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PREFACE

The text used for analysis of *The Castel of Helth* by Sir Thomas Elyot was a book made by the Micro Photo Division of Bell and Howell Company using the duopage process. It was made from a copy produced in 1937 by Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, which is in the collection of the Western Reserve University Libraries, Cleveland, Ohio. The 1541 edition, from which the facsimile of 1937 was made, was owned by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach. The 1937 copy includes the title page and the preface from the 1539 edition, which were reproduced from a copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library. In addition, there is an introduction by Samuel A. Tannenbaum, M.D., L.H.D.
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ABSTRACT

An analysis was made to determine word classes of early sixteenth century English as represented by the language of a single writer. The Castel of Helth by Sir Thomas Elyot was used as the corpus. The analysis was based on the method suggested by George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith in An Outline of English Structures (Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers, No. 3 [Reprinted Washington, D. C.: ACLS, 1957]). Necessarily, the graphemic representation was substituted for the phonological, but no analysis of that level was attempted except at a few points where a separation of words and phrases was required. On the morphological level analysis was limited to inflectional suffixes.

Word classes (or parts of speech) were characterized by paradigmatic sets. There were four major classes: nouns, pronouns (containing three subsets), verbs, and adjectivals. Those points at which inflected words and positions (subjects, adjuncts to nouns, and so forth) consistently co-occurred provided syntactic frames for the testing of noninflected words, inflected words from other classes, phrases, and clauses. These words, phrases, and clauses, as well as the positions which they filled, were given the name of the morphologically defined classes except that an -al suffix was added: noun-nominal, pronoun-pronominal, and so forth.

Two adjustments were necessary. The positions, but not the word classes, of nominal and pronominal were seen to be identical when
it was noted that the nominal position was commonly filled by an endo-
centric phrase having a noun or nominal as its head, but that a pronoun
or pronominal filling the position substituted for the entire phrase and
stood alone. Thus, the complementary distribution of phrase and word
permitted the reduction of the two syntactic positions to one, the
nominal. Adjunctivals, though morphologically alike, were found to belong
distinctively on the syntactic level to nouns and to other word classes
respectively; they were consequently subdivided into adjectivals and
adverbials. The adjectivals were divided into four subsets according
to the order in which they were privileged to occur as adjuncts to nouns
(or nominals). A fifth quite small subset had severely restricted privi-
lege of occurrence.

Adverbials as adjuncts to adjectivals were basically the same
as those that occurred within the verbal (verb phrase) and both groups
were placed in one subset. Another subset was adjunct to other adverbi-
als, and a third subset occurred only after verb(al)s.

Two other major word classes were established, their determina-
tion depending entirely upon their relationship with other words, phrases,
or clauses. They were called prepositionals and conjunctivals. The
former class was relatively simple, but the latter was a complex and
disparate group which was subdivided into three major subsets of con-
junctivals: subordinating, coordinating, and transitional. The first
two groups of conjunctivals exhibited interesting characteristics of
functioning within an intricate system of structural signalling. The
analysis departed drastically from traditional treatment at this point
in that the conjunctivals did not necessarily have a one to one relation-
ship with a particular grammatical type of sentence with which they
occurred. For example, than was classified as a coordinating conjunctival, the term coordinating having reference only to structural equation. To a great extent, the privilege of initial occurrence of a construction which followed a subordinating conjunctival was dependent upon the system of signalling mentioned above. The third group, the transitionals, was diffuse and not classifiable in any satisfactory way. Stricter classification awaits analysis of syntax on a level higher than that attempted in the study.

The single most promising line for further study was the system of signalling that controlled clause structure.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Nature and Scope of Investigation

1.1 A descriptive analysis of the grammar of the early sixteenth century as represented by the language of Sir Thomas Elyot in The Castel of Helth was made. The goal of this study was an analysis of word classes as determined by (1) establishing syntactic positions on the basis of morphological forms that regularly filled those positions and (2) noting the uninflected words, phrases and clauses that could substitute within a frame for the paradigmatic membership. Word classes lacking a morphologically defined membership were analyzed on the basis of their relationship to other words or to larger syntactic constructions. Attention to constructions larger than words was limited to relationships that were relevant to the establishment of the syntactic word classes.

Justification of the Study

1.2 In spite of numerous reminders by historians of the English language that the arbitrary dates separating the various stages of the language are only a convenient fiction,¹ linguists have taken little advantage of the implications. Although there have been a few fine Old English and Middle English grammars, all of them have been loosely

restricted chronologically and spatially, a necessary consequence of a study of the periods during which scribal and dialectal variations must be levelled in the interest of congruence of presentation.

The development of the language from the Middle English period up to the present time poses a different situation. The term Modern English lulls one into a false acceptance of a uniformity that is more apparent than real. The printing press brought about a certain uniformity of external features (of configuration and, to some extent, spelling). Early Modern English did not spring full blown, but rather developed along a continuum, retaining for a while certain features commonly thought of as belonging exclusively to ME while developing new ones that grammarians would later assign exclusively to ModE.

Studies of this period have tended to take one of two directions: toward the literature as a part of the burgeoning Humanistic movement or toward the strained and often fanciful creation of "inkhorn terms" and the writers' own attitudes toward them. The latter have pointed up noteworthy socio-linguistic aspects but have altogether omitted the more basic aspects of system in language.

The facts suggest that examination in depth along a continuum of the past four and one-half centuries, which comprise the EModE and ModE periods, should uncover information that has hitherto been arrived at

---

2 Hereafter Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Modern English will be referred to as OE, ME, EModE, and ModE, respectively.

rather loosely: points of initiation of new linguistic structures (changing syntax), the rate and direction of change, as well as needed information about resistance to change. Such new studies will provide a means of verifying (or conversely, pointing up the lack of validity in) previous descriptions.

Ideally, any language under study should be a natural and unself-conscious variety, a type not easily found during the first half of the sixteenth century, the period selected for investigation. While writers of the period discussed at length the condition of the language as they saw it, their discussions indicate that they thought of language as words rather than as relationships of words in larger constructions. The grammars of the period were Latin grammars. The preoccupation with English lexicon to the neglect of other aspects of language seems to substantiate the hypothesis that sixteenth century unnaturalness of lexicon lacked its corollary in the grammar. 4

Since there is no way to get to the spoken language of the period for a full study, one must content himself with a study of the written language. Previous grammars of specific writers have seemed to be faulty in certain respects: (1) they have been totally concerned with the language of poetry or they have attempted to mix the language of poetry and prose in a single study; (2) the purpose has been turned toward the study of the language for whatever information may be brought to literary

---

4The assumption seems further substantiated by the findings of Herbert Sugden, whose study of Spenser's language (roughly the same period as Elyot's) showed that his deliberate archaisms resided "(1) chiefly in vocabulary, (2) to a high degree in spelling, (3) to some extent in the inflections, and (4) only slightly in the syntax" (The Grammar of Spenser's FAIRIE QUEENE, supplement to Language [1936], p. 10).
criticism; that is, the studies have not been done solely for information about the language.\(^5\)

The shortcomings mentioned above have been avoided by a study of the language of Sir Thomas Elyot. While his works, particularly Boke Named the Gouernour, have been considered of some literary importance, Elyot himself holds only a modest reputation as a writer among scholars concentrating on sixteenth century literature and is little known by most scholars of other periods. The language of Elyot is worthy of study simply because his writings were intended for practical purposes. One may assume, then, that his language represents those linguistic choices that would yield the most suitable utterances for communicating information to an eclectic reading audience.

The choice of works was also a deliberate one resulting from two factors other than the purely practical one of availability of text. Originality was held of little literary value during the period under study; however, for language study one would value original work more highly than translations and paraphrases, suspecting that syntactic choices were made more freely in the former case. The Castel of Helth holds no claim of originality of subject matter. Nevertheless, "Elyot's book is the earliest important manual of health originally written in English."\(^6\) It was, moreover, a popular work, having been "printed at least fourteen times before 1610."\(^7\) Its immense popularity indicates that the language was not of a strained or highly literary variety.

\(^5\)No implication that such studies lack value is intended. The point being made is that the linguist analyzing a segment of the language cannot concern himself with the problems of literary aesthetics that may be involved.

\(^6\)Lehmberg, p. 133.

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 132.
In short, because he wrote for the purpose of communicating with others and because his health manual was read and presumably enjoyed by a wide variety of readers, Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Castel of Helth* seemed to offer the best possible choice as a text for a descriptive grammar of the language of a single writer (and speaker) of the early sixteenth century.

**Theoretical Basis for Study**

1.3 The writings of leading linguists in recent years have left in abeyance the question of the proper level at which to begin linguistic analysis. Those working with languages not previously analyzed have tended to place phonological analysis first and have worked upward, whereas at least one major linguistic school, that of generative transformational analysis, begins with the classical Greek concept of a sentence as consisting of a subject and a predicate and moves downward.

---

8The literature seems to have clearly established the terminology of *low level* as meaning phonological level with a rising hierarchy consisting of grammar and semology. In turn, a grammar has a lower and higher level of morphology and syntax respectively. H. A. Gleason refers to the tripartite divisions as systems (*Linguistics and English Grammar* [New York, 1965]), pp. 99-108, 295). Many analysts belonging to the Bloomfieldian school speak only of phonological, morphological, and syntactical levels, thereby denying the semological level. See particularly Eugene A. Nida, *Morphology*, 2d ed. (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1963), p. 2. Sidney Lamb states levels in terms of "stratal systems" two of which comprise each "major component." These components, in turn, are roughly equivalent (i.e., they move sequentially from an expression content to a meaning content or vice versa) to Gleason's "systems" (*Outline of Stratificational Grammar* [Washington, D. C., 1965]), p. 1).

---

string by string in an uninterrupted succession. The goal of the second group has been somewhat different, however, in that the proponents of that school of analysis have worked extensively only with native or well known languages and claim "a grammar of a language purports to be a description of the ideal speaker-hearer's intrinsic competence." The goal of the first group is rather to arrive at some degree of competence on the part of the hearer so that he may ultimately enter into either side of the speaker-hearer bifurcation and consequently apply his knowledge to a description of the language.

An analysis of a language having no phonological representation, such as the one under investigation, presents a special problem. It would be inaccurate to claim only two systems, since there is a graphemic system that substitutes, though perhaps only roughly, for the phonological.

Nevertheless, the quality of a large body of literature describing investigations of older periods of English using the graphemic system as a substitution for the phonological argues for its practicability. In

---

10In generative transformational grammar the name given a single line of a structural description of a sentence on any level whatsoever (Owen Thomas, Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English [New York, 1964], p. 42).

11Deducible from Noam Chomsky: "A fully adequate grammar must assign to each of an infinite range of sentences a structural description indicating how this sentence is understood by the ideal speaker-hearer" (Aspects of the Theory of Syntax [Cambridge, Mass., 1965], pp. 4-5). The notational system of the transformation then begins with the first rewrite rule: $S \rightarrow {\text{NP + VP}}$, a division which is invariably equivalent to an abstraction of the idea subject-predicate (Syntactic Structures [The Hague, 1957], p. 26).

12Chomsky, Aspects, p. 4.

13The writer is subscribing to Gleason's three systems as outlined in n. 1.

14Gleason, pp. 108-9, 186. For this reason all morphemes will be given graphemic rather than phonemic representation.
the present study the limitation of the analysis on the morphological level to inflectional morphemes permits a rather sharp line to be drawn between the graphemic level and the morphological.

