

Diachronic Analysis of Case Category in English Nouns

Javid Babayev

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology

Senior Lecturer, Chair of English and Methods, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan

Email: cavidbabayev@ndu.edu.az

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2472-0006>

© 2026 Javid Babayev. This is an open-access article published in *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities (GSRH)*. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) — free to share, adapt and use commercially, with attribution.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0260304008>

Abstract

The case category of English nouns has undergone substantial structural and functional changes throughout the historical development of the English language. From the relatively rich inflectional system of Old English to the reduced morphology of Middle English and the predominantly analytical structure of Modern English, the expression of grammatical relations has shifted from morphological marking to syntactic position, prepositions, and possessive constructions. This article examines the diachronic development of the case category in English nouns, focusing on the principal characteristics of Old English, Middle English, and Modern English. Particular attention is paid to the declensional patterns of nouns, the functions of the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative cases, and the historical processes responsible for the gradual reduction of nominal inflections. The study employs descriptive, comparative-historical, and structural analyses to identify the major tendencies in the evolution of English nominal morphology. It demonstrates that the loss of case endings was not simply a morphological simplification but a broader grammatical reorganization that increased the importance of word order and analytical constructions. Although the traditional four-case system of Old English disappeared from the nominal paradigm, certain functions of the genitive survived in the Modern English possessive, while other grammatical relationships came to be expressed through prepositions and syntactic constructions. The historical development of English nominal case therefore illustrates the transition from a predominantly synthetic grammatical structure to a more analytical one.

Keywords: *diachronic linguistics; English nouns; grammatical case; Old English; Middle English; Modern English; declension; morphological change; historical grammar*

1. Introduction

The historical development of the English language provides important evidence of the interaction between morphological change, syntactic organization, phonological processes, and language contact. One of the most significant transformations in the history of English grammar is the gradual reduction of the nominal case system. From the relatively rich inflectional structure of Old English to the simplified morphology of Middle English and the predominantly analytical grammatical structure of Modern English, the expression of grammatical relationships has undergone substantial changes. This development is particularly

important for historical linguistics because it demonstrates how a grammatical category can lose much of its original morphological expression while retaining its fundamental semantic and syntactic functions. The historical evolution of English nominal case is therefore closely connected with broader questions concerning grammaticalization, morphological restructuring, and the relationship between form and function in language change (Lass, 1992; Hogg & Fulk, 2011).

The category of case is traditionally defined as a grammatical category that expresses the relationship between a noun or noun phrase and other elements within a sentence. In inflectional languages, case is commonly represented through changes in the morphological form of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and determiners. These changes can indicate grammatical functions such as the subject of a sentence, the direct or indirect object, possession, and the relationships expressed by prepositions. In English, the historical development of case illustrates a transition from a system in which grammatical relations were substantially marked by nominal inflections to one in which word order, prepositions, and possessive constructions perform most of these functions. Consequently, the study of English nominal case requires an examination not only of the formal disappearance of particular endings but also of the grammatical mechanisms that replaced or supplemented them (Allen, 2005; Fischer et al., 2000).

Old English, conventionally dated from approximately 450 to 1100, inherited a relatively complex inflectional system from its Germanic ancestors. Nouns were inflected for case and number and classified according to grammatical gender. The principal cases were the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative, while traces of a distinct instrumental case were also present. Each case was associated with particular grammatical and semantic functions, although the relationship between form and function was not always one-to-one. Nouns belonged to several declensional classes, including strong and weak paradigms, and the endings varied according to declension, gender, and number. For example, the masculine a-stem noun *stān* (“stone”) exhibited the forms *stān*, *stānes*, *stāne*, and *stānas*, illustrating distinctions associated with case and number. The complexity of this system demonstrates that Old English relied extensively on morphological marking to express grammatical relationships, although syntactic position and contextual interpretation also played important roles (Hogg & Fulk, 2011; Mitchell & Robinson, 2012).

The Old English case system was nevertheless not entirely uniform. Different noun classes displayed different inflectional patterns, and some grammatical cases shared identical forms. This phenomenon, generally known as syncretism, meant that morphological distinctions were already incomplete in certain parts of the system. The nominative and accusative, for instance, were formally identical in several paradigms, while the dative and instrumental frequently shared forms. Such characteristics are important for understanding the subsequent development of English because the reduction of case marking did not begin with a perfectly differentiated system. Rather, the language already exhibited areas of overlap that could be expanded through phonological change and morphological restructuring. A detailed analysis of Old English paradigms therefore provides the necessary historical foundation for investigating the later reduction of nominal inflections (Hogg & Fulk, 2011; Quirk & Wrenn, 1957; Sweet, 1892).

The transition from Old English to Middle English, conventionally dated from approximately 1100 to 1500, was characterized by extensive changes in nominal morphology. One of the principal developments was the weakening and loss of unstressed final vowels, which reduced the phonetic distinctions between previously different case endings. As these endings became less distinct in pronunciation, their ability to signal grammatical relationships

also diminished. At the same time, morphological analogy encouraged the extension of more frequent and productive forms at the expense of less common declensional patterns. These processes contributed to the gradual merger of nominative, accusative, and dative forms and the increasing regularization of noun paradigms. Allen (2005) examines the changes in case marking from Old English to Middle English and demonstrates the importance of analyzing the distribution of individual forms when explaining the historical reduction of nominal case.

