

Advances in English Historical Linguistics



Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 112

Editor

Werner Winter

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Advances in English Historical Linguistics (1996)

edited by

Jacek Fisiak

Marcin Krygier

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 1998

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication-Data

Advances in English historical linguistics (1996) / edited by
Jacek Fisiak, Marcin Krygier.

p. cm. – (Trends in linguistics. Studies and mono-
graphs ; 112)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 3-11-016151-6 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. English language – Grammar, Historical. 2. English
language – History. I. Fisiak, Jacek. II. Krygier, Marcin.
III. Series.

PE1075.A39 1998

425–dc21

98-27494

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – Cataloging-in-Publication-Data

Advances in English historical linguistics (1996) / ed. by Jacek
Fisiak ; Marcin Krygier. – Berlin ; New York : Mouton de
Gruyter, 1998

(Trends in linguistics : Studies and monographs ; 112)

ISBN 3-11-016151-6

© Copyright 1998 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechan-
ical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, with-
out permission in writing from the publisher.

Printing: Werner Hildebrand, Berlin.

Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This book contains a broad selection of papers presented at the Ninth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics. The conference was held at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, in August 1996. Its participants came from all continents, and it was especially encouraging to see scholars from countries which had not been represented previously.

It may be safely said here that, judging by the sheer number of contributions worthy of publication, the 9th ICEHL was as successful as any of its predecessors. The organisers were able to offer a couple of plenary presentations every day, followed by parallel sections. Thus, the conference managed once again to convey the sense of growing interest in English historical linguistics in the scholarly community. Therefore, the task of selecting those papers that ultimately made it into the present volume turned out to be a daunting task indeed. We would like to thank those colleagues who helped us make the final decision concerning the selection.

It might be put forward by a concerned reader that the distribution of papers in this volume is rather uneven. Thus, morphological and syntactical studies form by far the strongest contingent in the volume. They cover topics as diverse as word-formation, modality and negation, or clause structure in the history of the English language. A more theoretically-oriented strain is represented by contributions discussing issues such as grammaticalization or lexical diffusion in language change. Recent interest in historiography of historical linguistics finds its reflection in a sizable number of submissions, presenting various aspects of works by past grammarians such as Buchanan or Huish, while phonological studies, less numerous for a number of years now, are represented by a few papers only. Among the more fashionable, at least recently, approaches, sociolinguistic studies in the corpus linguistics framework and papers devoted to the development of Early

VI *Preface*

Modern English seem to be of particular value. All the same, we believe that the results of our work accurately reflect the main areas of current scholarly interest in English historical linguistics.

Poznań, March 1998

Jacek Fisiak
Marcin Krygier

Contents

Double prepositions in English <i>Gunnar Bergh</i>	1
Motivations for producing and analyzing compounds in Wulfstan's sermons <i>Don Chapman</i>	15
The degrammaticalization of addressee-satisfaction conditionals in Early Modern English <i>Guohua Chen</i>	23
From <i>unasecendlic</i> to <i>unspeakable</i> : The role of domain structure in morphological change <i>Christiane Dalton-Puffer</i>	33
Anthony Huish: A 17th-century English grammarian <i>Roberta Facchinetti</i>	53
John Bullokar's "Termes of Art" <i>Maurizio Gotti</i>	63
The <i>Dublin Vowel Shift</i> and the historical perspective <i>Raymond Hickey</i>	79
On the ideological boundaries of Old English dialects <i>Richard M. Hogg</i>	107
The spread of <i>-ly</i> to present participles <i>Kristin Killie</i>	119
Inversion after single and multiple topics in Old English <i>Willem F. Koopman</i>	135
Epenthesis and <i>Mouillierung</i> in the explanation of <i>i</i> -umlaut: The rise and fall of a theory <i>Marcin Krygier</i>	151
On minor declarative complementizers in the history of English: The case of <i>but</i> <i>María José López-Couso and Belén Méndez-Naya</i>	161

VIII Contents

Bare and <i>to</i> -infinitives in Old English: Callaway revisited <i>Bettelou Los</i>	173
The interplay of external and internal factors in morphological restructuring: The case of <i>you</i> <i>Angelika Lutz</i>	189
The origins of long-short allomorphy in English <i>Donka Minkova and Robert P. Stockwell</i>	211
Modals in past counterfactual conditional protases <i>Rafał Molencki</i>	241
Downsizing the preterite-presents in Middle English <i>Stephen J. Nagle and Sara L. Sanders</i>	253
Social mobility and the decline of multiple negation in Early Modern English <i>Terttu Nevalainen</i>	263
The grammaticalization in Medieval English <i>Michiko Ogura</i>	293
Evolution theory and lexical diffusion <i>Mieko Ogura and William S-Y. Wang</i>	315
On nominative case assignment in Old English <i>Masayuki Ohkado</i>	345
Social factors and pronominal change in the seventeenth century: The Civil-War effect? <i>Helena Raumolin-Brunberg</i>	361
Towards an integrated view of the development of English: Notes on causal linking <i>Matti Rissanen</i>	389
Problems of functional structure in some relative clauses <i>Aimo Seppänen</i>	407
Eighteenth-century linguistics and authorship: The cases of Dyche, Priestley, and Buchanan <i>Robin D. Smith</i>	435

Adverbialization and subject-modification in Old English <i>Toril Swan</i>	443
Standardization of English spelling: The eighteenth-century printers' contribution <i>Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade</i>	457
The functional relationship between rules (Old English voicing of fricatives and lengthening of vowels before homorganic clusters) <i>Jerzy Welna</i>	471
Index of subjects	485

Double prepositions in English

Gunnar Bergh

1. Introduction

The topic of the present paper is double prepositions in English.¹ By this term I mean a syntactic structure which — although rather marginal in frequency — attracts a great deal of theoretical interest because it represents a combination of two well-known syntactic phenomena, pied-piping and preposition stranding. Structurally speaking, the construction may be described as containing a prepositional phrase (PP) which is fronted from its logical, usually postverbal² position and where the moved preposition is repeated in the empty syntactic slot left behind.³ The following sentences illustrate this deployment principle:

- (1) a. *þus it is enpeyringe not oonly of oone estate of þe chirche, but of all þre, of the whiche I spoke of in þe bigynnyng.* (Wycliffe, 14th c.)
- b. *That fair for which loue gron'd for and would die.* (Shakespeare, 16th c.)
- c. *I had nobody to whom I could in confidence commit the secrecy of my circumstances to.* (Defoe, 18th c.)

The main reason for using the term “double prepositions” here is, of course, that the target items express the same syntactic function in the sentence (heads of the same PP), as shown by the fact that we can delete one of the prepositions and still be left with a good sentence (or, in modern eyes, an even better sentence). Whereas in Present-day English such constructions are likely to be considered anomalous (Riley—Parker 1986), solecistical (Visser 1963: 407), or downright ungrammatical (Denison 1981: 213), they are in fact attested on a number of occasions in earlier periods of the language, as suggested by the above examples (cf. also Dubislav 1916; Jespersen 1927: 192–193; Rydén 1966: 43–44, 139–140).

Trying to formulate the problem which this paper will address, it is clear that while sufficient evidence is available for the existence of this otiose construction, few attempts seem to have been made to explain its *raison d'être*. And yet when such attempts have been made, it is usually not a question of any detailed analysis

of its origin or syntactic properties but rather of cursory reflections on its use (cf. Sisam 1921: 242; Mustanoja 1960: 347–348; Visser 1963: 407).

With this background in mind, we will now consider some of the central issues relating to the use of this construction, in particular as it is represented in *wh*-structures (relatives and interrogatives), since this is the theoretically most interesting field. The questions which will guide us through the process can be formulated as follows: What is the relative distribution of the double preposition structure in texts from the different historical subperiods of English? What factors are at work in determining its usage? How can the existence of this construction be explained with reference to its distributional patterns and internal properties?

2. Data

In order to be able to answer the first of these questions — what the distributional pattern looks like — one may receive a first hint of the answer by simply consulting some of the major works relating to the syntactic history of English. Thus, e.g., Fischer states in the *Cambridge history of English* that double prepositions “are quite frequent in Late Middle English” (1992: 390), a claim which is supported by Mustanoja in his *Middle English syntax*, where he notes that such pleonastic prepositions are “not uncommon in later ME” (1960: 347). Likewise, we may record that Visser (1963: 407), when discussing “prepositions used twice” in his *Historical syntax of the English language*, gives ten examples of the construction, of which no less than seven are from the period between 1370 and 1500. From these observations, then, one is prone to draw the conclusion that double prepositions are a phenomenon which was particularly favored in Late Middle English.

However, since this eclectic method is in itself impressionistic, we cannot rely on it alone in a scientific context, but have to complement it by a systematic search of a collection of authentic texts, preferably one which represents the main subperiods of English in a balanced way. With the *Helsinki Corpus* as a natural choice here, a computerized investigation was carried out on the basis of its 1.4-million-word collection of Old English, Middle English, and Early Modern English text samples. As the investigation was confined to *wh*-items, it was possible to limit the search to three lexemes only, viz., the equivalents of the modern pronouns *what*, *which* and *who* — although, of course, realized in a multitude of different spellings. The target sequence which the computer was set to work with was a fronted PP containing any of these items, simply because all instances of double preposition constructions necessarily contain a pied-piped PP. These phrases were then checked to see if the pied-piped preposition happened to co-occur with a stranded preposition representing an identical syntactic function at the end of the same clause.

The search produced the results given in Table 1:

Table 1. Absolute distribution of *wh*-constructions with double prepositions in the *Helsinki Corpus* material.

subperiod	number
OE1–3	0
ME1	2
ME2	2
ME3	4
ME4	7
EModE1	5
EModE2	0
EModE3	0
total	20

As we can see, these results tend to confirm each of the two claims made earlier about the frequency of the double preposition construction: first, the low total indicates that the construction is typically a marginal one in English; second, the figures lend support to the quoted indications in the literature that the construction was more common in the Late Middle English period than in any other period of the language.⁴ In addition, as suggested by the same data, there seems to be a fairly high proportion in the period immediately following, i.e., in the first subperiod of Early Modern English, where five cases were noted. And, admittedly, this outcome was not altogether unexpected either, since in a detailed study of relative constructions from the 16th century, Rydén (1966: 43–44, 139–140, and *passim*) makes reference to no less than 28 cases of double prepositions. Thus, it is of interest to note here that out of the total 20 cases identified in the *Helsinki Corpus* material, no less than 16 turned out to derive from texts representing the 15th and 16th centuries. This clustering suggests that at that time some kind of linguistic development or change was taking place which is related to the noted frequency increase. The main question here, then, is obvious: what did this development consist of?