Method of Analysis

1.4 The inflectional paradigms were determined according to the processes outlined by Trager and Smith: "inspection, commutation within a frame, complementary distribution" (p. 53). After all paradigmatic parts of speech were defined or characterized, their positional variations were noted. These variations provided frames for other

15Derivational morphemes and roots have been excluded from the analysis on the basis that they belong to a study of word formation and therefore relate directly to the lexicon (semology) rather than to syntax. The hypothesis is not clearly borne out in the literature on the subject, but is claimed as valid by the investigator. The arguments in justification for the claim will be clarified in Chap. II.

16However, phonological phenomena reflected by the graphemic system and having syntactic relevance will become a necessary part of the analysis. A hypothetical case in point is ME alternate forms ne wille/nille. If ne invariably immediately precedes wille, no statement need be made as the alternating forms may be considered in free variation. If not, some statement must be made concerning the positional occurrence of ne in relation to wille. The fact that the two forms are negative belongs to the semology.

17Paradigms are defined as "sets of inflected or derived forms of a base" (George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., An Outline of English Structures [Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Reprinted Washington, D. C.: AGLS, 1957)], p. 56). However, instead of base, Bloomfield's terminology of root, usually thought of as the meaning-bearing morpheme, and stem, the root with or without affixation to which yet another affix may be attached (p. 225) will be substituted. No attempt was made in the analysis to include an exhaustive list of roots or nonfinal (derivational) affixes. The latter, whether prefixal or suffixal, often provide morphological information concerning parts of speech. For example, in ModE, en- and -ate frequently signal verbs (endear, enable, activate, propitiate), but this test alone would fail in a great many words (enemy, energy, mate, potentate, etc.); whereas the definition of verb based on inflection and syntactical position does not fail. For example, on the surface time flies is ambiguous. But at this stage only the first process of "inspection" has been applied. At the next stage, "commutation within a frame," the ambiguity is resolved.
morphemic words which lacked the characteristic paradigms, but which were clearly substitutable in the frames. These words were placed in subsets and denoted by the same part of speech as those of the basic set except that they were differentiated by the addition of the suffix -al: noun-nominal, adjective-adjectival, and so forth. The occurrence of a morphemic word in more than one paradigmatic frame, that is, belonging by inflectional paradigm to one part of speech and occurring as a member of a subset of another, was not unexpected.

---

18 For definitions of terms, see below.

19 James Sledd, who used this method in his book *A Short Introduction to English Grammar* (Chicago, 1959), reversed himself in his review of Gleason's *Linguistics and English Grammar* (*Language*, XLII [Dec., 1966], 797-809) by concluding that "it [the suffix -al] merely gives distracting new names to traditional classes . . . ." He makes a case for "old-fashioned teachers" who "talked about inflected and uninflected nouns, noun clauses, adjectives used as nouns, and so on" (p. 798). He is probably right in the instance he cited; nevertheless, it seems that he erred at several other important points. The multitude of forms where part of speech is not so easy to determine (particularly adverbs and to a smaller extent adjectives and a few forms traditionally called pronouns) may be accounted for neatly by the morphological-syntactical dichotomy. Furthermore, any aversion to "cross-cutting," a term used by Gleason (p. 130) to designate words occurring in two or more word classes, is ameliorated when one considers that the same morphological form occurs in more than one syntactical position rather than assuming that one form is a noun here but an adjective there. Finally, the syntactical part of speech neatly discloses the variety of linguistic forms--words, phrases, and clauses--that may substitute for morphological parts of speech. In view of these facts, the double classification of morphological part of speech and syntactical position determined by it and designated by the suffix -al was retained.

20 Words like *news* and *newer* are taken to be two morphemic words, though different in a way that does not apply to the difference between *newer* and *newest*. The root is the same for all the forms, but *news* differs syntactically from *newer* in the fact that the former belongs both morphologically and syntactically to a noun word class and the latter does not; whereas, though *newer* and *newest* belong both morphologically and syntactically to the same word class (a fact which does not prevent their occurrence in other syntactic positions), there are certain environmental restrictions placed upon both forms: a *newer* book but not a *newest* book; *my book is newer than yours* but *my book is the newest* (one).
Attention was next turned to uninflected forms which were describable in terms of (a) position or (b) relationship to words belonging to a paradigmatic set. These were placed in sets and subsets and were characterized by a sample listing of forms commonly found in a stated position or relationship to words belonging to paradigmatic sets. The number of sets and subsets was limited only by practical considerations of an analysis that had as its goal both clarity and economy.

All morphemic words having been accounted for, morphemic phrases and clauses were then tested in the frames which had been determined by inflected forms. These were found to be of two types: endocentric and exocentric. These forms were also given the name of the syntactical part of speech.

Definitions

The following definitions obtain for the analysis:

1.5 A morphemic word is to be understood as one root with or without affixation.

1.6 A morphemic phrase is to be understood as a sequence of roots with or without affixation and having further restriction that the roots with or without affixation are first considered as morphemic words, the whole of which may supplant a single inflectional form on the syntactic level or a morphemic word belonging to the class of prepositionals or conjunctivals.

21 Although the definitions used here follow Trager and Smith rather closely, they depart significantly in that supra-segmentals, having no clear representation in the written corpus, were ignored.

22 Such a stipulation as the last one avoids the problem of taker-taker which Trager and Smith resolve by superfixes and change of allomorph under stress (pp. 57-8). It will be noted that according to the ascribed definition above, a verb plus object could not then be classed as a phrase since no single word can substitute. The same would hold for all predicate complementation.
1.7 A **morphemic clause** consists of a verb or a verbal (as defined in 3.4), with or without subject, complementation, or modification, and further characterized by the fact that any morphologically defined syntactical position within the clause except that of verb may be filled by another morphemic clause; the process of embedding morphemic clauses in morphologically defined syntactic positions may occur n-tuple times. There will be, then, as many morphemic clauses as there are verbs or verbals, except that, if there is any evidence of verbal coordination as described below (3.82a), the verbs or verbals so coordinated are to be construed as belonging to the same morphemic clause within which the coordination occurs.

1.8 **Syntactic clauses** may be thought of as being coterminous with morphemic clauses. It is necessary to classify them on a level higher than morphemic to facilitate the description of the relationship they hold to each other within a single utterance. An **independent syntactic clause** is one which does not enter into a syntactic structure larger than itself. A **dependent syntactic clause** is one which enters into a syntactic structure larger than itself.
CHAPTER II

MORPHOLOGICAL WORD CLASSES

Nouns

2.1 A noun is defined as a morphemic word which has at least one overt inflectional form. Nouns are characterized by the following paradigm:

1 By this definition ryches (Aiiia), a plural form which does not occur in the corpus in an uninflected singular common case form nor in the genitive may nevertheless be classed as a noun if a common root is found to occur elsewhere as in rich, richer, richest, since this fact will establish the -es as an inflection and disprove accidental similarity to the plural allomorph (See Chap. I, n. 20). However, where such morphemes are not distinctive, the decision rests finally with syntactical evidence.

A more difficult problem is posed by proper nouns. In many ways they behave more like pronouns than like nouns. They lack the type of modification that other nouns may have. They substitute for the entire nominal morphemic phrase. They are, moreover, distinctively singular in that each linguistic form has a kind of permanent relationship with its referent, making plural forms impossible except with very special meanings. Proper nouns do take the inflection of the genitive case, however, as is illustrated by Christis passion (67a). Consequently, in this study all proper names will be categorically classified as nouns.
As indicated by the physical appearance of the paradigm, the two types of inflectional features are of quite separate dimensions and cover completely different aspects of the language system. The genitive case overtly contrasts with the common case in the singular. In the plural, the facts are much more complex.

It would have been possible to set up the paradigm without including the zero allomorph of the genitive plural if one were willing to concede a morphophonemic rule of the type that states that where the two

2The zero morph is used as a symbol to point up a contrast between the absence and presence of an overt form. The convention (Trager and Smith, p. 61) is particularly useful in the present analysis for two types of words: (a) those like swine (15b), dere (15b), etc., and (b) those like men(ne) (Aiva), where the zero allomorph is automatically accompanied by alternation of the stem vowel.

3The letters included in parentheses indicate variant spellings that occur in the text. The comma between two sets of parentheses indicates that one, but not both, may be chosen. When citations of forms are given, a base spelling is selected and variants are not shown. Longer constructions are spelled exactly as they occur in the text except for the substitution of an n for a tilde, a symbol commonly used in the manuscript under study to indicate nasality.

Citations are given by leaf page followed by a small a signifying the left side of the page or a small b, the right side. This procedure is in contrast to Elyot's instructions for pagination, but is justified by greater simplicity. Also, since a and b are not printed in the text, no confusion results. Preliminary pages ("Proheme" and "The Table") are cited by folio letter and leaf number given in small Roman numerals followed by a or b.

4At least two contrasts are present here; thus a terminological decision had to be made. Gleason (Linguistics, p. 379) proposed non-genitive as a case name for the uninflected form. Morphologically, the term is attractive, but it seems to hide a syntactical fact that although no contrast occurs in nouns between the nominative and objective forms, a contrast does occur with pronouns; moreover, the rules governing the substitution of pronouns for nouns seem to be of sufficient importance to weight the scales in favor of common case.
sibilant allomorphs co-occur, they coalesce. The graphemics would then be a reflection of the morphophonemic rule. Such a rule has the advantage of avoiding a decision as to which morpheme is present in forms like *hennes* (p. 15a) which could be construed as genitive plural. However, the fact seems to be clear that there is an ordering of inflectional morphemes evidenced by the addition of a morpheme to a plural stem in such forms as *mennes* (Aivb). If the statement is valid, then one must say that the order of morphemes in *hennes* is sibilant plural allomorph plus genitive zero allomorph. Thus, while the number of allomorphs in the noun paradigm seems unnecessarily profligate, the description reveals a pleasing symmetry of complementary distribution.

A singular form accompanied by a determiner means 'one', but lacking a determiner means 'in general' or 'lacking specificity'. The

---

5 Sidney M. Lamb (in his class, Stratificational Grammar, U. C. L. A., Summer, 1966) suggested that the phonological phenomenon was simply the coalescing (his word was "telescoping") of two sibilants. This explanation, however, does not seem to aid the descriptive problem.

6 Gleason has suggested that the genitive morpheme no longer functions as a case ending in ModE. He uses the phrasal genitive as his evidence. Gleason likens the genitive morpheme "to an element behaving more nearly like a preposition" (p. 380), thus relegating the problem to the syntax. He does not make clear how a phonologically conditioned, bound form can become a member of a set of particles. Nor does he explain how a bound form is to be excepted from morphological considerations.

7 The statement is interesting in the light it throws on linguistic levels. Nida has pointed out (*Morphology*, pp. 2-3) that in analysis one must constantly have access to all other levels. In this case a statement concerning number-meaning involves a morphological fact alone for one meaning, but a morphological fact (the same one) plus a statement of syntactic relationship for another. Hence, the contrast of meaning does not occur on the morphological level, but on the syntactic level.