The sociolinguistic conditions of the Middle English period also deserve attention. Following the Norman Conquest of 1066, English developed in a multilingual environment in which Anglo-Norman French and Latin were used in various administrative, literary, religious, and educational contexts. These circumstances influenced the broader history of English vocabulary, writing, and language use. However, the decline of nominal case cannot be attributed exclusively to the influence of French or to the social consequences of the conquest. The weakening of unstressed endings had internal phonological foundations, and morphological changes were already developing within English. The historical reduction of case is therefore best understood as the result of interacting linguistic and sociolinguistic processes rather than as the direct consequence of a single external event (Baugh & Cable, 2013; Blake, 1992; Hogg & Fulk, 2011).

The Middle English period is particularly significant because it illustrates the gradual nature of grammatical change. The reduction of case endings did not occur simultaneously across all noun classes, regions, or textual traditions. Different forms continued to coexist, and regional dialects preserved certain inflections longer than others. The historical record consequently reveals a transitional system in which the distinctions of Old English were progressively weakened while new patterns of nominal organization emerged. This variation demonstrates why the history of English case must be examined diachronically: a form found in an individual text cannot automatically be regarded as evidence that the complete earlier declensional system remained productive. Instead, the frequency, distribution, and grammatical function of particular forms must be considered within their historical and dialectal contexts (Allen, 2005; Fischer et al., 2000).

One of the most important features of this development is the differential survival of case distinctions. Whereas the nominative, accusative, and dative largely disappeared as distinct morphological categories in English nouns, the genitive remained productive through the development of the possessive marker *-s*. The historical relationship between the Old English genitive ending *-es* and the Modern English possessive is especially significant because it illustrates both continuity and structural change. Although the modern possessive marker has a historical connection with genitive inflection, its grammatical distribution has changed over time. Modern English permits constructions such as *the student's book* and *the King of England's daughter*, in which the possessive marker can occur at the end of a complete noun phrase. Such constructions have been central to research on the historical development and grammatical status of the English genitive (Allen, 2008; Rosenbach, 2002).

The reduction of nominal case also contributed to the increasing importance of syntactic organization in Modern English. In Old English, case endings helped distinguish the grammatical functions of nouns, allowing some flexibility in constituent order. As the distinctions between nominal forms diminished, word order became increasingly important in identifying subjects and objects. The difference between *The teacher praised the student* and *The student praised the teacher* illustrates the importance of syntactic position in Modern English: the nouns themselves remain morphologically unchanged, while their grammatical functions depend primarily on their positions in the sentence. Prepositional constructions also became central to the expression of relationships that had previously been marked, at least in

part, by inflectional endings. Fischer et al. (2000) demonstrate the importance of examining the historical relationship between morphology and syntax when explaining the development of English sentence structure.

Despite the substantial reduction of nominal case, Modern English has not lost every morphological distinction associated with grammatical relationships. Traditional descriptions generally distinguish the common case from the genitive or possessive case in nouns. The common form is used for subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, and objects of prepositions, while the possessive form expresses relationships involving ownership, association, origin, and other semantic connections. Moreover, personal pronouns preserve more extensive case distinctions, as illustrated by *he*, *him*, and *his*. The contrast between nouns and pronouns indicates that case-related morphology has survived unevenly across different grammatical categories. Accordingly, the historical development of English case should be understood as a selective reduction and redistribution of morphological distinctions rather than the complete elimination of grammatical case from the language (Quirk et al., 1985; Rosenbach, 2002).

The topic is also relevant to the broader theoretical distinction between synthetic and analytical language structures. Synthetic grammatical systems rely relatively heavily on morphological changes within words to express grammatical relationships, whereas analytical systems employ separate grammatical words, prepositions, and syntactic constructions more extensively. Old English is generally described as more synthetic than Modern English, although both languages use a combination of morphological and syntactic resources. The historical development of English nominal case demonstrates how a language can shift the balance between these resources without losing the communicative functions they serve. The increasing use of prepositions, relatively fixed word order, and possessive constructions illustrates the capacity of grammatical systems to reorganize the expression of relationships over time (Lass, 1992; Traugott, 1992).

Although the historical development of English morphology and syntax has been widely examined, the case category remains a useful subject for integrated comparative analysis. A systematic comparison of the declensional patterns of Old English, the transitional forms of Middle English, and the nominal structures of Modern English makes it possible to identify both the continuity and the discontinuity of grammatical categories. Such a comparison also helps distinguish the disappearance of morphological forms from the persistence of their grammatical functions. In particular, examining the development of the genitive alongside the reduction of the nominative, accusative, and dative provides a clearer understanding of why some case-related distinctions survived while others were replaced by analytical constructions.

The aim of this article is to investigate the diachronic development of the case category in English nouns by examining the principal declensional patterns and grammatical functions of Old English, Middle English, and Modern English. The article seeks to explain how the original inflectional system was reduced, which morphological distinctions were preserved, and how the grammatical relationships formerly expressed through case endings came to be conveyed through syntactic position, prepositions, and possessive constructions.

The specific objectives of the study are the following:

1. To describe the principal noun declensions and case distinctions in Old English.
2. To examine the phonological, morphological, and sociolinguistic factors associated with the reduction of case in Middle English.
3. To analyze the limited case distinctions preserved in Modern English nouns.

4. To compare the development of the genitive with the disappearance of other nominal cases.
5. To establish the relationship between morphological reduction and the increasing importance of analytical grammatical structures.

The research employs descriptive, comparative-historical, and structural methods, which are detailed in the following section. The significance of the study lies in its integrated examination of nominal case across the major historical stages of English: by comparing the inflectional richness of Old English, the morphological transition of Middle English, and the predominantly analytical structure of Modern English, the article demonstrates that grammatical change involves not only the loss of forms but also the redistribution of functions across different linguistic structures. The findings contribute to the study of historical English grammar by clarifying the relationship between case marking, phonological change, morphological regularization, and syntactic development.