3. Discussion

In the following, three possible explanations will be evaluated, each of which relates to the noted frequency pattern of double prepositions. First, the phenomenon will be discussed in terms of stylistics, specifically the availability of texts from the pertinent centuries and the later rise of prescriptive grammar. Then, a grammatical perspective will be brought in where consideration is given to the possibility of the target development being connected to the rise of preposition stranding with *wh*-elements which occurred in Late Middle English. Finally, the

grammatical examination will be continued by a discussion of the idea of different verb units being influential here, and whether the data can be explained with reference to syntactic reanalysis.

3.1. *Informal texts and prescriptivism*

With regard to the first of these explanations, in what sense could the availability of texts be relevant here? To begin with, it seems clear that constructions involving preposition stranding generally tend to belong to the informal use of language (cf., e.g., the discussion in Visser 1963: 400–415), and if such a construction is also tautological due to the inclusion of a redundant element — as in double preposition structures — most people are likely to say that it makes the case for informality even stronger. Could it be, then, that the demonstrated increase in frequency is conditioned by the fact that extant informal texts, e.g., private letters and speech-based writings of different kinds, go back only to Late Middle English, and that the noted distribution, therefore, is simply an artifact produced by various historical accidents?

To find out, it might suffice to check the material from the *Helsinki Corpus* again, and specifically the text type classification of the 20 samples containing double prepositions:

Table 2. Absolute distribution of text types with double-preposition *wh*-constructions in the *Helsinki Corpus* material.

text type	number
fiction	4
law	4
document	2
science, medicine	2
biography	1
handbook, medicine	1
Old Testament	1
philosophy	1
private correspondence	1
religious treatise	1
romance	1
rule	1
total	20

The natural conclusion, as suggested by these data, would be to claim that double prepositions occurred in all types of text, since obviously a variety of both informal and formal texts are represented here. And this, in its turn, would mean that we

cannot subscribe to the idea that the increased incidence of double prepositions would be due primarily to changes in the distribution of different text types, i.e., mainly formal versus informal ones.

Still, this argument would only pertain to the rise of double prepositions. What about their decline? In this perspective, the notion of prescriptive grammar might be relevant, with its blanketing effect on all sorts of constructions which appeared to run counter to logic and/or Latin. As is commonly known, prescriptivism started to pluck up courage in the 17th century, not least through the work of Dryden and later Gibbon. An early contribution by the former goes back to the 1680s, as reported by Visser in the following way:

Dryden, who openly states: “I am often put to a stand in considering whether what I write be the idiom of the tongue... & have no other way to clear my doubts but by translating my English into Latin”, and consequently finds that end-position of the preposition is a non-Latin idiom and therefore inadmissible in English, alters all the sentences with end-position occurring in the 1684 edition of his *Essays on Dramatic Poesy* published sixteen years before. (Visser 1963: 402)

It seems safe to assume that measures of this type must have had a hampering effect not only on preposition stranding proper but also on related pleonastic structures such as double-preposition constructions. The only problem for our purposes is that there is a certain time gap between the noted decline of the target construction and the rise of prescriptivism: the former seems to have occurred around 1600, while the latter did not gain serious weight until after 1700. Accordingly, we conclude that the combination of text availability and prescriptive grammar can not be regarded as a full explanation in this context.

3.2. *Transitional wh-effect*

Let us now turn to the second of our possible explanations — that the increased use of double prepositions represents a transitional stage in the syntactic development of prepositional *wh*-phrases. One indication along these lines is provided by Fischer (1992: 390), who argues that sentences with double prepositions “show the development of preposition stranding in *wh*-structures”, thus implying that the two processes are somehow related.

To be able to evaluate this implicit hypothesis, we first need to know the basic facts of preposition stranding in *wh*-constructions. While the stranding pattern itself was fairly well established in connection with the elements *þe* (obligatory) and *þat* (optional) already in Old English (cf. Dekeyser 1990; van den Eynden 1994: 220–221), there were apparently no cases of it in *wh*-environments at that time, i.e., pied-piping was obligatory with interrogatives, the only *wh*-type found. Instead, the first sporadic instances seem to have emerged in the early 13th century, after

the extension of *wh*-elements into the relative domain; Fischer (1992: 390), e.g., cites the following two examples, the first interrogative and the second relative:

- (2) a. *nuste nan kempe, whæm he sculde slæn on*, (Layamon's *Brut*, 1205)
 b. *And getenisse men ben in ebron, Quilc men mai get wundren on*.
 (*Genesis and Exodus*, c. 1250)

It was not until the decades before 1400, however, that the frequency of stranding increased noticeably, and, as noted by Dekeyser (1990), it was not until well into Early Modern English that it became a competitive alternative to pied-piping. Incidentally, by saying that we can also refute the idea suggested by some scholars — in particular Grimshaw (1975: 37) — that pied-piping was obligatory in Chaucerian English. The following examples from *The Canterbury tales* (late 1380s) should provide sufficient counter-evidence (cf. also Bengtsson 1996):

- (3) a. *But to kyng Alla, which I spake of yoore* (*The Man of Law's tale*)
 b. *His lady, certes, and his wyf also, the which that law of love acordeth to* (*The Squire's tale*)
 c. *What sholde I tellen ech proporcious of things which that we werchen upon* (*The Canon's Yeoman's tale*)
 d. *Yet hadde I levere payen for the mare, Which that he rit on* (*The Manciple's prologue*)

With regard to double prepositions, then, could it be the case simply that the use of these items increased during the transitional stage between obligatory and optional pied-piping with *wh*-items? One would be inclined to answer in the affirmative here — although there are other important circumstances which we will bring up in the next section. The main argument for believing so is the almost perfect timewise match between the two processes involved — i.e., both the noted higher frequency of double prepositions and the change from obligatory to optional pied-piping seem to have occurred in the 15th and 16th centuries.

Another type of support for this theory comes from odd cases like the following, where one and the same construction appears in two different forms in two different periods:

- (4) a. *Wherfore the Mair and aldermen comandeth on the kyngges half and on hire owene half also that no man of what*

- condicioun or degre that he be, priue ne straunge*
(Proclamations - ME3)
- b. *The Kyng oure Sov~eigne Lorde [...]/ hath enacted ordeyned
and stablysshed, that ev~y p~sone of what condicion or degre
he be of, beyng or herafter be in oure seid Sov~ayn lord the
Kyng~ wagis* (Statutes - ME4)

The first example, which is from ME3, represents an ordinary pied-piping construction, and stands in contrast to the second example, which is from ME4, and which exhibits both pied-piping and stranding, i.e., a double-preposition construction.

To this we may add a third type of supportive data which has to do with the extensive language contact — as represented by various Anglo-Norman activities, translation work, etc. — which took place during the Middle English period. Sisam (1921: 242), citing four cases of otiose prepositions in *Mandeville's Travels* — e.g., *fro whom all godenesse and grace cometh fro* — provides the following explanation of the phenomenon as it appears in relative clauses (cf. also Denison 1981: 215):

The pleonasm is explained by the divergence of French and ME. word order. In French, as in modern literary English, the preposition is placed at the beginning of the clause, before the relative (*de qui, dont*, etc.). ME. writers naturally use the relative *that*, and postpone the preposition to the end of the clause: e.g., *þat all godenesse cometh fro*. The translator compromises between his French original and his native habit by placing the preposition both at the beginning and at the end.

The French influence would here work as a temporary reinforcement of the previous obligatoriness of pied-piping with *wh*-elements at a time when this constraint was being relaxed, thus potentially increasing the difficulty experienced by contemporary speakers/writers in handling these phrases.

While it is quite probable, then, that significant influence should be attributed to the rise of preposition stranding in *wh*-structures, it still cannot be seen as the full solution to the present problem. The reason for this is, however, not the fact that there are earlier *wh*-cases with double prepositions, e.g., the ones instanced in the corpus investigation:

- (5) a. *þe mucche wlite habbe; nim him of hwas wlite beoð awundret
of; þe sunne & te mone. up-o hwas nebscheft; (Hali Meidhad,
c. 1200)*
- b. *sei me hwer þu wunest meast. of hwet cun þu art ikumen of. &
ti cunde cuð me. & þurh hwas heaste heane 3e hali men.
(Margarete, c. 1200)*

- c. 'Dame', a seide, 'þat sit aboue, For þat ilche lordes loue, On wham þin herte is on iset: Zeue me to day a meles met!' (*The Romance of Sir Beues of Hamtoun*, c. 1300)

These instances can be accounted for simply by making reference to the parallel odd cases of preposition stranding noted in the 13th century, implying that the two types of construction tend to go hand in hand in their early development. What is more problematic, however, is the fact that there are other structures containing double prepositions which do not involve *wh*-elements and which, therefore, cannot be straightforwardly connected to the above explanation. Consider the following examples, which all involve an element of topicalization:⁵

- (6) a. *inne on þæm fæstenne sæton feawa cirlisce men on* (*Chronicle A*, 884)
 b. *swa þat on þære rode... sticodon on mænige arewan* (*Chronicle E*, 1083)
 c. *Of love were liking of to here* (*Ipomedon*, c. 1185)
 d. *In uncuth land to won ai in* (*Cursor Mundi*, c. 1300)
 e. *Of many aunters I here of telle* (*Cursor Mundi*, c. 1300)

Constructions of this kind make it necessary, arguably, to turn to our third and last possible explanation, which has to do with the notions of complex verbs and syntactic reanalysis.

3.3. *Verb units and syntactic reanalysis*

The significance of complex verbs has been discussed by several scholars. Jespersen (1927: 184–190), e.g., trying to explain the variant use of pied-piping and stranding, notes that there are some prepositions which are more naturally placed at the end of a clause, because they are felt to be less intimately connected with the fronted item than with the verb, e.g., in complex verbs like *long for*, *delight in*, *wonder at*. In contrast, there are other prepositions which exhibit the opposite pattern, i.e., they are more intimately connected with the fronted item than with the verb, e.g., *beyond which*, *during which*, *except what*. These facts would suggest that a preposition is often torn between the attraction of the main verb governing it and the alliance duties it has towards its own complement — thus acting as an important factor in deciding different sentence patterns.

Visser (1963: 407) has capitalized on this idea in the context of double prepositions. Specifically, he suggests that these constructions may be conditioned by a verb and a preposition forming what he calls a semasiological unit — i.e., a semantic unit — so that in spite of the fact that the preposition has already been

placed before a fronted item, it is resumed and tacked on to the subsequent verb as well. Let us analyze one of his examples:

- (7) *William Jeney... and yonge Thomas Heigham, [to which personys] [I] [haue spoken to]* (Bury Wills, c. 1370)

The preposition *to* in this sentence would be first fronted together with its complement *which personys*, and then resumed by the phrase-internal attraction of the verb *speak*, thereby keeping intact each of the three main constituents of the subclause, as indicated by the added brackets.