8 In the early days of American linguistics, the use of means often led to misunderstanding; consequently, its use was avoided wherever possible in the decades following Bloomfield's major work. Few linguists, however, shy away from the subject any longer, and almost all of them now
plural indicates not so much "more than one" as "not restricted to one." While the uses of the genitive case in Elyot's language could be classified on a semantic basis into several sets according to meaning (for example, see Randolph Quirk and C. L. Wrenn, An Old English Grammar [New York, 1957], pp. 61-4), it is possible to make a division based only on position into two sets which may be conveniently referred to as nominal and adverbial in keeping with the word classes to which they are adjuncts. The difference is illustrated in the following sentences:

(10b) . . . the innermost skine of a hennes gysar . . . (Nominal genitive)

(45a) Exercise being a vehement motion, therof nedes must ensue hardnes of the members, therby . . . (Adverbial genitive)

It may be seen that the nominal genitive is a morphologically established position whereas the adverbial genitive is not; therefore, further discussion of the latter is postponed to the consideration of syntactic word classes (3.61a, 3.62f).

recognize the difference between referential meaning and structural meaning (that is, that meaning which is dependent upon such structure signals as inflection, word order, etc.). It is the latter "meaning" intended here. For discussion of linguists' attitude toward meaning, see Bloomfield, pp. 74-5; Gleason, pp. 58-60; Willard V. Quine, "The Problem of Meaning in Linguistics" in The Structure of Language by Jerry A. Fodor and Jerrold J. Katz eds. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964), pp. 21-32.

9This fact was pointed out by Robert A. Hall, and although he had reference to ModE, the same fact seems to hold for EModE (Introductory Linguistics [New York, 1964], p. 153).

10The subjective genitive seems to be the historical progenitor of the nominal genitive and the objective genitive of the adverbial. Quirk and Wrenn call attention to the latter fact (pp. 62-3) though their use of adverbial is not so inclusive as the term used in this study.

11There are a few errors in leaf pagination in the text, as in 45a, which is taken from folio 0. Hereafter, pagination corrections will be made by placing the folio letter in brackets within the parentheses.
A fourth form, the only one occurring, appears to be a combination of synthetic and analytic structure of a type commonly called double genitive in ModE:

(36b) Of sugar, I do fynd none auncient author of grekes or latynes, do write by name, but onely Paulus Aegineta, who sayth . . .

The evidence is not conclusive, of course, since a reasonable interpretation may be of grekes and latynes pertaining to nationalities (that is, 'no authors among the Greek people') rather than to languages. However, the people are usually treated in the text as grekes and Romanes, as illustrated below:

(Bia) . . . let theym remembre, that the grekes wrate in greke, the Romanes in latyne.

If the explanation of co-occurring synthetic and analytic forms is correct, the usage is significant in that the language under study may represent a period during which the analytic of and the genitive inflection were not mutually exclusive in certain constructions.

2.11 Examples of paradigmatic forms occurring in the text follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common case</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>bodys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childere</td>
<td>dayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daye</td>
<td>hennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humour</td>
<td>humours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kynge</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>monthes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phisition</td>
<td>phisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reder</td>
<td>reders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sede</td>
<td>sedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is, however, no comparable occurrence in ModE.
Nouns were found to occur in eleven syntactic positions, ten of the eleven being nominal. The singular and plural forms of the common case have the privilege of occurring in all nominal positions, but there are strong restrictions concerning the genitive form, which is privileged to occur in only one nominal position, namely, preposed to another noun. In this same position and with a loosely comparable meaning, a noun in the common case, either singular or plural, may occur. The noun structure in this position may be recursive; however, as is true of all recursiveness in language, there is a low limit on the number of times the

---

13 Whether genitive or common case, a noun, preposed or postposed to the head noun, seems to be a reduction of a related sentence. In generative transformational terminology, it bears close resemblance to an "embedded" clause structure (see Emmon Bach, An Introduction to Transformational Grammars [New York, 1964], pp. 75-82). Meaning (see n. 8, above) may be interpreted only on the basis of a fuller structure than the single word. Compare, for example, *hennes gysar* (10b) 'gizzard of a hen' with *boke of pronostications* (55b) 'book containing prognostications' where the first example has as underlying sentence something like 'a hen has a gizzard' whereas the second is much more complex: 'someone writes a book' and 'some books contain prognostications' yielding 'a book of prognostication'.

The preposed noun may closely resemble the genitive: *shirte sleue* (48a) 'sleeve of a shirt' from an underlying 'the shirt has a sleeve', but it may be of another type altogether. For example, *men children* (7b) does not mean 'children of men' but 'children who are men [male]'.

The postposed noun is of the latter type, that is, a reduction of a copulative sentence: *Galen, the most excellent phisition* (Aiiib) from 'Galen was a most excellent phisition'. It may be said to be coordinate with the noun head; and it may, in turn, take the same pattern of preposed forms as the noun head itself (see 3.53).

14 Recursiveness is a technical term belonging to generative grammar, but when taken to mean that a single type of construction may occur one after the other rather than to designate a part of the notational system permitting such a generation, the term becomes notably apt for nongenerative descriptions.
construction may recur. It must be noted that all positions in which the head noun alone has the privilege of occurrence are also open to the head noun accompanied by other nouns, whether pre- or postposed, except for occasional environmental restrictions imposed by the semology.

2.12 Examples of syntactic positions filled by inflected noun forms alone or as heads of constructions are as follows:

1. Subject

(38b) Children wold be nouryshed with meates and drynkes . . . .

2. Subjective complement after linking verb

(9a) Natural fleume is a humour cold and moyst . . . .

Subjective complement after passive voice

(14a) Thynges not naturall be soo called, by cause they be no portion of a naturall body, as they be which be called naturall thinges . . . .

15 The longest noun string found in the text was mayster kynge Henry the VIII (Aiva), in which Henry the VIII is taken to be a single linguistic form, that is, a proper noun. In such cases the noun head must be either intuitively or arbitrarily assigned. Not quite so difficult is a noun string broken by a determiner, souerayne lord the kinges majesty (Aiiib), where there is clear evidence for lord as head with souerayne and kinges majesty as preposed and postposed forms respectively.

16 Head is defined as the linguistic form without modification which fills a position established by both morphological and syntactical criteria. This definition may be compared to Bloomfield's (p. 195): "In subordinate endocentric constructions, the resultant phrase belongs to the same form-class as one of the constituents, which we call the head." Bloomfield's definition for form-class, however, is not sufficiently rigorous to make clear the status of such a word as poor in The poor were even worse off than before.

17 The syntactic element established by inflectional noun in initial sentence position and termed subject does not require proof further than illustration from the corpus, since the theoretical basis of utterance in English is taken to be subject-predicate (see Chap. I, n. 9). Traditional terminology has been used wherever possible to avoid the unnecessary imposition on the reader to master a new set no better than the old. Any terminology that implies more or less than the traditional term implies will be clearly explained; and where traditional terminology may be misleading, it will be replaced with a new term, carefully defined.
3. Nominative absolute

(20a) ... but some men do suppose, that in helth and siknes they be much better than porke, the iuyce of them bothe being more pure.

4. Nominative of address

(95a) Thus fare ye weel gentyll reders, and forget me not with your good report ... .

5. Direct object

(29a) Turnepes being welle boyled in water, and after with fatte fleshe norisheth moch, augmenteth the sede of man, prouoketh carnall lust.

6. Indirect object

(64b) ... Appollodorus the phylosopher, taught to the emperour Octavian, that ... he do recite in order, all the letters of the A, B, C, and ... .

7. Retained object

(18a) The bodys vntemperate, suche meates or drynkes are to be giuen, which be in power contrary to the distemperance.

8. Object of preposition

(Aiiib) Besydes the sayde kynges, whom I haue rehearsed ... .

9. Objective complement

(Aiiia) Truly if they wil calle him a phisition, which is studious about the weale of his countray ... .

---

18 The evidence concerning indirect objects is slim at this stage of analysis, but quite rich at the next stage. With pronouns, the evidence points to free variation between the complement introduced by (un)to and omission of preposition. The position relative to verb and direct object remains stable. In light of this fact, an indirect object is defined as a noun complement occurring between a verb of the type give, choose, teach, etc. and a direct object. It may or may not be preceded by (un)to.

19 It cannot be conclusively proved that bodys is the subject of the sentence and meates the retained object. The sentence in the active voice would yield something like Someone giues (unto) bodys vntemperate suche meates or drynkes, etc. However, even if the sentence were interpreted as having meates or drynkes as its subject, there would still be the retained (indirect) object bodys. There is insufficient evidence in the text to determine whether the language described permits either the indirect or direct object to become the subject in the passive voice as does ModE.
10. Attribute to noun

(a) Preposed (common case)

(3b) . . . ingendrynge more females than men chylderne.

(b) Preposed (genitive case)

(Aiva) . . . whose helth I hartely pray god as longe to preserue as god hath constitute mans lyfe to contynue . . . .

(34a) Ewes mylke is betweene cowe mylke and asses mylke.

(c) Postposed

(Aiib) Galen, the most excellent phisition fearyd that in wrytynge a compendious doctrine for the curing of syckenes, he should lose all his labour . . . .

Pronouns

2.2 A pronoun is a morphemic word that substitutes for a noun or nominal phrase or clause in any noun position. There are three sets, each having its own paradigm: personal, relative, and demonstrative. The last set is distinctive in that it (a) exhibits common case characteristics like nouns and (b) shares total membership with an important subset of another word class, the determiner. The inflectional endings

20 The form of cowe here is interesting in that it appears to be an inconsistent use of the common case. It may, however, be a reflex of an old West Saxon form cu a feminine noun whose genitive singular is cue.

21 For further discussion of the sentence, see 3.53.

22 Such a classification immediately poses the problem of whether it would not be more accurate to posit two homophonic sets, one pronoun and one adjectival subset, or to classify the set as adjectival with privilege of pronominal occurrence. The latter has much in its favor, and if the description were generative transformational would permit some interesting possibilities for deletions of nouns, along with all adjectives in the string except the demonstrative, thus resolving the problem of two sets. However, certain other important facts would be obscured; for example, privilege is granted personal pronouns in the genitive case to occur in the same position as the determiner. Therefore, classification as pronoun seems preferable because of the inflectional pattern and because it leads to greater generalization.
and the roots have allomorphs of such phonological (and therefore graphemic) variety that a simple listing of the linguistic forms will be given.

**Personal pronouns**

2.21 There are three categories of personal pronouns. The first person designates the speaker (writer) as he refers to himself; in the plural the speaker includes himself in a group of two or more people. The second person designates the person(s) spoken to and excludes the speaker; and the third person is used everywhere else. Gender is indicated only in the third person singular. Generally it may be said that gender is natural, but the historical change from grammatical to natural gender had left residues of the older type that are clearly exemplified in Elyot's language. Neuter forms homophonous with the masculine occur in both the objective and genitive cases.

Number is designated in all persons by inflection.23 There are three case distinctions: nominative, genitive, and objective. Only the neuter singular contains homophonous forms in the nominative and objective cases, thus exhibiting common case distribution similar to nouns. Almost complete consistency is found in use of case distinctions, there being few deviant forms in the text. The objective form you occurs in a subject position in

(64b) ... and is that wherof god speketh, by his prophete Davyd, sayinge, Be you angry, and do not synne.

Since quotation marks were not used in the printing of the text, it is impossible to determine whether Elyot intended the statement as a Biblical quotation or a paraphrase of a Biblical quotation. In either case, the

23 Nelson Francis points out the peculiar meaning of plural of pronouns as opposed to noun plurals (*The Structure of American English* [New York, 1958], p. 245).
usage is a part of the data which may be accounted for by noting its occurrence in inverted word order after nonindicative (2.33) mode.