2. Methods

The study employs a combination of descriptive, comparative-historical, structural-linguistic, diachronic, and contextual methods to investigate the development of the case category in English nouns from Old English to Modern English. The use of these complementary methods makes it possible to examine both the formal characteristics of case declensions and the historical processes that contributed to their transformation.

The descriptive method is used to identify and characterize the morphological features of nouns in each historical period, including case endings, declensional patterns, and grammatical functions. It provides a systematic account of the case system in Old, Middle, and Modern English (Hogg & Fulk, 2011).

The comparative-historical method is applied to compare noun declensions across different periods of English and identify similarities, differences, and patterns of morphological change. It helps explain the gradual reduction of inflectional forms and the transition from a relatively complex case system to a simplified grammatical structure.

The structural-linguistic method examines the organization of the case system, the relationships between morphological forms, and the functions performed by case endings within noun phrases and sentences. Particular attention is paid to the relationship between morphological marking and syntactic structure.

The diachronic method provides the principal framework for tracing the historical development of the case category. It enables the analysis of changes in noun inflections, the merging of previously distinct forms, and the increasing use of analytical constructions to express grammatical relationships.

Additionally, the contextual analysis method is employed to examine historical examples of noun forms within sentences and determine their grammatical functions according to their syntactic environment. This method is particularly useful when identical or similar forms perform different grammatical roles.

The study also considers phonological changes, morphological analogy, syncretism, and syntactic reorganization as major factors influencing the evolution of the English case system. Historical linguistic examples and relevant scholarly literature are used to support the analysis. The combined application of these methods provides a comprehensive account of the

transition from the predominantly inflectional structure of Old English to the more analytical grammatical system of Modern English (Allen, 1995).

3. Results

3.1. General characteristics of the Old English case system

Old English possessed a substantially richer inflectional system than Modern English. Nouns were inflected for case and number and classified according to grammatical gender. Their declensional patterns were historically associated with different stem classes, including a-stems, *ō*-stems, i-stems, u-stems, and n-stems. In traditional grammatical descriptions, the a-, *ō*-, and other non-n-stem classes are commonly discussed among the strong declensions, whereas n-stems constitute the principal weak declension.

The four principal cases were the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative. An instrumental case also existed, particularly in older grammatical descriptions, but its distinct nominal forms were limited and frequently coincided with the dative. Thus, the noun system is usually described as having four principal cases, with the instrumental treated as a residual or marginal category. Hogg and Fulk (2011) provide a detailed account of Old English noun declensions, while Allen (2005) examines the changes in nominal case marking during the transition to Middle English.

The principal grammatical functions of the cases can be summarized as follows:

Table 1

Principal grammatical functions of the Old English cases

Case	Principal function	Illustrative Old English example
Nominative	Subject of a sentence	se stān — the stone
Accusative	Direct object	þone stān — the stone
Genitive	Possession, origin, and certain relations	þæs stānes — of the stone
Dative	Indirect object and complement of certain prepositions	þæm stāne — to/for the stone
Instrumental	Means or manner in restricted contexts	Often formally identical to the dative

The forms in the table illustrate the case distinctions found in the wider Old English noun phrase. Articles and demonstratives, such as *se*, *þone*, *þæs*, and *þæm*, also carried case, gender, and number distinctions. Consequently, grammatical relationships were expressed not only through noun endings but also through agreement within the noun phrase.

An important characteristic of Old English declension was syncretism, whereby different grammatical cases shared the same morphological form. For example, nominative and accusative forms were identical in several plural paradigms. Therefore, the historical development of case cannot be understood simply as the disappearance of four completely separate endings: the system already contained overlapping forms before the major Middle English changes occurred.

3.1.1. Strong noun declensions in Old English

Strong nouns included several major declensional classes. The masculine a-stem, feminine *ō*-stem, and neuter a-stem paradigms are particularly useful for illustrating the system (Kolasińska, 2013).

The following tables present representative forms. The forms are normalized textbook paradigms; individual manuscripts and dialects sometimes exhibit spelling and inflectional variation.

Table 2

*Declension of the masculine a-stem noun **stān** (“stone”)*

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	stān	stānas
Accusative	stān	stānas
Genitive	stānes	stāna
Dative	stāne	stānum

The noun *stān* demonstrates the relationship between grammatical case and morphological form. In the singular, the genitive ending *-es* marks a possessive or relational construction, while the dative ending *-e* appears in certain indirect-object and prepositional contexts. In the plural, *-as* characterizes the nominative and accusative, *-a* marks the genitive, and *-um* marks the dative.

The development of the masculine genitive ending is particularly significant because the Old English *-es* ending became an important historical source of the Modern English possessive marker *-’s*.

Table 3

*Declension of the neuter a-stem noun **scip** (“ship”)*

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	scip	scipu
Accusative	scip	scipu
Genitive	scipes	scipa
Dative	scipe	scipum

The neuter paradigm differs from the masculine pattern principally in the nominative and accusative plural, which employ *-u* rather than *-as*. The example demonstrates that Old English declension depended partly on grammatical gender and declensional class, rather than on a single uniform set of endings.