What are the grounds for subscribing to this theory, then? Well, a crucial factor here seems to be the general change of word order which occurred in the transition from Old English to Middle English, making English an SVO language rather than an SOV language (e.g., Traugott 1992: 273–275; Fischer 1992: 370–372). This is a change which is often associated with the development of preposition stranding in constructions involving NP movement (e.g., prepositional passives, cf. Fischer—van der Leek 1981: 327–329; van Kemenade 1987: 212–213), but arguably the same connection can be established with regard to the movement of *wh*-items, thus providing a common platform for the notion of syntactic reanalysis (e.g., Koma 1981). Although the issue is likely to be somewhat controversial, not least due to the technicalities of generative (transformational) grammar (cf. Inada 1981; Denison 1993: 144–153), the parallel treatment of the two types of structure is desirable in the sense that it yields a more generalized account of the foundation of stranding.

To illustrate the principal idea of this theory, consider the following VP configurations:

- (8) a. [VP [PP P NP] V]
 b. [VP V [PP P NP]]

When, through this change, the (a)-pattern was replaced by the (b)-pattern, V and P became adjacent, which is a necessary condition for syntactic reanalysis to apply. Hereby it is theoretically possible to interpret the structure not only as a simple verb with a PP complement, as in (9a), but also as a complex verb with a regular object, as in (9b), a framework which has turned out to be of great significance in the field of generative grammar (cf., van Riemsdijk 1978: 218–226):

- (9) a. [VP [V laughed] [PP at him/whom]]
 b. [VP [V laughed at] [NP him/whom]]

Apparently, then, the concept of syntactic reanalysis can be regarded as the basis not only for the general extension of preposition stranding but also for the increasing force of complex verbs in the conditioning of different sentence patterns.

While there is much to commend a theory like this, the main question for our purposes would still be how to integrate it into our previous attempt to explain double preposition constructions through the introduction of preposition stranding in *wh*-environments. The following is my suggestion. The use of double prepositions seems to be triggered by a compromise between two linguistic forces, one syntactic and one semantic. The pied-piped preposition would be the result of a speaker's desire to keep the *wh*-phrase together, something which was more important in those days due to the strong influence of Latin and French, which did not recognize a stranded alternative. The stranded preposition, in its turn, would be a result of a speaker's trying to keep together what was felt to be a complex verb phrase, an interpretation which was facilitated by the change of word order at the beginning of Middle English, and which subsequently relaxed the conditions for end-placed prepositions. Between the two forces at issue, the syntactic one would be the stronger, and as long as it was in full operation the opposing semantic force was kept at bay. However, when the rule of obligatory pied-piping with *wh*-items was gradually made redundant, the syntax had to yield partly to the forces working towards semantic unity which were exercised by verbs with prepositional complements, thus paving the way for the double preposition construction. In topicalization structures, in contrast, where no impeding *wh*-elements occur, these semantic principles would have been able to apply with greater latitude. Incidentally, this also suggests part of the explanation as to why Old English admitted double prepositions in topicalization structures, as indicated in (6) above, but not in *wh*-interrogatives.

4. Summary

To sum up this investigation, then, we may return to the three key questions posed at the beginning of this paper. First, with regard to the relative distribution of double preposition constructions in English, it was shown that they are clearly overrepresented in 15th and 16th century texts, both as indicated subjectively through existing literature on the topic, and as measured more objectively through the data of the *Helsinki Corpus*. Second, concerning the main factors governing the frequency of the construction, it was suggested that both syntactic and semantic factors are operative in this field, and that stylistic measures in the form of prescriptive grammar are likely to have played a certain part too (but not the availability of informal texts as such). Third, it was argued that the main catalyst of the increased use of double prepositions was the change from obligatory to

optional pied-piping in *wh*-structures and the increased attraction exercised by verbs on prepositions in complex verb constructions, both of which are thought to be related to the underlying general change of word order and, hence, the possibilities of syntactic reanalysis.

Notes

1. Thanks are due to the following colleagues for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper: David Denison, Jennifer Herriman, Masayuki Ohkado, Susan Pintzuk, Aimo Seppänen, Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Anthony Warner, Ilse Wischer.
2. There are two main exceptions to this pattern: first, the PP may occur as the subject of a clause in some contexts; second, and more importantly, the PP may be placed before the finite verb when it functions as the object of a clause with SOV word order, e.g., in Old English.
3. When saying that the moved preposition is “repeated” in the slot left behind, it is necessary to add that it is not always the case that the fronted preposition is simply copied there, as suggested by Grimshaw (1975: 41–42). The slot can in fact also be filled by another preposition with the same syntactic function, as shown by the next set of examples (where the deletion test applies equally well):

- (i) a. *of him to whom he had most his trust on* (Caxton, 15th c.)
- b. *I fear me, and, I divine, much of doctor Nicolas; a man with whom my fantasy never wrought withal* (Latimer, 16th c.)
- c. *an occurrence for which they have been... in patient expectation of* (Goldsmith, 18th c.)

These examples suggest that we are faced with two subtypes of the double preposition construction — one where there is identity between the two prepositions, which may be referred to as the matched case, and another where there is no identity between these two elements, which may be referred to as the mismatched case (cf. Riley—Parker 1986). While there are several interesting ramifications of this distinction, limitations of space make it necessary to leave them out here. Instead, they will be brought up in a separate article to be published later.

4. Admittedly, the noted frequency pattern is complicated slightly by the fact that the use of *wh*-items in general was also on the increase in Middle English. Although this frequency rise was not parallel in time to that of double

prepositions, it might still have influenced the reported figures for that period to some extent.

5. As these examples clearly show, topicalization constructions with double prepositions can be found even in Old English, although some of them are likely to be “imitations of a Latin exemplar containing a compound verb with a spatial prefix” (Denison 1981: 215).

References

- Adamson, Sylvia—Vivien Law—Nigel Vincent—Susan Wright (eds.)
1990 *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bengtsson, Per
1996 *Prepositional relatives in English: A diachronic case study of three authors*. [Unpublished MS.]
- Blake, Norman F. (ed.)
1992 *The Cambridge history of the English language. 2: 1066–1476*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dekeyser, Xavier
1990 “Preposition stranding and relative complementiser deletion: Implicational tendencies in English and other Germanic languages”, in: Sylvia Adamson et al. (eds.), 87–109.
- Denison, David
1981 *Aspects of the history of English group-verbs, with particular attention to the syntax of the Ormulum*. [Unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford].
1993 *English historical syntax: Verbal constructions*. London: Longman.
- Dubislav, Georg
1916 “Studien zur mittenglischen Syntax I, II”, *Anglia* 40: 263–321.
- van den Eynden, Nadine
1994 *Syntactic variation and unconscious linguistic change*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Fischer, Olga C. M.
1992 “Syntax”, in: Norman F. Blake (ed.), 207–408.
- Fischer, Olga C. M.—Frederike van der Leek
1981 “Optional vs. radical re-analysis: Mechanisms of syntactic change”, *Lingua* 55: 301–350.
- Grimshaw, Jane
1975 “Evidence for relativization by deletion in Chaucerian Middle English”, in: Ellen M. Kaisse—Jorge Hankamer (eds.), 35–43.

- Hogg, Richard M. (ed.)
 1992 *The Cambridge history of the English language. 1: The beginnings to 1066.* Cambridge: CUP.
- Inada, Toshiaki
 1981 "Problems of reanalyses and preposition stranding", *Studies in English Linguistics* (Tokyo) 9: 120–131.
- Jespersen, Otto
 1927 *A Modern English grammar on historical principles.* Vol. 3. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Kaisse, Ellen M.—Jorge Hankamer (eds.)
 1975 *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- van Kemenade, Ans
 1987 *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English.* Dordrecht: ICG Publishing.
- Koma, Osamu
 1981 "Word order change and preposition stranding in ME", *Studies in English Linguistics* (Tokyo) 9: 132–144.
- Kytö, Merja (comp.)
 1996 *Manual to the diachronic part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding conventions and lists of source texts.* (3rd edition.) Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Mustanoja, Tauno
 1960 *A Middle English syntax.* Vol. 1. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk
 1978 *A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases.* Lisse: de Ridder.
- Riley, Kathryn—Frank Parker
 1986 "Anomalous prepositions in relative clauses", *American Speech* 61: 291–306.
- Rydén, Mats
 1966 *Relative constructions in early sixteenth century English with special reference to sir Thomas Elyot.* Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis.
- Sisam, Kenneth
 1921 *Fourteenth century verse and prose.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs
 1992 "Syntax", in: Richard M. Hogg (ed.), 168–289.
- Visser, Frederikus Th.
 1963 *An historical syntax of the English language.* Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Motivations for producing and analyzing compounds in Wulfstan's sermons

Don Chapman

Motivation of compounds, i.e., whether the composite structure of compounds is at least discerned and perhaps even relied upon for interpretation, is essentially a pragmatic issue; the question is not whether a given compound can be analyzed — most can — but whether it is analyzed by a speaker/hearer when it is used. This pragmatic concern can easily be mixed up with synchronic, theoretical concerns of word-formation, i.e., how compounds are originally coined, because both questions examine the patterns that allow a compound to be interpreted or coined. Like syntax, compounding and affixation are systematic enough to invite a search for quasi-generative word-formation rules. But unlike syntax, the output of word-formation is words, not phrases or sentences — words that can enter the lexicon and be retrieved through lexical, not generative processes, words that need never be produced by rules again, words that linger in the lexicon picking up nuances, connotations, and even denotations that could not have been predicted by the word-formation rules. So while every utterance, no matter how many times it is repeated, may be regarded as the output of generative syntactic rules, words, even compounds and affixed words, arise from two separate processes: retrieval (by far more common) and coinage (less common).

In this rough model of word-formation and word use, a word may originally be coined by recourse to word-formation rules, but gradually, as it is increasingly used, enters the lexicon, i.e., become lexicalized (cf. Lipka 1981: 120–122). E.g., the compound *blackboard* has been lexicalized, since *black* is no longer meaningful — few blackboards, in fact, are black. In any given utterance, then, the individual words will be at different stages of lexicalization, from the recently coined nonce compounds to the fully lexicalized and idiomatized words, like *blackboard* and *cupboard*, and even to the obscured compounds like *lord* < OE *hlaf* + OE *weard*. Simply analyzing compounds by the word-formation rules that originally produced them will likely impose different diachronic states of words on their synchronic use. So will treating all the words as if lexicalized. Since both generative and lexical processes can presumably account for the uses of words, what is needed is some way to gauge the relative lexicalization of a word. This paper is an initial foray into analyzing the lexical status of compounds in the Old English sermons of Wulfstan, Archbishop of York from 1002–1023.