Graphemic representation reflects phonological conditioning in the possessive case where forms ending in y /ay/ add -n(e) /n/ before words starting with vowel sounds: myne experience (80b). In addition, when the genitive form stands for both the possessor and the thing possessed, the longer form is used. 24

Personal pronouns occur in The Castel of Helth as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative case</th>
<th>Third person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>Second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>my/myne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 See "Subject, genitive case," in this same section, below.
Personal pronouns occur in only five of the nominal syntactic positions as established by inflectional noun forms. 25

1. Subject

   (a) Nominative

      (40a) Also they must forbear all thynges . . . .

   (b) Common case

      (42a) . . . where one feleth hym selfe full . . . .; than [then] is it most convenient, to abstayne . . . .

   (c) Genitive case

      (80b) . . . to the intent that they which haue their bodies in lyke temperature as myne was . . . .

2. Direct object

   (67b) If good men so iudge the, thanke thou god of that felicitie . . . . 26

---

25 In the corpus, all persons were not found in all positions. However, there was sufficient evidence to suggest that there were no restrictions on occurrence except those imposed semologically; that is, the particular person used was required by contextual occurrence of antecedent. In the cases of first and second person pronouns, no antecedents are required, though sequences of forms occur.

A problem is posed in example 1(c) where myne occurs alone as subject. No nominal position of this kind was established since all genitival forms preceded nouns in the common case. It is claimed, however, that the substitution of myne is not for the name of the speaker but for an entire nominal phrase where both referents (the person and the thing) have been clearly shown as antecedents: in this case, I and body.

(80a) And this haue I not written for vayneglorye or of presumption, but to the intent that they which haue their bodies in lyke temperature as myne [my body] was . . . .

Furthermore, one strongly suspects that the lack of a similar nominal example is due to the semantic limitations of the text rather than to restrictions on the language.

26 Note the instance of the nominative thou, which is positionally similar to the you found in nominative position cited above: "Be you angry . . . ."
3. Indirect object

(39a) These thinges knowne, if they eate strong meates, giue them not one . . .

4. Object of preposition

(a) Objective case

(67a) . . . consyder the circumstance of his moste excellent pacience . . . toward us . . .

(b) Genitive case

(64a) . . . and all this being done for the offence of mankind, and not his . . . 27

5. Attribute to noun

Preposed to noun

(53a) And also the tongue . . . is depriued of his office . . .

Relative pronoun

2.22 The relative pronoun who inflects for nominative, objective, and genitive cases. It substitutes indifferently for human and nonhuman referents in both the singular and plural numbers. The paradigm is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>whose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative pronoun is found in the following positions in dependent finite syntactic clauses:

1. Subject (human, plural)

(54a) . . . Galen correcteth Hipocrates, saying, that he shold haue excepted men very old, who, as experience declareth, muste eate often and lytell.

27 In the form under question, one may arrive at an explanation similar to that proposed above for myne (n. 25) by positing his as the second half of a coordinate object of a preposition: offence of (1) mankind, (2) his.
2. Direct object (human, plural)

(Aiib) Besydes the sayde kynges, whom I haue rehersed, other honorable personagis haue wriiten in this excellent doctrine . . .

3. Object of preposition (nonhuman, plural)

(62a) Hemorroides be vaynes in the foundement, of whom do happen sundry passions.

4. Attribute to noun

Preposed (human, plural)

(Aiib) Besydes the sayde kynges, whom I haue rehersed, other honorable personagis haue wriiten in this excellent doctrine . . . whose warkes doo yet remayne unto their glory immortall . . .

In addition to its uses in dependent syntactic clauses, who (functioning without an antecedent) introduces a question in an independent syntactic clause.

(Aiib [Proheme]) I haue spoken of frendshyp perchaunce more than nedeth, but who wil not wyshe (yf it mought happen) to haue such a treasour, as neither the mountaynes of Ethiope, nor the ruyers of Inde do conteyne in them, to be therto compared.

**Demonstrative pronouns**

2.23 The full paradigm of the demonstrative pronoun is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common case</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that</td>
<td>those</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demonstrative pronoun occurs in the following positions:

1. Subject

(67b) This nowe shall suffice concerninge remedies of morall philosophie.

(60a) But those whiche be temperate, kepynge good diete, be holpen without lettynge of bloude.
2. Subjective complement

(9a) Fleume unnaturall is \textit{that}, whyche is myxt with other humours . . .

(48b) Stronge or vyolente exercises be \textit{these}, deluynge . . . bearynge or susteynynge of heuye burdeyns, clymmyng or walking . . .

3. Nominative absolute

(64a) . . . and all \textit{this} being done . . . yet . . . he was neuer sene or perceyued angry.

4. Direct object

(53b) Lyke wyse I calle \textit{that} undigested, which still retayneth the fygure of meate.

5. Object of preposition

(52b) And of \textit{that}, whyche is resolued of meate undygested, procedeth fum ositie . . .

From the examples shown above, it may be seen that demonstrative pronouns, \textit{this} and \textit{that}, inflect for number, but, unlike the two previous sets, they do not inflect for case. They substitute for a wide variety of nouns or nominals. The antecedent may be unstated, as in sentence 67b above, where \textit{this} refers vaguely, but unambiguously, to the writing immediately preceding which has dealt with "remedies of morall philosophy," so that the phrase becomes a sort of summarization or reinforcement of \textit{this}. A different situation is seen in the sentence 9a in which \textit{that} substitutes for a portion abstracted by modification from the whole; that is, (1) "unnaturall" and (2) "whyche is myxt with other humours . . ."\textsuperscript{28} In

\textsuperscript{28}In generative transformational grammar the sentence may be viewed as a complex series of transformations of a set of kernel sentences of the sort

\begin{align*}
\text{fleume is something} \\
\text{somebody myxt something with other humours} \\
\text{some fleume is unnaturall}
\end{align*}

where the second sentence (whose prepositional phrase may itself be an embedding) is transformed to passive voice and embedded into the matrix; and finally the third sentence is embedded as an adjectival modifier into the nominal phrase and the demonstrative pronoun substituted for \textit{something}.\]
sentence 64a, *this*, a singular form referring to a string of offenses ("... yet he not withstandinge rebuked, scorned, falsely accused, plucked hyther ...") and running to 106 words, is a reference to the total atrocity rather than to the specific deeds itemized. In contrast, plural forms consistently appear to have more specific referents.29 The plural forms commonly refer either to people as in 60a or to a listing, often one which is to follow, as in 48b.

**Verbs**

2.3 A verb is a morphemic word having a contrastive inflectional paradigm in the non-past30 and past tenses. In their analysis of the verb, Trager and Smith list seven properties: person, tense, phase, aspect, mode, voice, and status.31 In this study only person, tense, and mode may be treated in relation to morphemic words, all other properties applying to morphemic phrases. Phase (3.43) and voice (3.45) will be

---

29 These plural cases, along with some singular ones, often seem to be a simple matter of deletion of the nominal in a phrase: *these* (exercises); *those* (persons). See n. 22.

30 The term non-past is used by Trager and Smith and seems more accurate than the usual present, since tense does not often specify time in a simple way. It commonly refers to a generality as in

(26a) The first counsayle is, that durynge the time of that passion, eschewe to be angry . . .

or custom, as in

(67b) The losse of goodes or authoritie doo greue none but fooles, which do not marke diligently . . .

Often the non-past implies a future act:

(23b) The chese which doth leest harme [that is, when it is eaten], is softe chese . . .

31 See pp. 77-80. For a fuller discussion differing only in minor details, see Francis, pp. 330-7.
analyzed in relation to syntactical word classes. Aspect and status are not pertinent to the analysis. 32

Person

2.31 Person is not solely a verbal property. It must be treated as belonging to both the pronominal and verbal systems since there are certain inflectional relationships between singular pronouns and verbs in the subject-predicate positions that are describable in terms of complementary distribution. Sharp verbal distinctions are lacking in the plural; thus, plural pronouns (in spite of their distinctive morphemic shapes) follow the same pattern of agreement with verbs as do nouns.

The problem concerning agreement is not whether Elyot's verbs agree with their subjects, but rather how to determine the basis of agreement. 33 It is possible, of course, to cite a non-past plural -eth form as a conservative reflex of the OE present plural -ath ending which became ME -eth. The hypothesis is quite attractive when one notes such examples as the following,

(26a) . . . they trouble the bealy, and fylleth the stomake with wynde . . .

32The formal characteristics of aspect, as described by Trager and Smith (pp. 77-8) yield forms often called progressive in traditional grammars, along with some verbal phrases classified according to their meaning (get, keep, etc.). The former occurs only once in the text (23a) and is analyzed as a linking verb with participial subjective complement, and the latter group is rejected outright as being meaning-based. Furthermore, a study of status, which is predominantly a matter of word order, would go beyond the scope of the present work and is consequently omitted.

33A descriptive grammar does not, of course, require explanation of why a speaker uses a particular form. However, if a usage appears to be in violation of a classical grammatical concept (in this case, concord), it must be shown either that the classical concept had no basis in fact or that the usage under analysis veered in some describable fashion from that concept.
where it may be pointed out that trouble has as its provenance Old French whereas fylleth is an OE word. However, the sentence below suggests that the facts may be more complex:

(22a) The lyuer of a capon, henne, fesaunte, or goose . . . is not onely easy to digest . . . . But the lyuers of beasts be yll to digest, passeth slowly, and maketh grosse bloud, but it is strong in nourishinge.

Lyuers appears to be a plural form; nevertheless, it cannot be unequivocally stated that the writer considers it plural since be is in free variation with both are and is in the indicative, as may be seen in the paradigm below.

2.4 In the second half of the sentence, it has reference to lyuers as a mass noun. The problem is further complicated by the fact that a plural form may have had a singular connotation to Elyot. The following sentence contains evidence to that effect:

(28a) The sedes therof braised and drunke with wine and water is very holsome agaynst the colyke, and frettinge of guttes, it stoppeth fluxes . . . .

In the case of the third person singular, it should be noted that there is a special usage that is clearly attributable to the format of the text. In "Book II" various "meates" are centered on the line and the discussion concerning their effect on man is explained without repetition of the heading. When more than one singular form is given, the verb is still singular; that is, Elyot appears to intend the discussion to apply to each one independently of the other. The usage is consistent, and where his heading is plural, he uses a plural verb. For example,

(20a) Kydde and uemale, of Galene is commended nexte unto porke, but some men do suppose . . . .

(20b) Pygeons Be easily digested, and ar very holsom to them, which are fleumatike, or pure melancoly.
Although no completely satisfactory conclusions may be reached, -eth is included as a plural non-past allomorph in the indicative mode, but is is taken to be third person singular only (2.4).

Tense

2.32 There are two tenses represented in the language: non-past and past. The text did not yield a full paradigm of a single verb, but there was a sufficient number of contrastive forms in both non-past and past tenses to serve as a basis for a generalization of Elyot's usage. The greatest lacuna occurred in the second person, singular and plural, as one would expect from a corpus of the type under study. No information was gleaned concerning the second person plural number of the past tense.