Table 4

*Representative feminine ō-stem forms: **giefu** (“gift”)*

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	giefu	giefa
Accusative	giefe	giefa
Genitive	giefe	giefa
Dative	giefe	giefum

The feminine *ō*-stem paradigm shows a different distribution of endings from the masculine and neuter *a*-stems. In particular, the nominative singular *giefu* contrasts with the other singular forms in *-e*. This distinction illustrates why Old English nouns must be analyzed according to their individual declensional classes.

These paradigms are not merely formal variations. They reflect an inflectional system in which grammatical relationships were partially encoded within individual words. At the same time, the overlap between case forms meant that context, word order, and agreement remained important even in Old English.

3.1.2. Weak noun declensions in Old English

The weak declension was principally associated with n-stem nouns. Unlike the strong declensions, which displayed several different patterns, weak nouns tended to use -an across many singular forms and in the nominative and accusative plural.

Table 5

Representative weak masculine noun: nama (“name”)

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	nama	naman
Accusative	naman	naman
Genitive	naman	namena
Dative	naman	namum

The weak declension is important for two reasons. First, it illustrates that Old English nominal morphology was organized into multiple paradigmatic patterns. Second, weak forms contributed to the later history of English plurals and the redistribution of nominal endings.

Not every Old English noun followed these patterns, and some nouns belonged to minor or irregular declensions. Nevertheless, the contrast between strong and weak paradigms provides a useful basis for understanding the system before the extensive reduction of Middle English inflections.

The Old English case system provided several ways to signal grammatical relationships. Nominative and accusative forms helped distinguish subjects from direct objects, while the genitive marked possession and other semantic relations. The dative expressed indirect objects and occurred after prepositions that selected that case.

Because nominal endings and agreement markers carried grammatical information, Old English allowed greater variation in constituent order than is typical of present-day English. Nevertheless, it would be inaccurate to claim that word order was unimportant. Information structure, emphasis, verb placement, and discourse context also influenced sentence organization.

The historical significance of the Old English system lies in the interaction between morphological marking and syntax. The subsequent reduction of case endings changed the balance between these mechanisms and encouraged greater reliance on relatively fixed constituent order and prepositional constructions.

3.2. General tendencies in the Middle English period

Middle English represents a transitional stage in the development of nominal case. The elaborate Old English declensional system was progressively reduced, and many forms that had previously distinguished grammatical cases merged into a smaller number of forms (Blake, 1992).

One of the principal causes was the phonological weakening of unstressed vowels. As final syllables became less distinct in pronunciation, endings that had originally differed in

their vowels increasingly converged. Once these differences were no longer consistently audible, the morphological distinctions they had expressed became less stable.

Analogical change also played an important role. Speakers increasingly extended familiar and productive forms to nouns that had previously followed different patterns. Consequently, the historical classes of Old English gradually gave way to more uniform paradigms.

The Norman Conquest of 1066 contributed to the sociolinguistic context of this transformation, but it should not be treated as its sole cause. The reduction of unstressed endings had already begun, and the loss of case distinctions developed through several interacting phonological, morphological, and syntactic processes. Allen (2005) documents the changes in case marking during the transition from Old English to Early Middle English and notes that the overt distinction between accusative and dative had largely disappeared by approximately 1250, apart from some southern dialectal variation.

3.2.1. Middle English noun declensions

By the Middle English period, the traditional declensional system had become substantially simplified. Although variation persisted across dialects and centuries, two broad patterns are commonly distinguished in textbook descriptions: strong nouns and weak nouns.

The following tables provide schematic Middle English paradigms, rather than universal forms applicable to every dialect and date.

Table 6

Representative strong noun: stōn/stone (“stone”)

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	stone	stones
Accusative	stone	stones
Genitive	stones	stones
Dative	stone	stones

The table represents a simplified late Middle English pattern. Earlier texts may show additional endings, including forms in -e, and the genitive plural was not uniformly identical to the genitive singular throughout the period.

The key development is the loss of productive distinctions between the nominative, accusative, and dative. The plural ending -es became increasingly widespread, while the genitive singular ending -es remained important. The resulting paradigm was therefore much less differentiated than its Old English predecessor.

Table 7

Representative weak noun: name

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	name	namen
Accusative	name	namen
Genitive	names	namen / namene
Dative	name	namen

This table is also schematic. Weak nouns displayed considerable variation, and forms such as -en, -e, and -es differed in distribution according to period, dialect, and grammatical function. The historical weak declension gradually lost its independent status as many nouns adopted more productive strong-type patterns.

The tables illustrate a general tendency rather than a single, simultaneous change. Middle English was characterized by variation, competing forms, and gradual restructuring. The survival of a particular ending in a text does not necessarily mean that the complete Old English case system remained productive in that variety.

The genitive was the most persistent case distinction in English nouns. While the nominative, accusative, and dative became increasingly indistinguishable in nominal morphology, the genitive ending continued to express possession and other relationships between nouns.

The Old English masculine genitive singular *stānes* is historically related to Middle English forms such as *stones*. Over time, the genitive marker became increasingly associated with the possessive construction rather than functioning as one member of a comprehensive case paradigm.

At the same time, English increasingly used the preposition *of* to express relationships formerly conveyed by genitive constructions. Thus, possessive and relational meanings came to be distributed between inflectional and prepositional constructions.

Compare the following examples:

- Old English: *stānes* — “of the stone” or “the stone’s,” depending on context.
- Middle English: *the kynges sone* — “the king’s son.”
- Modern English: *the king’s son* / *the son of the king*.

The examples illustrate the broad historical continuity of the genitive function, although they should not be interpreted as exact syntactic equivalents in every context.