Assessing the synchronic state of words in historical states of the language poses considerable challenges. The tools for analyzing historical states of the language are not plentiful or precise, since no native informants are available. But occasionally local clues within a text reassert a compound's original motivation

and suggest that whatever degree of lexicalization the compound had achieved, within its passage it is highly likely interpreted as a compound, not retrieved from the lexicon. Just such clues are found in one of Wulfstan's most prominent stylistic devices, the pairing of compounds with other compounds or simplexes that repeat one of the constituents of the compound, as in the pairs *manswican ne mansworan* 'evil-deceivers nor evil-swearers' (WHom 8c 162) and *wedlogan ne wordlogan* 'oath-liars nor word-liars' (WHom 8c 162–63).¹ Some 200 such pairs occur throughout Wulfstan's sermons, in varying connections, from the tightly joined pairs like those just cited to more loosely connected pairs like

- (1) *ac fengon to wurðienne æt nyhstan mistlice entas & strece woruldmen þe mihtige wurdan on woruldafelum* (WHom 12 36–38)
 'But at last they received as objects to worship various giants and severe world-men who were mighty in world-power'

(Cf. Fill (1992) for a further description of this device in later English writing).

In general such pairs draw attention to the compound structure of the words simply by the proximity of the repeated constituent. On occasion the pairs more explicitly highlight the compound structure, especially when interpretation of the compound is essential for the rhetorical effect of the larger passage. One such passage is

- (2) *Ne beon hi æfre... ne æwbrecan, ac healdan heora rihtæwe*
 'Let them not ever be... adulterers ('marriage-breakers'), but hold their lawful marriage-vow (wife?)' (WHom 10a 11–12)

The pair *æwbrecan* 'adulterer' and *rihtæwe* 'lawful wife' highlight the shared element *æw*, a resonant word originally meaning law and later specializing to marriage-vow or even wife. These later specialized senses are probably primary within both compounds, but the contrast between *brecan* 'breaking' and *healdan* 'keeping' reasserts the earlier, more general meanings, emphasizing that an adulterer (*æwebreca*) is literally one who breaks the law and that holding one's wife or keeping a marriage-vow (*rihtæw*) is a specialized form of more general oath-keeping. The tension between the general and specific meanings in *rihtæw* emerges even stronger, since the injunction is directed toward monks who would presumably have no wife to hold or marriage to keep. Apparently the general sense is intended (the monks should not be vow-breakers, but should keep their strict vows), except that the clause "that is their monastery" is added as if to explain what the lawful *æwe* 'wife'? 'marriage'? of a monk could be.

But even when the interpretation of the compound is not crucial to the larger meaning, the artificiality of such closely linked compounds cannot help but draw

attention to the compounds and their composite structure, as the following pairs illustrate:

- (3a) *Se þe wære weamod, weorðe se geþyldmod*
 'He who may have been "gloom-minded", let him be patience-minded'
- (3b) *Se þe wære hohmod, weorðe se glæðmod* (WHom 10c 122–38)
 'He who may have been "trouble-minded", let him be glad-minded'

As my translations are meant to show, the lexicalized senses of the words ending with *-mod* are superseded by the reasserted structure of the compound. Even if *weamod* would normally be felt to mean nothing more than 'gloomy', its proximity to other words ending with *-mod* highlight the second constituent and the composite structure.

The discussion so far has focused on gauging the composite status of a compound by the likelihood or even necessity of interpreting the compound within a passage. The composite status of a compound would also be asserted in recently coined words, so another method of gauging the relative lexicalization of a word is to assess the likelihood that a given compound was produced or coined for a given situation. The need for new words is often associated with the creative minds of society — e.g., the scientists, who need new words for their inventions and discoveries, or the poets, who seek new words to express their deeper consciousness (cf. Leech 1969: 43–44). Of course, less-creative minds need new words, too, to fill in gaps of performance or individual lexicon (cf. Brekle 1978: 74–75; Downing 1977), but Wulfstan's manipulation of language for rhetorical effect puts him in the same company as the poets. Perhaps he did not need new words to express a new consciousness, but as an orator he would have wanted to escape the ordinary use of words, to confer emphasis by ornamenting the language, to draw attention to the language itself. As Frye notes, the orator and poet are both concerned with figured language (1990: 17).

Wulfstan's paired compounds as a figurative device can easily be seen as occasioning the generation of compounds, where generation does not necessarily mean coining — creating a word for the first time in the language — but rather producing a word through generative processes. Throughout his prose Wulfstan favors rhyming and alliterating pairs of words, both simplexes, like *stalu and cwalu* 'stealing and killing' (WHom 20.1 52), and compounds, like those already discussed. The value of compounds for creating such rhyming or alliterating pairs is apparent. Once, e.g., the compound *wed-bricas* is chosen, one may achieve an echoic pair with a matching compound either beginning with *wed-* (e.g., *wed-logan*) or ending with *-bricas* (e.g., *að-bricas*). The ease of forming pairs that compounds provide suggests that Wulfstan could have generated compounds for the express purpose of joining them in pairs.

And the structure of the echoic pairs may well have further prompted the generation of compounds. Many of Wulfstan's echoic pairs are tightly joined by parallel syntax, whether a coordinating conjunction (*wedlogan ne wordlogan*) or

identical placement in parallel syntactic structures (*Se þe wære weamod, weorðe se geþylðmod*). And most of these pairs occur within extensive lists of similar pairs, like the following:

- (4a) *Se þe wære weamod, weorðe se geþylðmod*
 ‘He who may have been “gloom-minded”, let him be “patience-minded”’
- (4b) *Se þe wære hohmod, weorðe se glæðmod*
 ‘He who may have been “trouble-minded”, let him be “glad-minded”’
- (4c) *Se þe wære idelgeorn, weorðe se notgeorn*
 ‘He who may have been “idle-eager”, let him be “useful-eager”’
- (4d) *Se þe wære lofgeorn for idelan weorðscype, weorðe se carfull hu he swyþast mæge gecweman his Drihtne*
 ‘He who may have been “praise-eager” for idle honor let him be attentive to how he may most please his Lord’
- (4e) *Se þe wære ofermōd, weorðe se eadmod* (WHom 10c 125–30)
 ‘He who may have been proud (“excessive-minded”), let him be humble (“kind-minded”)’

The tight parallel structure and the incessant repetition act as a formulaic template; *Se þe wære* and *weorðe se* constitute the constant portion of the formula, and the compound pairs that change from pair to pair fill in the slots, i.e., the variable portion. Compounding offers an obvious expedient for filling these variable slots, since it can readily produce pairs of words guaranteed to fit together. The repetition of *mod* and *georn* in the example above ensures that the compounds can be paired in parallel, in this instance as antonyms. In effect compounding makes the fixed part of the template larger and the variable part smaller. Thus, the template could be regarded roughly as *Se þe wære ___mod, weorðe se ___mod*. In templates like this the constituents of compounds could presumably be interchanged with each other to fill in the variable parts of the formula. Indeed Wulfstan mixes and matches the constituents of the compounds, interchanging them in several permutations of rhyming pairs.

Just such mixing and matching is seen in the system based on *man-* as a first constituent, whether with a short vowel meaning ‘man’ or a long vowel meaning ‘evil’. Capitalizing on the obvious pun, Wulfstan blurs the distinction between the long and short vowels, using *man-* in pairs for which both senses can be appropriate. This is the most complex and productive formulaic system in Wulfstan’s writings; all possible permutations of *manslagum*, *manswican*, and *mansworan* occur:

- (5a) *ðyder sculan mannslogan, & ðider sculan manswican* (WHom 7 128–29; cf. HomU 41 274²⁴–275¹; HomU 34 203.21)
 ‘There must go man-slayers and there must go evil-deceivers’

- (5b) *ðyder sculan manslagan, & ðider sculan mansworan* (WHom 13 92–93; cf. LawVIATR 256, sec. 36; HomS 16 148–49.124–25)
'There must go the man-slayers and there must go the evil-swearers'
- (5c) *ne beon manswican ne mansworan* (WHom 8c 161; cf. WHom 10a 11–12)
'Let them not be evil-deceivers nor evil-swearers'

Such a formulaic device not only puts compounds sharing the same constituent close enough together to elicit the recognition of the composite structure of the compounds, but may well also have invited the generation of compounds. So even if Wulfstan did not necessarily coin the compounds in a given pair, he could well have produced them from word-formation, not lexical, processes.

And this device may well have invited the coinage, not merely generation, of compounds as well. Several hapax legomena occur among Wulfstan's echoic pairs, such as both terms in *freolsbrycas & fæstenbrycas* (WHom 20.1 98) 'feast-breakings and fast-breakings'. While a hapax legomenon is not necessarily a coinage, especially given the paucity of surviving texts, many of the hapax legomena occurring in Wulfstan's tightly joined echoic pairs are likely his own creations, such as *ælmesriht, aðbrycas, wedbrycas, manswican, and weddlogan*. Some twenty-seven hapax legomena are found in such tightly joined pairs; such a relatively high number suggests the generative capacity of such formulaic systems.

The generative capacity of Wulfstan's echoing compound pairs is further seen in the numerous hapax legomena that are synthetic compounds, i.e., compounds formed from a deverbal head and a modifier acting as an argument of the transposed verb, like *aðbryca* meaning 'one who breaks (*bryca*) an oath (*að*)'. Marchand designates such compounds "verbal nexus compounds", because they encapsulate the predicate of a sentence (1969: 18). The syntactic relationship between the constituents is explicitly posited in the deverbal constituent for such compounds, in contrast to non-synthetic (or primary) compounds in which the relationship is left unexpressed. In, e.g., the primary compound *brælríht*, the predicate relationship between constituents is not expressed and must be interpreted as "the right *belongs* to the slave", or something similar. The predicate relationship in *aðbryca*, on the other hand, is expressly "[one] breaks an oath". Thus, synthetic compounds are among the most transparent, and Marchand claims that such transparency makes synthetic compounds extremely productive (1969: 18). In Present-day English, almost all verbs can be made into nominals denoting either the agent or the action of the verb as in combinations like *apple grower* and *interior decorator*. Presumably the same converting processes were also readily available in Old English, and synthetic compounds would have been easy to form and interpret. In fact, Lieber appeals to the productivity of such compounds in Old English to explain why arguments of deverbal constituents still precede rather than follow the deverbal head in Present-day English compounds: "What is remarkable in the history of English is that the synthetic compounding pattern was so

productive that it did not change after the parameter settings for English changed” (about 1200 A.D. by her account) (1992: 63).