The inflectional past morpheme of the weak verb is characterized by the dental suffix, (e),(i)d; but strong verbs form the past in a variety of ways. It is noteworthy that verbs whose non-past form may be the same as the past at all other points still show contrastive distribution in both the second and third person singular. Weak verbs in the past tense have both distinctive second person singular endings and the past tense inflectional form while strong verbs have internal vowel change and distinctive second person endings.

Because the forms of be are so phonologically disparate as to make placing them in a paradigm with other verbs difficult, a complete set of forms as they appear in the corpus is given below (2.4).

---

34The strong verbs in Elyot's day were remarkably like ModE. There are two places where orthography may reflect points of historical and dialectal interest. The past tenses of drive and write are consistently spelled with an a (I wrote, he drove) and the verb choose is spelled chese in the infinitive form and chase in the past.
Mode

2.33 The traditional property of mode, that is, the three categories of indicative, imperative, and subjunctive, has leveled in Elyot's language to the point that preservation of mode in the traditional sense serves no practical purpose. There are, however, certain predictable contrasts of forms which are easily describable in terms of indicative and nonindicative. The traditional imperative is the verb head of an independent syntactic clause having the unmarked infinitive form and, usually, no subject.35 The traditional subjunctive, which George O. Curme defines as being related to "conception" rather than to "reality," may be easily illustrated from the corpus, but formulation of a statement of conditions of occurrence is extremely difficult. One can predict a specified form after if, except (used conjunctively), and such verbs as pray, but in other places variation defies classification. For example,

(Biiiib) They which be simple, be in symple qualities, as in heate, colde, moyste, or dry. They which be compound, are in compounde or myxte qualities . . . .

The initial be in both sentences might be expected as subjunctive based upon potentiality; that is, 'if they be simple'. It is the second be in the first sentence that obscures the usage. Thus, while throughout the

35The decision to use the terms indicative and nonindicative rests upon the fact that the traditional imperative and present subjunctive have homophonous allomorphs; yet there is complementary distribution in that the imperative either lacks a subject or, if one occurs, the prescribed word order is verb-subject-complement (Be you angry [64b]).

George O. Curme states the difference between indicative and subjunctive as lying between "reality" and "conception." It is interesting that he does not question the validity of the tripartite classification of "mood" even though he sees that the "imperative . . . does not lose its old indicative character" (Syntax [Boston, 1931], p. 390). Placing the imperative with the subjunctive in a new class continues to obscure the "reality" of the imperative. The advantages are the reduction of the number of classes (which are, at best, based on nebulous semantic definition) and redefinition in terms of observable facts.
corpus certain forms occur unambiguously as subjunctive, they often do not consistently do so, the same allomorphs being found in structures that must be classified as indicative; that is, they occur in independent syntactic clauses other than the one specified as nonindicative or otherwise do not conform to the definition of nonindicative mode. Elsewhere, the statistical probability of the occurrence of a subjunctive may be quite high (for example, after all though), but an occasional indicative form will follow. A complete description, then, can best be given by incorporating all allomorphs within one two-tense paradigm, specifying the nonindicative forms as determined by lack of second person subject (or inversion if subject occurs) in an independent syntactic clause or by the dependent clause being introduced by the forms if, except, pray (hereafter to be subsumed under the invariable if), and allowing them to appear in free variation with other forms elsewhere.

2.4 The verb paradigm for weak verbs is as follows:

Non-past

I, we, they, ye ---Ø

thou, he, she, it ---Ø -----(in nonindicative environment)

thou --------------------- (e)st

he, she, it, they ----------- (e)th

Past36

I, he, she, it, we, they ------- (e)d

thou ------------------------ (e)dst

36 The corpus did not yield a second person plural past form.
Examples of contrastive strong verb forms may be seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-past</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I take</td>
<td>I toke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wryte</td>
<td>I wrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he gyueth</td>
<td>he gaue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he speaketh</td>
<td>he spake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they come</td>
<td>they came</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paradigm for the verb be is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-past</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am, be</td>
<td>I was, were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou arte</td>
<td>he was, were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is, be</td>
<td>they were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we, ye/you be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are, be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be ---------------------</td>
<td>were -- required in all nonindicative environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjunctivals**

2.5 A linguistic form which is found to occur in any two of its three paradigmatic forms is to be called an *adjunctival*. Adjunctivals differ from the preceding word classes in that there is a common paradigm shared by two large and important syntactic word classes: those which are attributive to verb(al) or adjectival and those which are attributive to a noun (or nominal).\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{37}\) The question arises as to whether reference may be made to a syntactic position that has not yet been established, in this case *adjectival*. The analysis of the language under study has not, however, proceeded logically from one point to another in the order of presentation. As has been pointed out (Chap. II, n. 7), one must constantly have access to all other levels during any one part of the analysis. The term *adjectival* points toward the next step in the analysis of adjunctivals since it becomes quite clear that there is one inflectional pattern, but there is a clearcut dichotomy of positional occurrences on the syntactical level. Thus, even before defining the two, it becomes necessary to make reference to *adjectival* and *adverbial*, two major word classes that are morphologically similar but syntactically quite different.
Adjunctivals are characterized by the following inflectional paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive degree</th>
<th>Comparative degree</th>
<th>Superlative degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>-(e),(a)r</td>
<td>-(e)st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of adjunctivals are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive degree</th>
<th>Comparative degree</th>
<th>Superlative degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>colder</td>
<td>coldest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>deper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drye</td>
<td>drier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fyne</td>
<td>greater</td>
<td>fynest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>hotter</td>
<td>grettest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot</td>
<td>lyghter</td>
<td>hottest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyght</td>
<td>lyghtlyer(^{38})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sone</td>
<td>sooner</td>
<td>soonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweete</td>
<td>sweeter</td>
<td>swetest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thin</td>
<td>thinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thyck</td>
<td></td>
<td>thyckest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yonge</td>
<td></td>
<td>yongest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a large group of adjunctivals various irregularities occur. In some, suppletion is evident. In others, root allomorphs vary so much that a simple listing is more economical than a description of graphemic changes would be. A sampling of these forms follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive degree</th>
<th>Comparative degree</th>
<th>Superlative degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good/well</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>later</td>
<td>last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyttell</td>
<td>lasse</td>
<td>leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moch</td>
<td>more/mo</td>
<td>moste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nygh</td>
<td></td>
<td>neste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yll</td>
<td>wars</td>
<td>warste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{38}\)There was only one instance in the text of the inflection being added to the derivational -ly.
3.1 In Chapter II there were found to be four sets of morphological word classes: nouns, pronouns, verbs, and adjunctivals. The last group represented two large subclasses which, because they shared one inflectional paradigm, could not be differentiated on that level. Nouns were found in ten nominal positions. In addition, nouns occurred in an eleventh position which was declared adverbial. It follows, by definition, that only nouns (as opposed to nominals) can occur in the position since any other noun-like word, phrase, or clause becomes adverbial by virtue of its occurrence; that is, a morphological noun functions in a syntactical adverbial position (See 3.61a and 3.62f).

Personal pronouns were found to substitute for nouns, nominals, or nominal phrases or clauses in five positions, relative pronouns in four, and demonstrative pronouns in five.

Such a classification appears to be in violation of the analytical theory, but it may be seen that the position was based upon the word class of adjunctival; hence, the position was morphologically determined though a more rigorous division into adjectival and adverbial is necessary on the syntactical level.

It is interesting to note that the traditional term adverbial noun indicates both syntactical position and morphological form, the form appearing to have a degree of priority in serving as the head of the term.
Up to this point no statement has been made concerning the syntactical position of the finite verb, which can only be established in relation to other word classes. This relationship can best be shown by pronouns, since they show case distinctions not revealed by the common case of nouns. In the order of subject-predicate (commonly accepted as "normal" order), verbs follow a nominative or genitive pronoun form. These verbs are called finite. The pronoun form that occurs after the verb shows greater variety; it may be of any case. There may be members of other word classes after the verb or there may be a null. Verbs may be classed into subsets which predict to some extent the forms that will follow. Such prediction is not absolute because some verbs may be members of more than one subset. A large number of verbs, however, lack the privilege of occurring in more than one subset. On the basis of the restriction of the latter group, the subsets themselves may be declared to be mutually exclusive.

2The statement is true of any syntactic position, of course, but the verb seems to function in a special way in that the forms that may substitute for the morphological class contain one linguistic form whose root may also bear an overt non-past or past inflection, but not when it is functioning as a verbal (e.g., hath), and whose other forms function in highly specialized ways. Furthermore, one or more of these forms bear inflections or markers applicable only at the syntactic level (e.g., -ing and to).

3The term null is used here to mean a syntactic element corresponding to a zero morph: that is, the absence of an element contrasting with the presence of one. It is not to be confused with a null unit or null identity element which "functions in the mathematical system underlying the representation of a grammatical theory in generative transformational grammar as does zero in ordinary addition ..." (Emmon Bach, An Introduction to Transformational Grammars [New York, 1964], pp. 14-5).

4It would be possible to resolve the problem more rigorously by declaring the troublesome verbs to be different, but homophones, forms. Intuitively one rejects the hypothesis that grow is four different verbs in 'The corn grows', 'The corn grows tall', 'The corn grows fast', and 'The farmer grows the corn'. Rather, one sees that these are distributional differences in which the verb has certain stable relationships to the complement, one of which may be null (Compare the discussion by Nida, Morphology, pp. 55-7).
In the examination of verbs, only inflectional forms as they relate to subject pronouns were noted. There are, however, three other verb forms whose functions and relationships to subjects, if they have any, are of syntactical interest only, since they occur both periphrastically and in nonverbal positions; thus they will be treated below. These forms are nonfinite.

An examination of the text being analyzed shows that all morphologically defined positions except one are often filled by uninflected morphemic words and by morphemic phrases and clauses rather than by words having the paradigmatic suffixes as shown in Chapter II. These forms belong to the same positions already established, the difference being one of level. They have been given the related names of nominals, pronominals, verbals, adjectivals, and adverbials. Two other sets previously unexamined because they lack inflection, are called conjunctival and prepositional. The membership of these last two sets is small enough to list. Such is not the case of the other classes, where it is the free substitutability of forms—whether morphemic words, phrases, or clauses—that lend flexibility to and underscore the system of Elyot's language.

Nominals

3.2 Morphemic words, phrases, and clauses which fill positions classified as noun on the morphological level are exemplified below.

1. Subject

Morphemic word as noun head (See Chap. II, n. 16)

(24a) For as moche as before that ryllage of corne was inuented . . .
Morphemic phrase

(Biiib) Of them be foure, that is to say, erthe, water, ayre, and fyre. 5

Morphemic clause

(16b) And here it wolde be remembred, that the cholerycke stomake doth not desyre soo moche as he maye dygest . . . . 6

2. Subjective complement

Morphemic word as noun head

(28b) Colew ortes . . . were of suche estimation that they were judged to be a sufficient medicine agaynste all diseases . . . .

Morphemic phrase

(34a) The moste excellent milke is of a woman. 7

Morphemic clause (nonfinite)

(17a) . . . wyne is a reioycinge to the soule and bodye . . . .

(31a) The general propertie of all kyndes of pepper is to heate the body . . . .

5Analysis of this sentence is most difficult. Them stands for elements, and if one wished to interpret natural order as foure of them be, he would be resolving the problem of the prepositional phrase by assuming facts not observable in Elyot's language. A prepositional phrase in which the object of the preposition carries the semantic load of the subject is, if not common, certainly not rare in Elyot's language. In addition, numerals commonly occur in subjective complement position after be. Compare "Ages be foure" (13b).