Allen (2008) examines the history of genitive phrases from Old English to Early Modern English and demonstrates that the development involved changes in the position, distribution, and grammatical interpretation of possessive constructions, not merely the preservation of an unchanged suffix.

3.2.2. The relationship between case loss and word order

The reduction of nominal inflections increased the importance of syntactic position in distinguishing grammatical functions. In Old English, case endings could help identify the subject and object even when their positions varied. As those endings merged, the order of constituents became a more reliable indicator of their grammatical roles.

Compare the following Modern English sentences:

- *The dog chased the cat.*
- *The cat chased the dog.*

The nouns *dog* and *cat* have the same forms in both sentences, but their grammatical functions change according to their positions relative to the verb.

The development of prepositional constructions also helped maintain explicit grammatical relationships. For example, *to the teacher*, *with a friend*, and *in the house* express

relationships through prepositions rather than through distinct dative or instrumental endings on the nouns.

These developments illustrate a broader shift from synthetic to analytical grammatical expression. However, the change was neither absolute nor instantaneous: word order and prepositions had grammatical functions in Old English, just as morphological marking remained in use during Middle English.

3.3. *The Modern English case system*

3.3.1. General characteristics

Modern English represents the final stage of a long historical process in which the nominal case system was reduced to a small number of morphological distinctions. Unlike Old English, which possessed several productive nominal declensions, Modern English nouns generally have one basic form for the subject, direct object, and indirect object.

In traditional grammatical descriptions, Modern English nouns are usually said to retain two case forms: the common case and the genitive (possessive) case. Some contemporary linguistic approaches analyze the possessive marker *-s* as a clitic attached to a noun phrase rather than as an ordinary inflectional suffix. Despite this difference in theoretical interpretation, the possessive construction remains the clearest productive morphological expression of case-related distinctions in English nouns.

The common case is used in several syntactic functions:

- Subject: *The student reads a book.*
- Direct object: *The teacher praised the student.*
- Indirect object: *The teacher gave the student a book.*
- Object of a preposition: *The teacher spoke to the student.*

The noun *student* retains the same form in all four examples. Its grammatical function is determined by its syntactic position and its relationship to other sentence elements.

The possessive case, by contrast, is illustrated in *the student's book*. Here, the marker *-s* indicates a possessive relationship between the student and the book. This distinction demonstrates that Modern English has not eliminated all morphological case marking, but has restricted its productive use in nouns.

3.3.2. Declension of Modern English nouns

Modern English noun declension is considerably simpler than the Old English system. The following table presents the principal forms of a regular count noun.

Table 8

Declension of the Modern English noun student

Grammatical form	Singular	Plural
Common case	student	students
Genitive	student's	students'

The table shows that Modern English nominal morphology primarily distinguishes number and possession. The singular common form *student* functions as both subject and object, while the plural form *students* is used in corresponding plural contexts.

The genitive is marked by *'s* in the singular and normally by an apostrophe following the plural ending *-s* in regular plural nouns. Thus, *the student's book* refers to a book associated with one student, whereas *the students' books* indicates possession associated with multiple students.

The possessive marker can also occur at the end of a larger noun phrase, as in *the King of England's daughter*. This construction demonstrates that the modern possessive marker is not restricted to attachment to the final lexical noun in a simple noun phrase. Such patterns are important in historical accounts of the genitive because they reveal the changing grammatical status of the possessive marker. Allen (2008) provides a detailed historical analysis of these constructions.

3.3.3. The distinction between case in nouns and case in pronouns

An important feature of Modern English is the contrast between the limited case marking of nouns and the more extensive case distinctions preserved in personal pronouns.

Table 9

Case distinctions in Modern English nouns and pronouns

Function	Noun example	Pronoun example
Subject	The teacher arrived.	She arrived.
Direct object	I saw the teacher.	I saw her.
Indirect object	I gave the teacher a book.	I gave her a book.
Possessive	The teacher's book	Her book / the book is hers

The noun *teacher* does not change its form when its grammatical function changes, except when a possessive construction is used. The pronoun, however, distinguishes *she*, *her*, and *hers*.

This contrast is historically significant. The case category has been reduced much more extensively in English nouns than in personal pronouns. Consequently, it would be inaccurate to conclude that Modern English has entirely lost grammatical case. Rather, case distinctions survive unevenly across different word classes.

3.3.4. Analytical constructions as alternatives to morphological case

The reduction of nominal case endings encouraged the development and increased importance of analytical constructions. In Modern English, grammatical relationships that were formerly expressed partly through inflection are frequently conveyed by prepositions and syntactic patterns.

Consider the following examples:

Table 10

Analytical expression of grammatical relationships in Modern English

Grammatical relationship	Modern English construction	Function
Possession	the child's toy	Possessive <i>'s</i>
Possession or association	the roof of the house	Of-phrase
Recipient	to the child	Prepositional phrase
Instrument	with a knife	Prepositional phrase
Location	in the garden	Prepositional phrase

Grammatical relationship	Modern English construction	Function
Direction	into the room	Prepositional phrase

These constructions illustrate how English distributes grammatical and semantic functions across different linguistic structures. The dative, for example, is no longer marked by a dedicated noun ending, but recipient relationships can be expressed through word order or prepositional phrases: *I gave the child a book* and *I gave a book to the child*.

Similarly, relationships associated with the historical instrumental case are often expressed by prepositions such as *with* and *by*. The modern system therefore relies heavily on syntactic and lexical means rather than on a comprehensive paradigm of nominal case endings.

3.4. Comparative analysis of Old, Middle, and Modern English case declensions

The development of the English case category can be summarized by comparing representative forms from the three historical periods.