Among the two most productive formulaic templates (those using *-brica* and *man-* respectively) almost all the compounds are synthetic, and most of the *-brica* compounds appear to have been coined by Wulfstan. It would seem that Wulfstan’s template requiring matched pairs of echoing compounds would have provided an impetus and method for creating compounds, and the deverbal compounds would have provided a ready form. Because the compounds are so close to sentence syntax, they are almost as easy to create and understand as syntactic groups. Synthetic compounds veer extremely close to the line separating syntax and word formation.

And the preponderance of synthetic compounds in formulaic systems is not limited to new formations, as the *man-* system illustrates with such long-standing terms as *manslaga* and *manswora*. Almost half the compounds that occur in tightly-joined pairs are synthetic, like *manswica ne manswora* — a far larger proportion than obtains in pairs not so tightly-joined like *woruldmen... woruldafelum* cited in (1) above, where the compounds occur far apart, performing separate syntactic functions. Perhaps these synthetic compounds, even though they are not hapax legomena, also suggest the creative impetus of closely-matched pairs. So when Wulfstan uses a word like *huslgang*, a word occurring in earlier writings, perhaps he has generated it anew, at least in part, based on its similarity in type to *ingang*. In short the demands of creating closely-matched pairs help shape the compounds that are used, and the synthetic compounds that Wulfstan uses show a ready adaptability to such pairs.

In summary, these highly artificial compound pairs would likely have reasserted the composite structure of the compounds, because of the striking proximity of the repeated constituents and the occasional necessity of interpreting the compound to gain the full sense of the larger passage. Such pairs may also have occasioned the generation and even coinage of some compounds, which, being new, would almost certainly have been interpreted on the basis of their composite structure. While the lexical status of compounds still remains difficult to gauge for the Old English corpus, at least in these pairs Wulfstan has left us with some striking suggestions that these compounds were interpreted as compounds.

Notes

1. All quotes are cited by the *Dictionary of Old English* short title; cf. Healey—Venezky (1980).

References

- Bank, Claudia (ed.)
1992 *Language and civilization*. Frankfurt: Lang.

- Brekle, Herbert E.
1978 "Reflections on the conditions for the coining, use and understanding of nominal compounds", in: Wolfgang U. Dressler—Wolfgang Meid (eds.), 68–77.
- Downing, Pamela
1977 "On the creation and use of English compound nouns", *Language* 53: 810–842.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U.—Wolfgang Meid (eds.)
1978 *Proceedings of the 12th International Congress of Linguists*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Fill, Alwin
1992 "'Visions and revisions': A type of pun based on idiomatized complex words", in: Claudia Bank (ed.), 551–563.
- Frye, Northrop
1990 *Words with power*. San Diego: Harcourt.
- Healey, Antonette diPaolo—Richard L. Venezky
1980 *A microfiche concordance to Old English: The list of texts and index of editions* (Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 1). Toronto: Dictionary of Old English.
- Leech, Geoffrey N.
1969 *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. London: Longman.
- Lieber, Rochelle
1992 *Deconstructing morphology: Word formation in syntactic theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lipka, Leonhard—Hartmut Günther (eds.)
1981 *Wortbildung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Lipka, Leonhard
1981 "Lexikalisierung im Deutschen und Englischen", in: Leonhard Lipka—Hartmut Günther (eds.), 119–132.
- Marchand, Hans
1969 *Categories and types of Present-day English word-formation*. (2nd edition.) München: Beck.

The degrammaticalization of addressee-satisfaction conditionals in Early Modern English¹

Guohua Chen

1. Grammaticalization and degrammaticalization

Studies on grammaticalization have shown that a large number of grammatical items have developed from lexical items. On the basis of these studies, Hopper—Traugott (1993: 126) hypothesize that “all grammaticalization involves shifts in specific linguistic contexts from lexical item to grammatical item, or from less to more grammatical item, and that grammaticalization clines are irreversible”. Although it is now generally accepted that unidirectionality can not be regarded as an absolute principle, and changes in the opposite direction have been found (cf. Greenberg 1991: 301–314; Harris—Campbell 1995: 337–338), counterexamples, i.e., examples of degrammaticalization, are believed to be rare and “statistically insignificant” (Heine—Claudi—Hünemeyer 1991: 5).

In theory degrammaticalization should be a common phenomenon, for without it, as more and more lexical items are grammaticalized, the grammatical system of a language will grow more and more complex until it is too complex to serve its purpose effectively. The question is what counts as degrammaticalization. In a narrow sense when a grammatical item has lost its grammatical function and become merely a lexical item, it can be said to have been degrammaticalized. This kind of degrammaticalization is indeed rather rare. More commonly, a grammatical item may acquire a lexical function while retaining its grammatical function. Such a functional diversification should also be seen as a kind of degrammaticalization. Still another kind of degrammaticalization is the disuse or extinction of a grammatical item. This kind of degrammaticalization has so far been treated under grammaticalization. Givón (1979: 208–209) hypothesizes that grammaticalization follows the following cyclic development:

discourse > syntax > morphology > morphophonemics > zero

In my view, the last stage, which is represented by “zero”, is actually degrammaticalization. The reason is very simple: if the third-person singular form of the English verb were leveled, other things being equal, the English verb system would certainly be less grammaticalized rather than more grammaticalized. In this paper degrammaticalization is used in a broad sense to cover all three kinds of linguistic change just described.

2. De-conditionalization and degrammaticalization

Prototypical conditional sentences are characterized by a contingency relation between protasis and apodosis, with the truth of the apodosis being contingent on that of the protasis. Very often, however, we find sentences containing a clause clearly marked as a conditional protasis but no direct contingency relationship can be found between it and the rest of the sentence, e.g.:

- (1) *And yf the prologue bee so small that ye cannot wel reade them, ther is my fathers book.* (EModE1 CORP RPLUMPT 232)²

Since no direct contingency relationship can be found in (1), the conditional clause in such a sentence is said to express “indirect condition” (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1095–1097). For sentences like (1), indirect condition actually means the lack of a direct apodosis to what appears to be a conditional protasis. The missing apodosis, which is omitted by the speaker for one reason or another, is usually understood by the addressee and can be recovered from the context. There are situations, however, in which it is difficult, if not impossible, to recover the implied apodosis, e.g.:

- (2) *If it please you (sayes the gentleman), here is a good fellow will goe and attire him in one of his coates.* (EModE2 FICT ARMIN 10)
- (3) *There’s an excellent diapasm in a chain, too, if you like.* (1599 B. Jonson, Cynthia’s Rev., 5.2)
- (4) *As euell as a violent taker, or (if you will) a robber.* (1561 T. Norton, Calvin’s Inst. Author’s Pref.)

In (2)–(4) the *if*-clauses in fact convey hardly any sense of conditionality. They have become merely conventionalized expressions of either politeness (in (2) and (3)) or linguistic tentativeness (in (4)). Having ceased to function as the protasis of a conditional sentence, they can be said to have become de-conditionalized. By the definition adopted in this paper, they can also be said to have been degrammaticalized. These degrammaticalized *if*-clauses have two features in common: (a) they all involve a second-person pronoun or its equivalent,³ and (b) the verb expresses a sense of satisfaction or volition. For the sake of convenience I term them addressee-satisfaction conditionals. In this paper attention will be focused on addressee-satisfaction conditionals involving *please*, *like*, *will*, and *list*.⁴

3. The degrammaticalization of addressee-satisfaction conditionals

3.1. *The degrammaticalization of if it please you and its variants*

Of all the addressee-satisfaction conditionals, *if it please you* and its variants have undergone the most thorough degrammaticalization. According to the *Oxford English dictionary* (s.v. *please*, v.), *please* is a descendant of Old French *plaisir*, which in turn descends from the Latin verb *placere* ‘to be pleasing or agreeable’. With the impersonal pronoun *it* as its subject and a second-person pronoun or its equivalent as its dative object (preceded by the preposition *to*), it was first used in the 14th century in the sense ‘to seem good to one; to be one’s will or pleasure’. In conditional clauses only the form without *to* survived into Early Modern English, as in (2). Judging from the examples cited in the *OED* (s.v. *please*, v. 6. a and b), in the early 16th century *please* began to be used as an intransitive verb in the sense ‘to be pleased, to like; to have the will or desire’. As a result *if/and you please* emerged:

- (5) *But tary, I pray you all, Yf ye please.* (1530 *Jil of Brentford's Test.* (Ballad Soc.) 15)
- (6) *I wyll goe, and you please.* (1621 *Elsing, Debates Ho. Lords* (Camden) 58)

In (5) and (6), as in (2), the conditional clause has lost its sense of conditionality and become what the *OED* (s.v. *please*, v. 3) calls a “deferential phrase of address”. There seems to be no semantic or pragmatic difference between *if/and it please you* and *if/and you please*. The only difference, judging by their distribution in the *Helsinki Corpus*, seems to be that the use of *if/and it please you* was on the decrease while that of *if/and you please* was on the increase.