6It is here interpreted as an expletive in which the impersonal it fills the subject position while the logical subject comes after the verb. The usage is common after verbs of saying, noting, remembering, etc. in the passive voice.

7Double possessive noun forms in the text cannot be conclusively proved (See 2.1). At best, they are rare. Nevertheless, this sentence may be paraphrased 'The moste excellent milke is woman's milke'. Thus of a woman is construed as nominal. However, it must be conceded that there are equally cogent arguments for calling the form adjectival. If one leans toward the latter interpretation, it must be pointed out that Elyot commonly uses of where ModE would prefer from; thus still another possibility of adverbial (locative) is presented. The first suggestion seems more in keeping with usage within the total corpus.
Morphemic clause (finite)
(27b) To this fruitleyke as to figges, this propertye remayneth, that being dryd they doo proffite.

3. Direct object
Morphemic word as noun head
(25a) Also they abate carnall lust.
Morphemic clause (nonfinite)
(18b) Meates sweete chauffeth the bloudde, and causeth opilations or stoppynges of the pores and cundytes of the body.

(28b) Before that auarice caused marchauntes to fetche out of the easte and southe partes of the world, the traffyke of spuye and sundry drogges. . . .

Morphemic clause (finite)
(47b) Galen sayeth that the tyme most conuenient for exercise is complete, as wel in the stomake, as in the vaines, and that the tyme approcheth to eate eftsomes.

4. Object of preposition
Morphemic word as noun head
(65b) Consyder, that the corruption of mans nature is not so much declared in any thing, as in ingratitude, whereby . . . .

Morphemic clause
(21a) Black byrdes or ousyls, among the wylde fowle hath the chiefe prayse, for lyghtnesse of digestion, and that they make good nouryshment, and lyttell ordure.9

5. Attribute to noun
Morphemic word (preposed)
(35a) . . . consyderinge that barleye corne . . . is commended . . . .

---

8 Some analysts may prefer to consider marchauntes a direct object having the infinitive phrase as its objective complement.

9 This sentence illustrates a characteristic quite common in Elyot's work. It is easily seen that both lyghtnesse of digestion and the clause serve as compound objects of the preposition for. Both function nominally, but are structured differently, one being a phrase and one a clause.
Morphemic word (postposed)

(Aib) The Castel of Helth corrected and in some places augmented, by the fyrste author therof, syr Thomas Elyot knyght.

Morphemic phrase (postposed)

(Aiib) And I truste in almighty god that our soueraygne lord the kinges majesty.

Pronominals

3.3 The number of pronouns was found to be small. The pronominal position may be said to be coterminous with nominal positions. The justification for two parts of speech, noun and prounoun, rests with the fact that the pronoun substitutes for the entire noun phrase, that is, for the noun or nominal plus all its modifiers, rather than for the noun alone.

There are also noninflected linguistic forms in the text which substitute for the entire noun phrase. They are given in subsets since each group has some distinctive characteristic.

Compound personal pronouns

3.31 The first subset consists of morphemic phrases composed of a personal pronoun and self(e)(g). They will be called compound personal pronominals. There are two uses of the phrases, but they occupy distinctive positions and therefore are not ambiguous. One, the intensifier,

---

10 Given a larger corpus or one with a different subject content, one would expect to find knyght in an inflected form, thereby making it noun. It does not occur in the text analyzed, however, and thus qualifies as nominal.

It is probably not incidental to the type of corpus that nominal (as opposed to noun) attributes are difficult to find. This position is commonly filled by a genitive form (which automatically fulfills requirements for noun) or by compounds where the second element is the head, as in barley corne, rose water, etc. Furthermore, many postposed forms belong either to categories of proper nouns or to inflective titles such as king, phisition, etc.
immediately follows the nominative form of the personal pronoun with which it agrees in person, number, and gender.\(^{11}\)

(55a) And I my selfe haue knowen men, whiche dayly usinge it, haue brought . . . .

(63b) . . . and God, who (as he hym selfe sayd, mought haue had . . . .

The reflexive phrase is found in the predicate as direct object or object of preposition and exhibits agreement in person, number, and gender with its antecedent. Since nouns may have pronoun substitutes only in the third person, it follows that the reflexive pronominal occurs after nouns in that person only and exhibits agreement in gender in the singular. It may, however, occur after pronouns of all persons.

(65a) . . . sorowe hath kylled many, and in it self is found no commoditie.

(63b) If the other be pacient, than let hym abhorre that thynge in hym selfe, the lack whereof . . . . The pronominal phrase is not obligatory. The simple personal pronoun occurs under similar circumstances.

(83b) . . . Galen ought to be radde, before that one do take upon hym the generall cure of mennes bodies . . . .

(66a) . . . but thinke that thou arte delyuered from a monster of nature, that devoured thy loue and that thou art now at libertie, and hast won experience to chese the a better.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Gender was seen to be applicable only in the third person singular (2.21).

\(^{12}\) Although the reflexive form is not obligatory, it must be noted that there is more involved than simply choosing to add or not to add -self(e)(g) to the personal pronoun. The possessive forms of first and second person are used in the pronominal phrase, but case requirements of the personal pronoun obtain as may be seen by the use of the in 66a. The contrast suggests that the phrase was thought of as a single linguistic unit even though the spelling indicated a looser tie.
The complete paradigm as found in the text is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>myself</td>
<td>them selves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>thy selfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person</td>
<td>hym selfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it selfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative pronoun

3.32 The second subset consists of uninflected words which may be used in the same positions as the relative pronoun who except that they lack the ability to show genitival relationships. The pronominals are that, as, whense and which, and they introduce finite clauses which are adjuncts to nouns or nominals, thus adjectival (See 3.54). They follow indifferently animate or inanimate nouns or nominals. Which has the peculiarity of being preceded occasionally by the.

(41b) And here I wyl not recyte the sentences of authors, whych had neuer experience of Englysshe mens natures . . . .

(55a) . . . if it be not greuous to hym, whych is diseased.

There was one particularly interesting example in which the substitution of whiche occurred in a noun phrase as a preposed attribute to the noun head:

(13b) Adolescency to xxv yeres, hotte and moyst, in the whiche tyme the body groweth . . . .

Since the position as preposed attribute to noun has been established as nominal, which is analyzed as a pronominal substituting for the noun phrase xxv yeres.

The relative pronominal does not always immediately follow its antecedent:

(55b) . . . but to inforce one to vomyte which can not, is very odious, and to be abhorred.
Examples of other relative pronouns follow:

(53b) . . . out of the meate that is altered and concocte or boyled in the stomake . . . .

(20b) . . . there be not in all the worlde so many as be in Englande, where they . . . .

There was a single occurrence of *whense* as a relative pronoun:

(88a) . . . the myddel region, from *whense* the lowest ended, unto the cercle.

3.32a A small sub-subset of pronouns has the relative characteristic of functioning within the clause, but differs from the group above in certain ways. *What* functions within a clause that fills a nominal position.

(39a) . . . their nourices shal perceyue *what* digesteth wel, and *what* doth the contrary.

Phrases may occur in this group. There was only one example of *who soo euer* functioning in this capacity:

(34a) *Who soo euer* hath an appetite to eate or drynke mylke . . . let hym put in to a vessell . . . .

The clause appears to be pleonastic and may be understood as an appositive to *hym*. However, one does not expect to find an appositive except in the N+1 position (See 3.53). Another possibility is to view the clause as a nominative of address, a decision that would result in misreading if it were taken to be related to the nonindicative *let*. The clause is therefore declared an appositive, but an environmental restriction must be added to the description of the ordering of adjectivals\(^\text{13}\) that an appositive introduced by *who soo euer* and *what so euer* may occur first.

\(^{13}\)The discussion of adjectivals contains some statements about the ordering of nominals as well.
A similar construction occurs with what so euer.

(55a) . . . men . . . haue brought therby their stomakes in to suche custom, that what so euer they dyd eate, they coude not longe retaine it . . . .

There are a few phrases in this group which may be characterized by their composition. They may be described as a reversal of prepositional and object, the latter invariably consisting of the bound form wher-. The prepositional may be considered a discontinuous morpheme, since it is usually a part of a combination of verb and prepositional (See 3.73):

(39a) . . . let them eate the meates, wherunto they be most used . . . .

Indefinite pronominals

3.33 A third major group of morphemic words may be thought of as belonging to the inflectional demonstrative. Traditionally these words have been called indefinite; however, the term places emphasis upon a semantic fact of little concern to the analysis.

The following subset, like the inflectional demonstratives, has full privilege of both nominal and adjectival occurrence: any, euery, other, some, and such.¹⁴

In addition, both, eche, many, same (preceded by the), and so are placed in the same set because they function similarly except that their usage is restricted to the nominal position. The morphological adjunctivals lytell and moche (the comparative more is the form cited) occur freely in the same position:

---

¹⁴It should perhaps be pointed out that one, traditionally an indefinite pronoun, bears the possessive inflection in Elyot's language and thus by definition is a noun in spite of the fact that it has the pronominal semantic characteristic of a substitute. Like a noun, also, it is preceded by the. On the other hand, other, which like one is a substitute and may be preceded by the is listed below as a pronominal because it lacks inflection (the determining characteristic) and it shares the pronominal characteristic of substitutability.
(34a) More of the qualities of wine, shall be touched hereafter in the order of diete.

3.33a The pronominal forms did not always occur in subject position, of course; consequently, the attention to agreement of subject and verb did not yield results permitting full statement. Singular verb forms were used with eche, so, such, and other; plural forms were found with same, and other evidence pointed to other as being either singular or plural.

(53b) These excrementes be none other, but matter superfluous and unsauery . . . . (singular)

(29a) I, amonge divers other . . . . (plural)

Other examples of pronominal usages follow:

(70a) . . . wherein eche of them is in his most power . . . .

(69b) . . . by any of the sayd things callid not natural, every of them do semblably augment the complexion.¹⁵

(Aiiia) . . . the castell, which . . . in amendynge or repayrynge the same . . . .

(Aiiia) Truly if they wil calle him a phisition which is studiouse about the weale of his countray, I witsaufe they so name me, for . . . .

3.33b In the study of pronominal morphemic phrases, the problem was augmented by indiscriminate orthographical practices as well as by the force of traditional acceptance of such compounds as nothing, something, and so forth, as pronouns. In the language under study one, body, and thing are all nouns. It follows that a morphemic phrase compounded of one of these nouns and a member of the pronominal subset of demonstratives will fill a nominal position. Any terminological decision must therefore be arbitrary. In this analysis the forms are considered

¹⁵The evidence of plurality here is not conclusive, since do is found to be an allomorph of doth in a very few instances (See n. 32 below).
nominal morphemic phrases, rather than pronominal, on the basis of the prevailing orthographical practices and of the common occurrence of forms such as some thinge and some thinges.

(Aiiib) I . . . found here and there some thinge that I lacked . . . .

(Aiiiib) And yet perchaunce some thinges mought happen to escape . . . .

Only one phrase employs a distinctive pronominal form (that is, no adjectival uses occurred) as its second element: eueryche.

(65b) . . . for eueryche of theym may ease hym . . . .

One phrase commonly found as adverbial modifier occurs as a pronominal (See 3.61b).