Table 11

Diachronic comparison of English nominal case

Feature	Old English	Middle English	Modern English
Principal nominal cases	Nominative, accusative, genitive, dative	Major distinctions reduced; genitive retained	Common and genitive forms in traditional descriptions
Declensional classes	Numerous strong and weak classes	Substantially reduced, with considerable variation	No productive historical declensional classes
Nominative–accusative distinction	Present in some paradigms	Largely lost in nouns	Not morphologically distinguished
Dative distinction	Marked by specific endings in many paradigms	Mostly merged with other forms	Expressed through syntax and prepositions
Genitive	Multiple class-dependent endings	Increasingly associated with -s/-es	Productive possessive -'s
Number marking	Several class-dependent patterns	Increasingly regularized	Mainly -s/-es, with irregular plurals
Grammatical gender in nouns	Morphologically relevant	Gradually lost	No grammatical gender system for common nouns
Main grammatical resources	Inflection, agreement, word order	Mixed inflectional and analytical strategies	Word order, prepositions, limited inflection

The table demonstrates that the most significant change was not the disappearance of every inflectional ending, but the loss of systematic correspondences between noun forms and individual grammatical cases.

Old English nouns exhibited multiple paradigms, although syncretism already existed. Middle English gradually reduced these distinctions and regularized many forms. Modern English retains limited nominal case marking, while the grammatical relationships once expressed by a more extensive system are largely conveyed through syntax and prepositions.

4. Discussion

The diachronic development of the case category in English nouns represents a fundamental transformation in the grammatical structure of the English language. The comparison of Old English, Middle English, and Modern English demonstrates that the historical reduction of nominal inflections was not an isolated morphological phenomenon but a complex process involving phonological change, morphological restructuring, syntactic

reorganization, and changes in the distribution of grammatical information. The transition from an inflectionally rich nominal system to a predominantly analytical structure provides important insights into the mechanisms through which languages reorganize their grammatical resources over time (Hogg & Fulk, 2011; Lass, 1992).

4.1. Principal stages of historical development

The development can be divided into three broad stages.

Stage 1: Old English — inflectionally rich

Nouns have several declensional classes and distinguish nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative forms. Gender and agreement influence nominal morphology.

Stage 2: Middle English — morphological reduction

Unstressed endings weaken, different forms merge, declensional classes become less distinct, and the genitive becomes increasingly associated with -s/-es.

Stage 3: Modern English — predominantly analytical

Nouns generally have one common form for most syntactic functions and a productive possessive form. Word order and prepositions express many grammatical relationships.

This development was gradual rather than uniform. Different dialects preserved different forms for different lengths of time, and written texts sometimes retained inflections that were no longer widely productive in speech. A reliable diachronic analysis must therefore distinguish the existence of a form in a particular text from its status as a productive grammatical distinction.

4.2. Factors responsible for the reduction of nominal case

Several interacting factors contributed to the historical transformation of the English nominal system.

Phonological change. The weakening and loss of unstressed final vowels reduced the phonetic differences between endings. This was a major mechanism through which formerly distinct forms became indistinguishable.

Morphological analogy. Speakers increasingly extended common patterns to nouns belonging to different historical declensions. This process reduced irregularity and encouraged the spread of more productive forms.

Syncretism. The existence of identical forms for different cases in Old English made the system less than fully differentiated from the beginning. Further phonological change expanded the range of case mergers.

Syntactic reorganization. As inflectional distinctions weakened, word order and prepositional constructions became increasingly important for identifying grammatical relationships.

Language contact and sociolinguistic conditions. The coexistence of English, Anglo-Norman French, and Latin contributed to the historical setting in which English changed. Nevertheless, the reduction of inflections cannot be explained exclusively by language contact; internal phonological and morphological processes were also fundamental.

The relationship between these factors is complex. No single explanation accounts for all aspects of the transition. Allen (2005, 2008) emphasizes the need to examine the actual

historical distribution of case-marked constructions rather than assuming that morphological loss automatically produced every subsequent syntactic change.

In Old English, the case system played a significant role in establishing grammatical relationships between nouns and other elements of the sentence. The nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative cases were expressed through different endings according to the declensional class, grammatical gender, and number of a noun. These distinctions allowed nouns to retain different morphological forms depending on their syntactic functions. For example, the noun *stān* exhibited the forms *stān*, *stānes*, *stāne*, and *stānas*, reflecting distinctions associated with case and number. Nevertheless, the Old English case system was not completely uniform, since different declensions exhibited different endings and some grammatical cases shared identical forms. This phenomenon of syncretism indicates that the system already contained a degree of morphological overlap before the more extensive reductions of the Middle English period (Quirk & Wrenn, 1957).

The existence of multiple declensional classes also demonstrates that Old English nominal morphology was historically complex. Strong and weak nouns followed different patterns, and the distribution of endings depended on the historical development of individual noun classes. The masculine a-stem, feminine ō-stem, and neuter a-stem paradigms illustrate how grammatical gender and declensional membership influenced the formal realization of case. Weak nouns, meanwhile, frequently employed forms containing *-n*, as exemplified by *nama* and its inflected forms. Such distinctions contributed to the structural complexity of the Old English nominal system, although they also created opportunities for analogy and paradigmatic regularization.