Where the sense of conditionality expressed by *if it please you* and its variants was lost, there was of course not much point for these expressions to retain their conditional form. We find *and it please you* sometimes reduced to *an't please you* or *and please you*:

- (7) *Your Grandfather of famous memory (an't please your Maiesty) and your great-Vncle Edward the Placke Prince of Wales, as I haue read in the Chronicles, fought a most praue pattle here in France.* (1599 Shakespeare, *H5*, 2622/4.7.92)
- (8) *And please your Maiestie, let his Neck answeare for it, if there is any Marshall Law in the world.* (1599 Shakespeare, *H5*, 2760/4.8.46)

The formal reduction of *if you please* is more difficult to identify. In (9), where the nominative *ye* is used, there seems to be no doubt that *please ye* is a reduced form of *if ye please*:

- (9) *Sir, I shal not be slacke, in signe whereof,/ Please ye we may contriue this afternoone,/ And quaffe carowes to our Mistresse health.* (1596 Shakespeare, *Shr.*, 848/1.2.276)

Where *you* is used, as is more often the case, one can not be certain that *please you* is a reduced form of *if you please*. The *OED* thinks that *please you* is an elliptical form of *please it you*. Of course, if we take *please it you* to be the SV inversion form of *if it please you*, it is still a reduced form of an addressee-satisfaction conditional. The problem is that the *OED* does not paraphrase *please it you* as ‘if it please you’. Instead it (s.v. *please*, v. 3 b and c) defines *please it you* as ‘may it please you’, and *please you* and *so please you*, with omission of it, as ‘may it (so) please you’. All this sounds plausible, because from the very beginning *please it to you* and *please it you* could indeed be used in the sense ‘may it please you’, as in:

- (10) Please it, *Lorde*, to þe, þat þou defende me. (1325 *Prose Psalter*, xxxix. 18 (xl.13))
 (11) Please youre gracious Hynes to be advertised that [...] (1454 *Let. fr. Kildare* in *Ellis*, *Orig. Lett.* ii. 39 I. 118)

The *OED* (s.v. *please*, v. 3 b) observes that the infinitive following *please you* “often lost its *to* in 16 - 17th c.”, as in:

- (12) *My Lord I cannot be so soone provided,/ Please you deliberate a day or two.* (1591 Shakespeare, *TGV*, 375/1.3.73)

Sometimes it was the second-person pronoun rather than *to* that was omitted:

- (13) Please to bespeak something else, I have every thing in the House. (EModE3 COME FARQUHAR 7)

When *to* and the second-person pronoun were both dropped, we get sentences like (14), which is the earliest instance of this use of *please* cited in the *OED*:

- (14) Please entitle *S. only Bart.* (1711 *Hearne*, *Collect.* (Oxf. Hist. Soc.) III. 147)

The *OED* (s.v. *please*, v. 6 c.) concludes that the imperative or optative *please* was originally short for *please you* = ‘may it (or let it) please you’. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the sense ‘may it please you’ was sometimes expressed by *may it please you* itself, as in:

- (15) May it please you that I shall aunswer particularly to the matters objected against me. (EModE1 TRI THROCKM I,65.C1)

In some cases, however, the use of *please you* and *so please you* differ in important ways from that of *may it please you*, e.g.:

- (16) Imo. *Who's there? My woman: Helene?*
 La. Please you *Madam*. (1611, Shakespeare, *Cym.*, 905/2.2.1)
- (17) Ros. [...] *Will you heare the letter?*
 Sil. So please you, *for I neuer heard it yet*. (1600, Shakespeare, *AYL*, 2186/4.3.37)

In the first place, *may it please you* is usually followed either by an infinitive (with or without *to*) introducing a polite request or by a *that*-clause (with or without *that*) initiating a respectful discourse; whereas *please you* in (16) and *so please you* in (17) are not followed by an infinitive or a *that*-clause. Secondly, in *may it please you* the referent of *it* is the following infinitive or *that*-clause, without which the sentence is pragmatically incomplete; whereas both *please you* in (16) and *so please you* in (17) are pragmatically complete. Finally and most importantly, unlike *please you* in (16) and *so please you* in (17), *may it please you* never seems to have been used as or in association with an answer. In view of these differences, it is unlikely that the *please you* in (16) and the *so please you* in (17) were reduced forms of *may it so please you*.

By contrast it is easy to see the similarities between the bare *please you* and *so please you* on the one hand and *if it please you* and its variants on the other. They are all semantically complete and they are all commonly used as, or in association with, answers. In view of these similarities, the bare *please you* in (16) should be regarded as a reduced form of *if you please*, and the bare *so please you* in (17) as a reduced form of *if so you please*.

In principle, when used in making a request or accepting an offer, as in (5), (8), and (17), *if it please you* and its variants had the potential of being reduced to a bare *please*:

- (5') *But tary, I pray you all, (Yfye) please.*
- (8') *(And) please (your Maiestie), let his Neck answere for it.*
- (17') Ros. [...] *Will you heare the letter?*
 Sil. *(So) please (you), for I neuer heard it yet.*

When the bracketed elements in the above sentences are omitted, the bare *please* will be used in effect as an interjection expressing politeness. Reaching this stage, the degrammaticalization of *if it please you* and its variants has run through its course. This happened some time after the Early Modern English period.

It has to be pointed out that not all uses of *if you please* in indirect conditional sentences underwent formal reduction. It seems that when it is used in a

metalinguistic function, it is resistant to formal reduction. The earliest instances of the metalinguistic use of *if it please you* and *if you please* cited in the *OED* are:

- (18) *We may terme him the Loue-burden, following the originall, or if it please you, the long repeat.* (1589 Puttenham, *Eng. Poesie*, iii. xix. (Arb.) 233)
- (19) *The Emperour and Germans, or if you please the Imperials.* (1630 *R. Johnson's Kingdom & Commonwealth* 101)

The metalinguistic function of *if it please you* and its variants was not very common in Early Modern English. No such use is found in the *Helsinki Corpus*.

3.2. *The degrammaticalization of if it like you and its variants*

In Early Modern English *if it like you* resembled *if it please you* in every way except it did not go as far in degrammaticalization. According to the *OED* (s.v. *like*, v.1 1), the basic meaning of *like* used as an impersonal verb is 'to please, be pleasing, suit a person'. As *like* is synonymous with *please*, *if it like you* is also synonymous with *if it please you*. In fact, in the earliest instance of its use in a conditional clause cited in the *OED*, *like* is used in conjunction with *please*:

- (20) *Depende on me a drope of thy largesse,/ Right in this wyse if it thee lyke & plesse.* (1406 Hoccleve, *La male regle*. iv. 249)

If it like you shares some of the formal characteristics of *if it please you*. E.g., it has the variant forms *and it like you* and *like it you*:

- (21) *Than sayed my lord cheffe justyes unto me, "Syr, whate make yow here? are you not a Londynar?" "Yes, and yt lyke your lordshyp".* (EModE1 BIA MOWNTAYNE 206)
- (22) *Like it your Grace,/ The State takes notice of the priuate difference/ Betwixt you, and the Cardinall.* (1613 Shakespeare, *H8*, 160/1.1.100)

In (20) the *if*-clause functions as the protasis of a conditional sentence, while in (21) and (22) its variants have become merely expressions of deference. When its sense of conditionality was lost, *ifland it like you* also underwent formal reduction. In (23), e.g., *and it like your lordship* was reduced to *and like your lordship*:

- (23) *Than sayed my lord chyffe justys, "Have you browghte yn your swertyes?" "Ye, and lyke your lordship here they be".* (EModE1 BIA MOWNTAYNE 208)

Except for *if you like*, *if it like you* and its variants did not survive Early Modern English. In the *Helsinki Corpus* *ifland it like you* is quite common in EModE1 (as common as *ifland it please you*), rare in EModE2, and non-existent in EModE3.

As a variant of *if it like you*, *if you like* came into existence as early as in the mid 15th century (cf. the *OED*, s.v. *like*). Yet it was not until the end of the 16th century that it began to be used non-conditionally, as in:

- (24) *There's an excellent diapasm in a chain, too, if you like.* (1599 B. Jonson, *Cynthia's Rev.*, 5.2)

Unlike *if you please*, *if you like* did not undergo formal reduction. One reason may be that it never lost its function as a true protasis; the other reason may be that its non-conditional use has been restricted to metalinguistic function, which, as we have seen in 3.1, somehow saves the conditional clause from formal reduction. In its metalinguistic function, *if you like* means “if you wish to phrase or consider something in a particular manner, often used as vaguely intensive expression = ‘indeed’, ‘perhaps’” (*OED*, s.v. *like*, v. 6 b.). This metalinguistic function arose rather late. In the *Helsinki Corpus* not a single instance is found. In the *OED* the first instance of its use, which is cited under *credulity*, is dated 1875.

3.3. The degrammaticalization of *if you will*

According to the *OED* (s.v. *will*, v.1 I. 1) the basic meaning of *will* is ‘desire, wish for, have a mind to’, which is close to the meaning of *please* and *like* used as an intransitive verb. The earliest instance of *if you will* cited in the *OED* is (25), which seems to be synonymous with *if you please* and *if you like*:

- (25) *Ich wile þe zigge yef þou wylt.* (1340 *Ayenb.* 101)

In Early Modern English it could be used in the same sense and function:

- (26) *as I am a gentle man, you shall, if you will, enjoy Ford's wife.* (1598 Shakespeare, *Wiv.*, 1010/2.2.265)

As *will* did not begin as an impersonal verb, *if you will* has had no structural variant. However, it has gradually undergone functional specialization. As the *OED* (s.v. *will*, v.1 I. 17) observes, “*if you will* is sometimes used parenthetically to qualify a word or phrase: = ‘if you wish it to be so called’, ‘if you choose or prefer to call it so’”, as in:

- (27) *Gravity [...] depends entirely on the constant and efficacious, and if you will, the supernatural and miraculous Influence of Almighty God.* (1696 Whitson, *The Earth*, iv. i. § 2. 218)

The earliest instance of this use of *if you will* in the *OED* is (4), which is found under *taker*. It also turns out that *if you will* was not merely “sometimes” used in a metalinguistic function. Of the 30 or so citations of Early Modern English *if you will* under various headwords in the *OED*, more than half are metalinguistic conditionals. In the *Helsinki Corpus* there are nine instances of *if you will* and one instance of *and you will*. Of these ten instances only (28) has a metalinguistic function:

- (28) *I am for venturing one of the Hundreds if you will upon this Knight-Errantry.* (EModE3 COME FARQUHAR 6)

The rest are either expressions of politeness, like (29), or true protases.

- (29) *I ham verye sory for yt, beleve me and yow wyll.* (EModE1 BIA MOWNTAYNE 214)

In its metalinguistic function *if you will* is also resistant to formal reduction.

3.4. If you list — *the odd one out*

Of all the addressee-satisfaction conditionals, *if you list* was the only one that seemed to have undergone no de-conditionalization. According to the *OED* (s.v. *list*, v.1 1.) the basic meaning of *list* as an impersonal verb is ‘to be pleasing to’. As *list* in this sense is synonymous with the impersonal verbs *please* and *like*, *if it list you* is synonymous with *if it please you* and *if it like you*, though its impersonal use did not survive into Early Modern English. The earliest instance of *if you list* cited in the *OED* is (30) below, in which the pronoun *you* is clearly in the accusative case:

- (30) *Nu ye reste One while, ef you leste.* (a1300 *K. Horn*, 918)

Though not as common as *if you please* or *if you like*, *if you list*, nevertheless, survived into Early Modern English. By then *you* had largely taken over the function of *ye*, and according to the *OED* (s.v. *list*, v.1 2 b) *list* had acquired the sense ‘to wish, desire, like, choose’. *If you list* did not seem to have any variant form except for the switch between *you* and the occasional *ye*. It had the potential of being used in a metalinguistic function, as shown in (31), but never seemed to have realized it.

