., i. p. 26, &c.

**CHRONOLOGY.** The influx of noun phrases is first noted in the appositive construction with OF, which appears as early as the middle of the twelfth century; about a century later master-frequently replaces head- in compound nouns. The real flood of new phrasal nouns begins with the fourteenth century. From 1300 to 1350 we note the introduction of chief- for master-, month of, manner of, mar. of arms, man of law, man of price, brother-germain, brother-in-law, point of death, and the tautologies custom and use, hue and cry, lord and sire, los and price. The second half of the century extends these groups by man at arms, merchant of wool, and additional tautologies.

**CONCLUSION.** The establishment of Romance influence in nominal phrases as exemplified above seems warranted by the indisputable influence of master-, chief-, on the native habit of compounding with hēafod, and by the direct translation of frère en loi, supplanting AS. áðum. The expression of the appositive relation by OF is essentially a Romance, not a Teutonic construction. It is interesting to see, in the case of 'manner of,' what is abundantly illustrated elsewhere, that the foreign word tends to bring into the language that adopts it its own construction. The instances of conventional tautologies are part of those stylistic imitations of OFr. characterizing nearly all the fourteenth-century literature of MidE. The full history of these phrases would disprove what indeed the phrases here adduced suggest, that MidE. tautologies are a matter of style or of habit, not a conscious adjustment of language to the needs of speech in a bi-lingual people. (See Earle, *Philology*, pp. 84 ff., 5th ed., *contra*.)