The reduction of case endings during the Middle English period must be interpreted in connection with the phonological development of the language. The weakening of unstressed vowels made previously distinct endings increasingly similar in pronunciation. As these distinctions became less perceptible, the formal differences between nominative, accusative, and dative forms gradually diminished. This process did not necessarily eliminate the grammatical relationships associated with the cases; rather, it reduced the extent to which those relationships were expressed through the morphology of individual nouns. Consequently, morphological distinctions that had previously been overtly marked became increasingly dependent on syntactic context and other grammatical indicators (Allen, 2005; Lass, 1992).

Morphological analogy further contributed to the restructuring of the nominal system. As certain endings became more frequent or productive, they increasingly replaced less common forms associated with older declensional classes. The spread of plural endings such as *-es* illustrates the tendency toward greater regularity in English noun morphology. However, this development should not be understood as a uniform process affecting all nouns at the same time. Middle English texts reveal considerable variation, and individual dialects preserved different forms for different periods. The historical transition therefore involved competing forms and gradual changes in grammatical distribution rather than an immediate replacement of the Old English system by a completely new paradigm.

The influence of language contact also requires careful consideration. The Norman Conquest of 1066 established a multilingual environment in which English coexisted with Anglo-Norman French and Latin in different social, administrative, literary, and educational contexts. These circumstances influenced the broader development of English, but they do not provide a sufficient explanation for the loss of nominal case endings. The reduction of unstressed vowels and the simplification of inflectional paradigms had internal historical foundations. Therefore, the disappearance of the Old English case system is more accurately

explained through the interaction of internal linguistic processes and external sociolinguistic conditions (Baugh & Cable, 2013; Hogg & Fulk, 2011).

One of the most important consequences of case reduction was the increasing grammatical importance of word order. In Old English, inflectional endings could help identify the subject, direct object, and other sentence constituents even when their positions varied. In Modern English, the forms of ordinary nouns generally remain unchanged across these grammatical functions. Compare *The teacher praised the student* and *The student praised the teacher*. The nouns *teacher* and *student* have identical forms in both sentences, but their syntactic roles are determined by their positions relative to the verb. This contrast illustrates how the reduction of morphological marking increased the importance of relatively fixed constituent order in identifying grammatical relationships (Fischer et al., 2000; Traugott, 1992).

Nevertheless, the development of more regular word order should not be considered a simple consequence of case loss. Word order also reflects information structure, discourse organization, emphasis, and other syntactic principles. Furthermore, Old English already employed word order as a grammatical resource, while morphological distinctions continued to be used in Middle English after their overall productivity had diminished. The relationship between inflectional reduction and syntactic organization was therefore reciprocal and gradual. As morphological distinctions became less reliable, syntactic patterns acquired greater importance; at the same time, the continued use of recognizable syntactic constructions supported communication despite the reduction of nominal endings.

The historical development of the genitive is particularly significant because it demonstrates that not all case distinctions disappeared to the same extent. Whereas nominative, accusative, and dative distinctions were largely lost from ordinary noun paradigms, the genitive continued to be expressed through the possessive marker. The historical relationship between the Old English genitive ending *-es* and the Modern English possessive *-s* provides evidence of continuity within a substantially transformed grammatical system. However, the modern possessive marker cannot be regarded as an entirely unchanged version of the Old English ending. Its distribution has developed over time, and its ability to occur at the end of a complete noun phrase, as in *the King of England's daughter*, distinguishes it from a simple suffix attached exclusively to a noun stem (Allen, 2008; Rosenbach, 2002).

The coexistence of possessive constructions with *-s* and prepositional constructions with *of* also illustrates the redistribution of grammatical functions during the historical development of English. Expressions such as *the student's book* and *the cover of the book* demonstrate that possessive and relational meanings can be represented through different grammatical structures. Although these constructions are not interchangeable in every context, their coexistence reflects the broader tendency for English to employ analytical structures alongside its remaining inflectional forms. The survival of the genitive therefore provides evidence that grammatical functions may persist even when the morphological systems originally associated with them undergo considerable change.

Another important aspect of the transformation concerns the relationship between noun morphology and grammatical gender. Old English nouns belonged to masculine, feminine, and neuter grammatical classes, and gender influenced their declensional patterns and agreement with determiners and adjectives. During the historical development of English, grammatical gender distinctions were progressively lost from the nominal system. Modern English common nouns are generally not classified according to grammatical gender, although natural gender may be reflected in personal pronouns and in the semantics of certain nouns. The disappearance

of grammatical gender and the reduction of case marking are related aspects of the broader restructuring of English nominal morphology, although they followed distinct historical trajectories and should not be treated as identical processes.

The persistence of number marking also demonstrates that morphological reduction did not eliminate inflection from English nouns altogether. Modern English continues to distinguish singular and plural forms, primarily through endings such as *-s* and *-es*, as well as through irregular patterns such as *man/men* and *child/children*. The distinction between *student* and *students* remains morphologically productive, even though the same noun does not normally change form to indicate whether it functions as a subject, direct object, or indirect object. English nominal morphology has therefore undergone selective reduction: some distinctions, particularly number, remain productive, while most historical case distinctions have been lost.

From a comparative-historical perspective, the development of English nominal case illustrates the importance of distinguishing morphological form from grammatical function. The disappearance of a particular ending does not necessarily imply the disappearance of the meaning or syntactic relationship that the ending once expressed. Rather, grammatical functions may be transferred to other linguistic structures. The historical dative, for instance, is no longer represented by a productive noun ending, but recipient relationships remain expressible through constructions such as *I gave the student a book* and *I gave a book to the student*. Similarly, relationships involving means, location, and direction are commonly expressed through prepositions such as *with*, *in*, *to*, and *into*. These examples indicate that grammatical restructuring frequently involves a change in the distribution of linguistic resources rather than a direct loss of communicative capacity (Allen, 2005; Fischer et al., 2000).