- (31) *Upon the packsaddels [of an elephant], they haue on euery side a little house, or tower, or cage (if you list so to call it) made of wool.* (1533 *Eden, Treat. New Ind.* (Arb.), 15)

Only two instances of its use are found in the *Helsinki Corpus*, both being direct conditionals. Unlike other addressee-satisfaction conditionals, *if you list* does not seem to have any connotation of deference or politeness. With its last citation in the *OED* (s.v. *list*, v.1 2 b.) dated 1823, it failed to make it into Present-day English.

4. Summary

In Early Modern English conditional sentences were undergoing grammaticalization in terms of both conditional markers and verb forms (cf. Chen 1996: 37–237). While the use of a conditional conjunction, *if* in particular, was becoming the standard conditional marker for the expression of open conditions, in the case of *if it please you* and its variants, however, there was a different trend. Not only did *if* fail to squeeze out SV inversion and the substandard *and*, but the conditional marker itself was being left out, leading eventually to the use of the bare *please* as an interjection. Grammaticalization and degrammaticalization have been seen as linguistic changes in opposite directions, yet paradoxically, as the case of *if it please you* and its variants illustrate, they have happened at the same time to the same linguistic item. If we approach the phenomena from the point of view of functional diversification, there is nothing paradoxical about it, for it is common for a linguistic item to develop several functions at the same time. What is puzzling is the fact that metalinguistic function seems to safeguard two of the addressee-satisfaction conditionals from formal reduction.

Notes

1. I am grateful to Sylvia Adamson for her comments on an earlier version of the paper, and to Merja Kytö for kindly arranging for me to use the Early Modern English section of the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. For reasons that have nothing to do with the purpose of the present paper, I have taken out the Bible samples from the corpus and replaced the samples of Shakespeare's *The merry wives of Windsor* in EModE2 with samples of Ben Jonson's *Every man in his humour*.
2. All examples with references beginning with "EModE" are from the Early Modern English section of the *Helsinki Corpus*, which consists of three sub-periods — EModE1 (1500–1570), EModE2 (1570–1640) and EModE3 (1640–1710). For details of the corpus and the key to the abbreviations used in text reference cf. Kytö (1996).
3. When a noun phrase such as *your majesty* is used in referring to the addressee, it is in effect equivalent to a second-person pronoun.

4. Of these four verbs, *please*, *like*, and *list* were originally impersonal verbs. The shift of their impersonal use to personal use, although it led to variations in the syntactic structures of conditional clauses involving the three verbs, has little to do with conditionality and is, therefore, not discussed in any detail in this paper.

References

- Chen, Guohua
1996 *Conditional sentences in Early Modern English: A study in grammaticalization*. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.]
- Givón, Talmy
1979 *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph H.
1991 "The last stage of grammatical elements: Contractive and expansive desemanticization", in: Elizabeth Closs Traugott—Bernd Heine (eds.), 1.301–314.
- Harris, Alice. C.—Lyle Campbell
1995 *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Heine, Bernd—Ulrike Claudi—Friederike Hünemeyer
1991 *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper, Paul J.—Elizabeth Closs Traugott
1993 *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kytö, Merja (comp.)
1996 *Manual to the diachronic part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding conventions and lists of source texts*. (3rd edition.) Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- OED = Murray, James A. H.—Henry Bradley—William A. Craigie—Charles T. Onions
1989 *The Oxford English dictionary*. (2nd edition.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Quirk, Randolph—Sidney Greenbaum—Geoffrey Leech—Jan Svartvik
1985 *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs—Bernd Heine (eds.)
1991 *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

From *unasecndlic* to *unspeakable*: The role of domain structure in morphological change

Christiane Dalton-Puffer

1. Introduction

This paper is about deverbal adjectives of the type *translatable*, *imaginable*, *washable*. In Present-day English the productive formation of these adjectives is carried out exclusively by means of ABLE. This means that of all the deverbal adjectives in the lexicon most are the products of a non-native formative. This is in stark contrast to the other major morpho-syntactic categories of derived English words where non-native formatives play only minor roles at the side of one or more native formatives. For the formation of agent nouns, e.g., we need to distinguish between a core area which is occupied by the native *-er*, and peripheral areas with formatives like *-ant*, *-ist*. The situation is very similar for the other major morphosyntactic categories, i.e., deadjectival nouns and denominal adjectives. The exact nature of the restrictions which define the domains of Present-day English formatives within their category is the subject of a long-standing discussion which is mostly conducted on the phonological and morphonological levels, but these restrictions will not be the concern of this paper. The question which is at the center of attention here is to outline the historical conditions under which ABLE came to be more successful than other non-native formatives entering the English language at the same time and through the same channels.

In order to pursue this inquiry we need to determine when the form ABLE entered the language and whether or not it was also a functional-semantic novelty. It will turn out that carriers of an ABLE-like function existed in English prior to the arrival of ABLE so that a comparison between them and ABLE seems the next natural step. This kind of procedure is based on the competition metaphor of language change and we will accordingly have to present arguments in what way(s) ABLE was better fitted for survival in English than the native formative(s) that were there before it.

2. The appearance of ABLE in English

It is a well-known fact that ABLE entered the English language during the Middle English period via loanwords from French. Using quantitative data from the *Helsinki Corpus* covering the period from ca. 1150–1420 we can be more specific about this development.

Table 1. Quantitative development and morphological patterning of ABLE in Middle English.

ABLE	ME1		ME2		ME3	
	types	tokens	types	tokens	types	tokens
total occurrences	1	1	7	10	46	176
morphological category of the base						
V	1	1	5	8	30	111
N	-	-	-	-	3	4
Stem/Simplex	-	-	2	2	13	61

Examples: V: *colourable, deceivable, movable, knowable, wilnable*
 N: *contemptible, profitable, honourable*
 Stem/Simplex: *amyable, perdurable*

Formations prefixed with *un-* have not been counted as separate types if the material also contains the unprefixated form. This was done on the grounds that negative prefixation with *un-* is regular and fully productive. Looking at the "total occurrences" line of Table 1 it is easy to see that ME3, the period from 1350 to 1420, accounts for 94 per cent of the 187 ABLE's in this particular corpus. This quantitative explosion is paralleled by all other Romance formatives identified for Middle English (cf. Dalton-Puffer 1996: ch. 6–8) and we can, therefore, exclude the possibility that any peculiarities in the chronology of the borrowing process itself were (co-)responsible for the specially warm reception ABLE seems to have had in the English language.

The fact that ABLE was readily analyzed as a possible derivational formative rather than just a recurring element in a number of loans is witnessed by the fact that a small number of formations with native words as their bases starts appearing at an early point in time.

- (1) Earliest hybrids with ABLE:
ðe heizest wilnable þing, þe whiche is God. (Cloude of Unknowing)
sende þee help and cunfort vnspeicable, þat no tunge may telle how myche it is (Hilton)

In the morphological analysis summarized in the second half of Table 1 the double category Stem/Simplex contains not only simplex lexical items featuring the string *-able* but also those ABLE-words which may well be analyzable within French and/or Latin but whose base does not occur independently in the Middle English lexicon. There will be many morphologists who would exclude such cases from a discussion of Middle English word-formation. Yet the meaning of most of these words (together with part of their form, namely *-able*) is compatible with

analyzable formations so that we cannot rule out the possibility that they contributed to the overall “strength” of the pattern.

3. Was ABLE a functional novelty?

Before answering the question whether ABLE was a functional novelty on top of being a formal one we need to address the question of what the function of ABLE actually is.

3.1. *The function(s) of ABLE*

In considering the Middle English ABLE-figures in Table 1 we noted a clear preponderance of deverbal formations over other types. It, therefore, seems to make sense to look for the main function(s) of ABLE among this large subgroup. The most characteristic deverbal ABLE formations are of the type *knowable*, *unspecable* (Middle English), *unquenchable*, *unmatchable* (Early Modern English) which are paralleled in Present-day English by, e.g., *doable*, *marketable*, *untranscribeable*, *unbearable*. The usual paraphrase which is used to render their meaning is something like ‘can be Ved’; *doable* = ‘can be done’. This amounts to saying that such adjectives encode the possibility of the noun they modify to be affected by the action expressed in the verb (or its ability/likelihood to carry out the verbal action). Looking at actual data (irrespective of the historical period they are from) it is striking how often negative meanings are involved. So, very often the adjectives actually express the impossibility of the noun they modify to be affected by the action expressed in the verb; i.e., they mean ‘canNOT be Ved’. Consequently, formations prefixed with *un-* make up a sizable part of any set of ABLE data and, once we consider not only prefixal negation but include the phrasal level, the negatives are probably in the majority.

I do not think this high incidence of negation is fortuitous¹ and I believe we can tease out its implications better if we try to “deconstruct” what is actually encapsulated in the above-mentioned paraphrase. Once we do that, several semantic “building-blocks” can be identified. Besides negation we can identify passivity and some kind of possibility. It seems to me that possibility and negation are more strongly linked to each other than passivity is to either of them, and I would take this as a first indicator that the passivity element is less central to the function of ABLE (and ABLE-type suffixes in general) than the other two elements. Negation and possibility both encode the speaker’s view of a particular proposition or a particular portion of reality, which puts them into the circle of modality. Bybee (1985: 176–178) also notes an affinity of negation and other mood meanings, both cross-linguistically and with special reference to affixing. In the case of ABLE (and ABLE-type suffixes in general) the most likely scenario, then, is that the “possibility” meaning attracts negative meanings which can be

derivational (*unVable*) or syntactic (*not Vable*). From this it follows that the modal component represents the core meaning of ABLE-type formatives.

Taking this view on ABLE allows us to cover not only the more frequent ‘can((not) be Ved’ instances but also those derivatives where the passive element is missing, e.g., *suitable*. It seems to me that a basic modal meaning appears in different guises: in the passive adjectives the modal meaning is one of possibility, in the active ones it tends to be one of ability or likelihood. There are some cases where both readings are possible, e.g., *movable* which can mean ‘able (and prone) to move’ but also ‘can be moved’. Traditionally, it has been said that ABLE somehow “contains” both an active and a passive meaning and whether one or the other is activated depends on the syntactic properties of the base-verb. This way, derivatives based on intransitive verbs are automatically active and derivatives based on transitive verbs are automatically passive. Confronted with a largish amount of data we have to admit that, while not being entirely false, this claim is not entirely true either, as is shown by the *movable* example above. Without committing myself to an in-depth discussion of the issue I will simply claim that the passive meaning of ABLE-type suffixes is secondary to the modal meaning, and is generated where appropriate through access to syntactic but probably also referential and contextual information.²

Summing up we can say that the function of ABLE is to derive modal adjectives. The mood which it encodes is Potential, covering both (prob)ability and possibility.