(57a) . . . and afterwarde is mixte with the iuyce, wherof the substance of the body is made, and expellynge the adversary humours, somewhat therof doultesse remayneth in the body.

Verbals

3.4 On the morphological level verbs were found to consist of two tenses, the past and non-past, and two modes, the indicative and non-indicative. Verbals are found to be much more complex than verbs, but in no other word class is there such complete accord between the forms that occur on the morphological level and those that may substitute on the syntactic level. Consequently, there are no problems of the sort that had to be resolved between the pronominal and adjectival subsets,
since at least one form in the morphemic verbal word or phrase bears an overt inflection or a marker (which may in certain environments be zero). Traditional grammars have made little mention of basic differences between verb(al)s and other word classes, and they have been insufficiently stressed in more recent linguistic works. However, L. M. Myers pointed out "a rather close connection between form and function" of verbs. He failed to develop the idea further by calling attention to the fact that the "connection" is the only place where the terminology of form and function have been the same traditionally, thus obscuring a dichotomy of level. In his analysis based on function, Ralph B. Long attempted to separate form and function at the level of verb structure by using the terms verb and predicator respectively.

3.41 The discussion above concerns finite forms, but in a more involved way the same facts apply to nonfinite forms which govern predication in the same way that finite verbs do. Nonfinite syntactic clauses parallel finite syntactic clauses in their privilege of occurrence in large constructions. However, within the nonfinite syntactic

---

19 For example, the problem of a "shift" (See Pence and Emery, pp. 134-7 for traditional treatment of the subject) could not occur in the present analysis because any "shift" to verb or verbal would carry exactly the same inflections, markers, and word order as words normally accepted as verbs. Any shift takes place only at the point of the variable, the root morpheme of the notional form, and is of no grammatical consequence. This fact, added to those cited above, probably accounts for the intuitive feeling that the verb is, in some way not clearly describable, the matrix of the sentence.


22 There is a minor restriction concerning gerunds where either the subject or direct object, whichever is expressed, follows the verbal form and is preceded by of; cf. swellynge of the splene (32b) with drinkinge of wyne (32b).
clause itself, the analyst is concerned mainly with predication, while the entire subject-verb relationship in the analysis of a finite syntactic clause is the same for both independent and dependent clauses. Stated in another way, the analysis of a dependent finite syntactic clause parallels exactly the analysis of a complete utterance, whereas the analysis of a nonfinite syntactic clause is concerned mainly with predication, and where subjects do occur, the analyst's produces results different from those of finite clauses.

Nowhere else is the intricacy of levels of structure so evident in the language and nowhere else is the fact that one does not always move steadily up some hierarchial system so apparent as in nonfinite clause constructions where the verbal undergoes the same type of complementation as a finite verb or verbal and then the full construction is permitted to enter the sentence at the level of position as established morphologically.23

3.41a The entire inventory of verbal morphemes consists of the base form24 of the notional verb; the non-past morpheme of the second and third persons; the past tense morpheme; the past participial morpheme; the present participial morpheme; and the particle to (hereafter called the marker when it is used in a morphemic verbal phrase). When one of the above forms is used in combination with be or haue and the last form

23It should be noted that a gerund, for example, does not fill a noun phrase position (that is, nominal plus adjuncts), but only the morphological noun position, as is evident from the fact that it is often preceded by a determiner or adjectival.

(32b) Moch drinkinge of wyne is yll.

24The base form, that is, the name by which the verb is called, is taken to be the form of any verb found in the second person, non-past tense, nonindicative mode. Preceded by the marker to (which has a zero allomorph), the phrase serves as the simple infinitive form.
of the morphemic phrase has another base form as its root morpheme, be or/and have are considered as auxiliaries. Also classified as auxiliary is a small subset consisting of seven members, five of which may combine with the past tense morpheme. Members of this last subset are called modal auxiliaries.

It was noted in Chapter II that only three of the properties assigned to English verbs by Trager and Smith pertained to the inflected morphemic words. They were person, tense, and mode. These same three properties also function on the level of morphemic verbal phrases along with two additional properties: phase and voice.25

**Person and tense**

3.42 Person and tense bear the same kind of relationship on the morphemic phrase level as they showed on the morphemic word level except in combination with modals, where third person singular distinctions do not occur.26 Elsewhere, person-tense forms follow the paradigms listed under "Verbs" (2.33). In a phrase, however, where more than one base form occurs, agreement is shown with the first one, the auxiliary, rather than with the final, or notional base form.

Although it must be noted that any subject of an infinitive must be an objective pronoun or common noun form, there is no further relationship between person and tense that is relevant to nonfinite forms.

---

25 Aspect and status, additional properties proposed by Trager and Smith, were found to be of no relevance to the present analysis (See 2.3).

26 A cogent argument for classifying can, will, may, etc. as verb forms with past tense characteristics is that they have the dental suffix of a past tense and also the second person of both tenses has the distinctive -st form of all other verbs. Not all forms occurred, but contrasts like can/canst, coude/couldest make a strong case for verb paradigm. Only do, which in this analysis is listed as a subset of the modal forms, has both second and third person distinctions, but it has an allomorph do along with the more common doth in the third person singular number.
Phase

3.43 Phase is a property of verbs that characterizes a perfect (complete) or resultative state. The forms may be of two types: those verbal phrases using the non-past or past of *haue* and those using the non-past or past of *be*. In both cases the notional verb is the past participial form. The construction may be described as *haue* (either non-past or past) or *be* (either non-past or past) plus the base form plus the past participial morpheme. By far the largest number of verbs combine with *haue*, yielding the perfect phase. A few verbs such as *become*, *go*, and *come* combine with *be*, yielding the resultative phase. Nonfinite constructions occur in the infinitive form with *haue*: to *haue defended* (63b).

Modals

3.44 One set of verbal constructions consisting of morphemic phrases relate rather closely to one of the properties of verbs: mode.

---

27 Francis, who develops the Trager and Smith analysis of verbs, makes no attempt at a definition of phase. He simply states that "all English verbs except a few auxiliaries have two phases, the simple and the perfect." He states further that a few intransitive verbs have a resultative phase and adds that "verbs not formally marked as in the perfect or resultative phase are in the simple phase." This statement is particularly unsatisfactory in view of his following discussion of aspect, where he again ascribes the term simple to an unmarked form (p. 333). It is a generally accepted theory that the only justification for a zero element is to point up an absence of a linguistic form that exists overtly elsewhere (H. A. Gleason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* [New York, 1961], pp. 75-6). It seems a misapplication to posit phase (or aspect) as relevant to single morphemic words by the absence of a form, since nowhere has it been shown by the presence of a form on that level that it has meaning or function.

28 For nonfinite constructions with *be*, see 3.45. Both *be* and *haue* occur as the notional verb in a verbal phrase as well as in auxiliary positions.
Mode was found to be either indicative or nonindicative (2.33). Verbals do not have inflectional characteristics of mode as verbs do; but there is a small set of six verbs which exhibit mode-like qualities and which serve as auxiliaries to form verbals which may be termed modal constructions. The six verbs called modal auxiliaries are can, may, shall, will, must, and ought. Can, may, shall, and will inflect for past tense. Must and ought lack a contrastive inflection and, although they belong historically to the preterite tense, there is no justification for ascribing tense to these forms; they are consequently listed with non-past forms. Ought has the further restriction of being followed by the marked infinitive form. The construction may be described as a modal (either non-past or past [if it has a past]) plus a base form of a verb.

Modals occasionally occur alone.

(42b) ... and so to slepe long and sundly, if he can.

Unlike do, be, and have, these six forms are restricted to auxiliary function. Will occurs as a main verb, but it is here analyzed as a separate homophonous form.

(33b) Moreover he wolle that yonge men shulde drynke lyttell wine...

Even though the construction is a single morphemic word, the form is nevertheless considered a verbal since the base form is taken as a zero morpheme in these situations. The environment in which the zero morph occurs may be specified as that following a modal auxiliary preceded (not necessarily immediately) by a root morpheme which is taken to be semantically identical to one which could (but does not) occur after the modal auxiliary.
Elyot uses the following modal auxiliaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-past</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>can/canst</td>
<td>coude/coudest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maye/mayst</td>
<td>moughte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shall</td>
<td>shulde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will/wylte</td>
<td>wolde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A subset composed of a single member, the auxiliary do, may be placed with the modal auxiliaries. Like be and have, it also functions as a full verb. It has three non-past forms: do, dost, doth. The past tense forms are dyd/dydst. Do occurs anaphorically; that is, it functions as a substitute for the base form of a verb.

(40a) . . . for it fareth by them as it doth [fareth] by a lampe, the lyght wherof is almost extincte . . . .

Furthermore, it may occur in its anaphoric function in combination with another modal auxiliary.

(42a) . . . for it interrupteth the offyce of the stomake in concoction, and causeth the meate to passe faster than it shuld do [passe] . . . .

Other uses are more difficult to describe. Do often occurs with not in a negative construction as in doth not anov (36b), but its presence is not obligatory, as may be seen in it cesse not (66b). Elyot seems to have a preference for verbals over verbs, especially if there is an adverbial modifier, but the usage is too inconsistent to state other than as probability of occurrence. For example,

---

31 The second form occurs with the second person singular subject. It may be seen then that, like main verbs, the modals inflect for second person, singular number, but unlike them, they do not inflect for third person singular number.

32 Dost is a second singular form and do/doth are allomorphs of both the third singular and plural, though the statistical probability points to the occurrence of doth as singular and do as plural. Do occurs elsewhere.
(47a) ... Cornelius Celsus, saying, that sluggyshenes dulleth the body, labour doth strength it.

(62a) ... if there doo yssue moche bloudde ... .

(66b) ... thou diddest litel thynke on ... .

One of the clearest differentiations between modal phrasal structures and other verbals is the fact that, except for do, modals never occur in nonfinite constructions.

**Voice**

3.45 Voice is a property of transitive verbs whereby the use of a verbal in the passive voice permits the agent (the subject of a verb in the active voice) to occur after the verbal in an exocentric phrase as an object of the prepositional of. The passive construction may be described by the verb be (which may exhibit either characteristics of both tense and phase or characteristics of tense alone) plus the past participial form of the notional verb.33

Since the past participial form also functions adjectivally, a structural ambiguity may result. The ambiguity is automatically resolved if the agent is expressed by the preposition of and its object. For example, in the sentence

(65b) Sometyme this affecte happneth ... eyther where ... one receyueth damage, or is deceyued of hym, whom he trusted ... .

the object of the preposition is taken to be the one who does the deceiving. It is more difficult to determine whether the past participle serves as a part of a passive construction or as a subjective complement in such constructions as

(Biiia) It is to be remembred, that none of the sayd elementes ... .

---

33 When mode and voice combine, the modal rule takes precedence over voice; that is, the presence of a modal form requires the be morpheme of the passive construction to be the base form. For all possible types of combinations, see "Combinatory forms," (3.46).
The construction results in a peculiar constructional ambiguity in which one may analyze the phrase as copulative verb plus passive infinitive or as idiom composed of copulative verb plus copulative infinitive, this construction then having a past participle as a subjective complement. Both analyses yield similar final results; however, the placement of the negative in *are not to be eaten* (44b) suggests that the former may be more in accord with the language than the latter. The decision to call *to be remembered* a passive infinitive is further strengthened by the occurrence of *remember* in the active voice.