The findings also have implications for the study of grammatical change more generally. The English case system demonstrates how phonological changes can influence morphological paradigms and how morphological restructuring can interact with syntactic patterns. It further shows that historical developments must be investigated through evidence from different periods rather than explained through a single factor. The differences between Old English declensions, the transitional patterns of Middle English, and the relatively limited inflectional system of Modern English reveal a long-term process of grammatical reorganization characterized by variation, competition, and gradual stabilization.

In methodological terms, the comparison of representative paradigms provides a useful foundation for identifying the principal directions of change. However, individual paradigms cannot fully capture the chronological and dialectal complexity of the transition. A more comprehensive account would require the examination of historical texts, including prose, poetry, legal documents, and other written records, together with evidence from different regional varieties. Corpus-based investigation could establish how frequently particular case forms occurred, when certain endings became restricted, and how possessive and prepositional constructions developed in different contexts. Such research would help distinguish changes in the frequency of a form from changes in its grammatical status.

Overall, the historical development of the case category in English nouns demonstrates a shift from extensive morphological differentiation toward a system in which syntactic position, prepositions, and a limited set of inflectional forms perform the principal grammatical functions. Old English provides evidence of a comparatively elaborate declensional system, Middle English reveals the gradual reduction and reorganization of that system, and Modern English illustrates the outcome of these long-term developments. The persistence of the

possessive marker, together with the continued expression of grammatical relationships through analytical constructions, confirms that the evolution of English case involved not the disappearance of grammatical relations but the transformation of the linguistic means through which they are expressed.

5. Conclusion

The diachronic analysis of the case category in English nouns reveals a gradual transition from the relatively rich inflectional structure of Old English to the predominantly analytical grammatical system of Modern English. The comparison of Old, Middle, and Modern English demonstrates that the reduction of nominal case was one of the most significant developments in the history of English grammar.

Old English nouns possessed several declensional classes, including strong and weak paradigms, and distinguished the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative cases. A residual instrumental distinction was also present, although it frequently coincided with the dative in noun forms. These inflections expressed grammatical relationships and operated alongside word order, prepositions, and agreement patterns.

During the Middle English period, phonological weakening, morphological analogy, and the increasing merger of previously distinct endings contributed to the reduction of the declensional system. The loss of unstressed vowels was particularly important because it diminished the formal differences between case endings. By the later Middle English period, the nominative, accusative, and dative were no longer systematically distinguished in ordinary noun paradigms, although historical forms and dialectal variation persisted.

Modern English preserves only limited morphological case marking in nouns. The common case is used for subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, and objects of prepositions, while the possessive construction remains productive. The historical genitive is therefore particularly significant: it represents a continuation of an earlier morphological distinction that has survived within a substantially reorganized grammatical system.

The study also establishes that the loss of nominal inflections did not eliminate the grammatical relationships that these inflections once helped express. Instead, those relationships came to be conveyed more extensively through syntactic position, prepositions, and possessive constructions. This transformation illustrates the shift from a predominantly synthetic structure toward a more analytical one.

In conclusion, the history of English nominal case should be interpreted as a process of grammatical restructuring rather than simple morphological decline. The comparison of Old, Middle, and Modern English provides a clear example of how phonological change, morphological regularization, and syntactic reorganization interact over time. Further investigation of historical texts and electronic corpora could provide a more detailed account of the chronological and dialectal variation involved in this development.

Declarations

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, analysis, drafting, and revision: J.B.

How to Cite:

Babayev, J. (2026). Diachronic analysis of case category in English nouns. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, 3(4), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0260304008>

References

- Allen, C. L. (1995). *Case marking and reanalysis: Grammatical relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford University Press.
- Allen, C. L. (2005). Changes in case marking in NP: From Old English to Middle English. In M. Butt & T. H. King (Eds.), *Competition and variation in natural languages: The case for case* (pp. 223–249). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044651-6/50011-2>
- Allen, C. L. (2008). *Genitives in early English: Typology and evidence*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199216680.001.0001>
- Baugh, A. C., & Cable, T. (2013). *A history of the English language* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Blake, N. F. (1992). *A history of the English language*. Macmillan.
- Fischer, O., van Kemenade, A., Koopman, W., & van der Wurff, W. (2000). *The syntax of early English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hogg, R. M., & Fulk, R. D. (2011). *A grammar of Old English: Vol. 2. Morphology*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444327472>
- Kolasińska, P. (2013). Early Old English nominal system: Synchronic declensions in the Vespasian Psalter. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 48(4), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.2478/stap-2013-0013>
- Lass, R. (1992). Phonology and morphology. In N. F. Blake (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language: Vol. 2. 1066–1476* (pp. 23–155). Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, B., & Robinson, F. C. (2012). *A guide to Old English* (8th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Quirk, R., & Wrenn, C. L. (1957). *An Old English grammar* (2nd ed.). Methuen.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
- Rosenbach, A. (2002). *Genitive variation in English: Conceptual factors in synchronic and diachronic studies*. Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110899818>
- Sweet, H. (1892). *A new English grammar, logical and historical. Part I: Introduction, phonology, and accidence*. Clarendon Press.
- Traugott, E. C. (1992). Syntax. In R. M. Hogg (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language: Vol. 1. The beginnings to 1066* (pp. 168–289). Cambridge University Press.

Received: 15 September 2026

Accepted: 06 October 2026

Published: 11 October 2026