3.2. *LIC as a precursor of ABLE*

The question we need to pursue now is how the semantic function I have sketched in the previous section was expressed in English before the arrival of ABLE. This includes the question whether it was expressed derivationally at all and if it was, what the formal exponent(s) looked like.

It is evident that, other than the speaker who encodes conceptual into linguistic form, the analyst has to start at the formal end and so the first route of access to the question at hand is often an *-able* in the gloss of an Old or Middle English word. To cut a long story short, the semantic function encoded by means of ABLE from Middle English onwards was generally expressed less frequently,³ and by more variable formal means in Old and Early Middle English. Nevertheless, there emerges one derivational suffix which served as the main exponent of the said function, namely LIC. In his 1991 article McIntosh mentions OE *-lic* in this function and notes some of the problems involved. While not answering his demand that a future, full treatment of *-lic* should be based on the Toronto material, the data I will present and discuss in the following are based on a corpus rather than on dictionary material.⁴

The formation of modal adjectives is only one among several functions of LIC in Old English and we will have opportunity to review the others in section 4 of this

paper. In the modal function we find LIC attaching to verb-stems, past participles and present participles. The fact that participles can take on the syntactic role of an adjective has repeatedly led to these derivatives being categorized among deadjectival formations with *-lic*, but a look at the meanings of the de-participial formations presented here will make it obvious that these are proper ABLE-type, modal adjectives. In the following I present some examples showing LIC in modal function:

(2) Modal adjectives in LIC in Old and Early Middle English

from verb-stems: *unandwendlic* 'inadvertible' V *wendan*, *ungeferlic* 'inaccessible' V *faran*, *gedafenliche* 'fitting, behooving' V *gedafenian*, *unhierlice* 'disobedient, fierce, savage' V *hieran*, *unsehelic* 'invisible' V *seon*

from Past Participles: *ungeliefedlice* 'unbelievable', *unaræfnedlic* 'intolerable', *untodæledlice* 'indivisible', *gerisenlich* 'suitable', *gesewenlic* 'visible', *unarimedlice* 'uncountable', *unalyfedlice* 'unallowable', *unoferswidhedlice* 'unconquerable', *unbefangenlice* 'incomprehensible', *unatealledlic* 'innumerable'

from Present Participles: *ungeliefendlice* 'unbelievable', *unaræfnendlice* 'intolerable', *untodælendlice* 'indivisible', *unasæcgendlice* 'unspeakable', *halsiendlic* 'deprecable', *onsconiendlice* 'abominable, detestable', *thearfendlic* 'needy, destitute', *unadrysnendlic* 'unquenchable', *unmiltsigendlic* 'unpardonable', *unwuniendlic* 'uninhabitable', *witnigendlic* 'punishable, to be punished', *brosniendlic* 'perishable', *unoferwinnendlic* 'invincible, unconquerable'

The examples include several doublets (the first four examples of each of the participle paragraphs) and it is interesting to note that the different base forms do not result in different meanings. This is rather puzzling because it destroys a form-meaning symmetry which seems to follow from the meanings of the components involved. If we take the suffix to be responsible for the modal meaning, the past participle can be said to contribute the passive meaning, while the present participle remains [-passive] and activates the ability/probability meaning. Quite according to this principle *unalyfedlic*, whose base is a past participle, means 'unallowable, cannot be allowed', and *styrigendlic*, whose base is a present participle, means 'movable, can move'. In the data, however, this form-meaning symmetry clearly exists only in principle as there are more derivatives from present participles with unexpected passive meanings than there are with active meanings. I do not want to speculate at any length on the possible reasons for this state of affairs but I do not think that my aggregate view of the data obliterates a diachronic development here, as the doublets co-occur within the

same sub-period. What may be involved is dialectal variation but this needs to be checked using a larger database such as the Toronto material. Even so, I have my doubts whether dialectal variation is behind the asymmetry. Contrastive data from Old High German (Schmid *forthc.*) show the same kind of phenomenon, which means that Old English seems to have inherited it from its ancestor language.

Table 2, then, gives a numeric overview of modal adjectives with LIC for the period under investigation. Note that forms exhibiting prefix variation (*ge-/a-*) and the negated *un-*forms were counted as only one type.

Table 2. Numeric development of modal LIC Old English to Early Middle English.

	OE2 types	OE2 tokens	OE3 types	OE3 tokens	OE4 types	OE4 tokens	ME1 types	ME1 tokens
V-stem	9	15	8	55	4	14	16	22
PastPart	12	19	13	49	7	7	2	2
PresPart	8	9	24	60	8	17	14	20
TOTAL	29	43	45	164	19	38	32	44

In interpreting Table 2 we can see that it parallels the impression gained from the examples in (2). The number of formations based on participles by far outweighs those based on verb-stems. There is a certain tendency for decline, visible most clearly with the derivatives from Past Participles (the decline will become much more striking when we move into Middle English in Table 3). The derivatives from verb-stems seem to hang on more tenaciously, even showing the highest number of different types at the latest sub-period under scrutiny here. This is of course in line with the general development of English towards preferring bare stems (later words) as input to its morphology, but the data do not show switches from one form-class to another. I.e., derivatives which used to be from the participle hardly ever show up at a later period featuring the verb-stem as their base.

In interpreting tables such as Table 2, it is of course necessary to consider corpus size, because the ratios of type and token figures necessarily vary depending on the overall size of a corpus. In order to enhance comparability between the development of the LIC and ABLE-figures it was, therefore, decided to create sub-corpora of equal size. This is a solution which offers itself since the two adjacent sub-periods OE4 and ME1 taken together contain the same number of words as sub-period ME3, namely ca. 190,000. Table 3, then, shows the quantitative development of LIC and ABLE

Table 3. Distribution of LIC and ABLE throughout Late Old English and Middle English.

	O4M1		ME2		ME3	
	types	tokens	types	tokens	types	tokens
LIC	51	82	6	15	5	6
ABLE	1	1	5	8	30	111

The figures show the two exponents of modal deverbal adjectives as being subject to opposite trends. The type-token ratio of LIC in the earliest period looks surprisingly like that of a productive pattern: 82 tokens represent a striking 51 different types. In terms of frequency a role reversal has taken place by ME3 but ABLE certainly cannot be said to have reached the same kind of morphological productivity which LIC appears to exhibit earlier. The type-token ratio speaks otherwise and, of course, most of the types are loans from French at that time. There are, however, formations on native bases and these are hapaxes.

Can we say then, that ABLE actively “conquered” the territory of LIC? I do not think we can, and for several reasons. Firstly, the figures (especially the ones of ME2) run counter to such an interpretation: this is a phase where the two “rivals” seems to be at an impasse. Also, in order to bring about some sort of “catastrophic event” ABLE would have had to be extremely vigorous and “superior” to LIC in several ways, on several linguistic levels. In an earlier study which checked the two suffixes against several Naturalness parameters it was concluded that this was not the case (Dalton-Puffer 1993: 159–161). Considering the system-congruity of the two formatives in terms of the morphological status of their input (stems and/or words) the LIC and ABLE are on a par, and in terms of morphotactic transparency LIC even has a slight edge on ABLE. Subsequent events, however, indicate that LIC was experiencing a crisis; something was eroding its status and preparing the ground for the quick flowering of ABLE. The remainder of this paper is dedicated to the examination of what I think was behind the crisis of modal LIC.

4. Comparing the domains of LIC and ABLE

4.1. *Derivational domains*

It is standard procedure in paradigmatic morphology to determine for a certain formative what kind of base it attaches to and what it does, i.e., what kind of thing it “produces” in formal terms and in semantic terms. In principle, form and meaning are considered as being on a par but the realities of morphological study and the traditions which have arisen from it have usually meant that formal descriptions and formal criteria tend to be more refined than their semantic counterparts. Even so, it is usually acknowledged that the connections which hold between derivational forms and derivational functions play an important part in several phenomena derivational morphologists are interested in: establishing suffix taxonomies, delineating diachronic developments, determining productivity, or working out which restrictions govern the applicability of word-formation rules.

The information about where an affix goes and what it does is commonly regarded as that affix’s domain. The domain thus has a formal and a semantic sub-domain. Each of them can vary in complexity from affix to affix, and so can the connections between the domains. Several word-formation theories which are radically different in outlook and design have acknowledged this fact and have said

in one way or another that the configuration of derivational domains is important. Structuralist analyses have often worked with the concept of “functional overload” of formal entities when engaged in explaining structural changes in linguistic subsystems. Aronoff in his Unitary Base Hypothesis postulates that the “syntacticosemantic specification of the base... is always unique. A WFR [word-formation rule] will never operate on either this or that” (1976: 48), which leads to a proliferation of homophonous affixes each of which has a satisfactorily simple domain. It will soon be obvious that the approach adopted here is not in keeping with the Unitary Base Hypothesis as it stands, but only with its basic interest in keeping domains simple. In Natural Morphology this general idea takes the shape of a preference for unique (or even bi-unique) form-meaning relations. The assumption behind this is that unambiguous form-meaning relations enhance the iconicity of derived words, thus making them better signs in semiotic terms (cf. Dressler 1987: 111–116, 1994).

It is the general spirit of the latter theory that the approach adopted here is most sympathetic to without being an instantiation of Natural Morphology in any pure sense. The reasons for this lie in the fact that also Natural Morphology is too form-oriented for what I think is necessary in the present context.

Having made this somewhat half-hearted commitment to Naturalness Theory, I will from now on refer to my general assumption about the behavior of derivational suffixes as the “Simple Domain Principle”: across theories it is thought preferable for one meaning to be expressed by one and only one form. Conversely, each suffix (form) should have a clearly defined semantic “effect”. This entails that each suffix should prefer a certain kind of derivational base. Exactly how this “certain kind of base” is to be defined is a question for which there does not seem to exist a satisfactory solution. Traditionally, morphologists have thought in terms of word-classes or syntactic categories, i.e., mainly in terms of nouns, verbs, and adjectives, but such a coarse-grained classification tends to be unsatisfactory, because it is far too general in many cases. As soon as we transcend strictly syntactic sub-categorization, however, it becomes very hard to constrain the kind and amount of semantic information that needs to come into play. I will make no attempt at solving this problem here but I am aware that we will be confronted with it when we look at the domain structures of LIC and ABLE.

4.2. *Formal domains*

4.2.1. Formal domain of LIC

In this section our task is to determine which types of bases the form *-lic(h)* seems to be able to attach to in the Old English and Early Middle English data. Accordingly, our point of view will be (almost) exclusively form-oriented. The discussion will not include any descriptive statistics but the following list has been