(40a) . . . alway *remember* that aged men shuld eate often . . .

**Combinations of verbal properties**

3.46 Finally, it is necessary to re-examine all the foregoing verbal properties to note the various combinations that may occur. All verbs must be considered as having person and tense. They may in addition have mode. 34 In periphrastic constructions finite verbal constructions have person, tense and mode; they may also have phase and voice. Possible combinations are illustrated below:

---

34In one sense mode and voice belong to all verb forms. Concerning mode, for example, the classification indicative and nonindicative implies an either-or situation. Voice differs slightly in that most grammars assign it only to transitive verbs, a sound linguistic practice since only in the set of verbs called transitive is there a contrastive form. Pence and Emery go so far as to use transitive classification only for verbs in the active voice (p. 42), a procedure which obscures the relationship that clearly exists between verb(al)s in the active voice and verbals in the passive. However, in analyzing the morphemic verbal phrase, interest is centered on the kinds of combinatory forms and the inflections each of these may take. Thus, more information seems to be given if indicative mode and active voice are taken as inherent in all verbs and attention is given to these properties only when they exhibit formal evidence of departure from their norms: that is, nonindicative mode and passive voice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ps</th>
<th>Ts</th>
<th>NIMd</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>PVc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(67a) we made
(89b) (if) it be
(67a) I haue hadde
(37a) it is made
(63b) (if) he wolde haue asked
(94b) it hath ben sene
(16b) it wolde be remembred

Nonfinite forms exhibit fewer privileges of combination than finite forms. The past participle is used in finite forms for passive voice and perfect phase. There is consequently a structural meaning which seems to imply both passivity and completion that obtains even when the auxiliary is not present, as is the case in some nonfinite constructions.

(28a) The sedes therof braied and drunke with wine and water . . . .
(28b) The iuyce . . . being moche eaten . . . .

The gerund, of course, shows no formal morphological difference from the present participle. The difference is functional, and there is consequently justification for using the separate traditional terms so long as it is kept in mind that the term verbal is itself a syntactic rather than a morphological classification.

The most striking difference between finite and nonfinite constructions is the fact that person has no relevance to nonfinite forms. Only infinitive forms may be said to take subjects, but there are no distributional differences shown in the verbal in relation to the subject.

35Abbreviations for person, tense, nonindicative mode, phase, and passive voice, respectively.
The properties which may be combined to form nonfinite morphemic phrases are illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ts</th>
<th>NIMd</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>PVc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(34a) makyng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30b) taken36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30b) beinge chewed37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(32b) drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(32b) to drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31b) to be drunke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(63b) to haue defended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjectivals**

3.5 In Chapter II it was found that morphological demands of the analytical method resulted in the positing of a single large word class characterized by the overt inflections -or and -est. Traditionally

36Since *taken* is the form used with *have* to show phase or *be* to show voice, there may be some question as to the classification. Generative transformational grammar offers a solution to the problem which cannot be formally demonstrated in phrase structure grammars (though the principle has long been recognized in traditional grammar). If the form is hypothetically classified as passive, it can easily be shown that the noun or nominal to which it is an adjunct is actually an object of the verbal in its active voice. In the sentence

(30b) . . . it helpeth the cough taken with pepper and hone.

where it [*rosemary*] is the thing "taken," the active construction is 'Somebody taketh it with pepper and hone. It helpeth the cough' (See Chap. II, n. 10). By the passive transformation the sentence becomes 'It is taken with pepper and hone (of somebody)'. After the deletion of the subject and auxiliary, the construction is embedded at the end of the matrix sentence.

The property of phase offers no such satisfactory possibilities for depicting formal relationships between its form and the past participle. One concludes that the past participle alone or preceded by a nonfinite auxiliary shows the property of voice but not of phase.

37*Be* occurs in the indicative as well as the nonindicative, but by definition the base form to which the -ing is added is nonindicative (See n. 24). There is, furthermore, an interesting ambiguity in that a satisfactory paraphrase could be made involving either mode or phase: if the roote be chewed or when it hath ben chewed. It must be admitted, nevertheless, that both paraphrases could be the result of imposing ModE interpretation on EModE structure.
the inflectional forms have been called degrees: positive (which is represented by a zero morph), comparative, and superlative. The word class was called adjunctival because its members were found to adjoin and to modify, limit, or restrict members of other word classes, particularly nouns and verbs. The cleavage was strong enough to suggest a separation into two subsets, which are traditionally called adjectives and adverbs, but which here are given the -al suffix since the division into two subsets is necessitated by syntactic considerations rather than morphological ones.

Adjectivals in all degrees are adjunct to nominals (which in this discussion is extended to include any form found in nominal position, whether noun, pronoun, or nominal as defined in Chapter III) in rather restricted fashion. They function as complements after linking verbs, and they either precede or follow nominals, the former position being more common with a single form:

Following linking verbs

(22b) . . . it is yll for the stomake.
(21b) Ducke is hoter than goose . . . .
(34a) The mylke of a cow is thyickest . . . .

Preceding nouns

(18a) Contrary wyse, colde water . . . . be holsom to cholerike bodyes . . . .
(19b) Barley breadde . . . . maketh colder iuyce in the body.
(19b) For it maketh beste iuyce . . . .

38 For rigorous analysis care was taken with this group to assure morphologically defined adjuncts preceding morphologically defined nouns.

39 The pagination on this and the following example is unclear. Both are from folio Filiib.
If the adjectivals are compounded, they commonly follow the noun.

(9a) Natural fleume is a humour cold and moyst . . .

However, one adjectival may precede and one follow.

(22b) . . . but rawe iuyce and colde . . . .

Adjectivals follow personal pronouns only when they function as objective complements:

(34a) And so drynke it warme from the udder . . . .

3.51 Since there are relatively few inflected adjectivals, a large number of morphemic words may be expected to substitute in the positions noted above. Often several occur together, and it can be seen that there is an ordering of the forms that do occur. In the discussion of nominals, it was shown that the head nominal could be preceded by one or more other nominals. These forms were not treated as shifts, but rather it was emphasized that nominals may precede or follow head nominals. Now it must be noted that any adjectival occurring will immediately follow any head nominal or precede any sequence of nominals except that a genitive nominal may signal the beginning of a new series, a condition which will be illustrated in the following discussion.

In their brief outline indicating the procedure for syntactic analysis, Trager and Smith did not specify a method of analysis of words within phrases (although they emphasized the importance of more detailed

---

40 Moyst did not occur with an adjunctival inflection in the text, but its use as a coordinate form with colde, which exhibits all degrees, establishes it as belonging to the same word class on the syntactic level.

41 See Chap. II, n. 14. It may be seen that no serious ambiguity results from the fact that both nominals and adjectivals may follow other nominals since forms such as Galen, the most excellent phisition has the marker the to indicate the presence of a nominal phrase, whereas no forms of the sort a humour the cold and moyst occur.
analysis in calling attention to their omission of its consideration [p. 76]. A grammar of the sort attempted here must deal with the relationships of adjectivals, and a slot-filler analysis seems most compatible with the analytical method undertaken.

3.52 The nominal position as established in Chapter II by the single morphological form is found on the syntactic level to include the form itself along with its adjuncts. These forms together comprise the syntactic morphemic nominal phrase. Examination reveals that two forms, a(n) and the, occur time and again as the first members of the phrase. Their importance is such that traditionally they have often been called a separate part of speech, the article. Here they are called determiners and notice is taken that they are not the only members which serve to introduce nominal phrases. Also functioning in this subset are the genitive forms of the personal pronouns, the demonstrative pronouns, and the morphologically unclassified adjectivals, every, some, and any.

One important exception must be made to the statement that genitive forms immediately precede nominals. In a peculiar way genitive forms govern the privilege of occurrence of all adjectivals. They are mutually exclusive with the determiner; however, there is the privilege of recurrence so that a new phrase may begin. For example, thy schole

---


43Here the double analysis is made manifest. The forms are pronouns morphologically, but they are adjectival syntactically. The importance of the -al terminology becomes obvious at this point in the analysis.

44Cf. discussion of these forms in "Pronominals" (3.33). No claim is made that the list is exhaustive.
mavsters study (66a) has an initial genitival pronoun form which may substitute for any string beginning with a determiner and ending with a genitival nominal. This entire string (here represented by a genitive pronoun) must then be thought of as occupying the determiner position and a new string may begin: in this case a common case nominal plus genitival nominal (which is morphologically a noun) plus nominal head.

3.53 Subsets which must occur in some determinate order in relation to other subsets are discovered by placing them in frames which disclose which forms are mutually exclusive as well as the sequence of the subsets. Following the usual slot-filler terminology\(^{45}\) minus numerals designate the ordering preceding the nominal and plus numerals designate positions to the right. The central position is held by the nominal (N). It seems unwise to plot the actual occurrence of every possibility lest the number of slots obscure the system rather than reveal it. For example, two positions may be recognized after the N: another nominal or an adjectival. It is unnecessary, however, to designate two slots since the two seem to be mutually exclusive in Elyot's language. Furthermore, in such a phrase as Galen, the most excellent phisition, it is unwise to place phisition in an N+4 slot, when it may simply be noted that a postposed nominal may itself have the privileges of modification of a head nominal.

On the other hand, it is advisable to posit an N-1 slot for the nominal, since the minus slots are both more varied and more complex than the plus slots. However, although two nominals sometimes occur here, only one slot is provided on the basis that the two comprise a construction: for example, scole mavsters. The N-2 slot is extremely important because it is here that most of the inflected forms occur. Also, these

\(^{45}\)Gleason, Linguistics, p. 139.
are the forms, often accompanied by the N-3 modifier, which most commonly occur after a linking verb. The N-3 slot is provided for forms which are obviously modifiers of words in N-2. The slots N-2 and N-3 form a construction. The common form found in an N-3 slot is an intensifier.\footnote{Occasionally the N-3 filler modifies in other ways, but its modification is restricted to the form in slot N-2: that is, \textit{deep red wyne}.}

The N-4 slot is the most indeterminate. Often it seems inconsequential whether a filler is placed in N-4 or N-2 slot, but the possibility of an intensifier preceding provides an arbitrary criterion; for example, \textit{dead} and \textit{sayd} in \textit{her dead husband} and \textit{the sayd herb} seem to be fillers in slot N-2. However, \textit{very} does not occur in any place in the corpus before \textit{dead} or \textit{sayd} and the two forms are placed in slot N-4. Later, the form \textit{the sayd simple qualities} is found and verifies the classification since \textit{very} could reasonably occur before \textit{simple}, though it does not. Ordinals and numerals are also placed in the N-4 slot.

The N-5 slot is filled by \textit{other}. There is some question as to whether one word can justify a separate slot, but forms like \textit{the other three humours}, \textit{other lyke motions}, and \textit{some other late writers} suggest that it occupies a distinctive position. The N-6 slot is filled by the determiners listed above (3.52). One other slot is required for a very few forms which may precede the determiner. These are predeterminers. The subset is small, consisting of \textit{all} and \textit{so necessary} (a form which looks suspiciously like an N-3 and N-2 construction; it could therefore be treated as a selectional restriction rather than a filler for the N-7 slot). The predeterminer is of interest in the restriction it places upon the form of the determiner; that is, \textit{all} is always followed by \textit{the}. Also, \textit{all} as a predeterminer does not belong to the nominal string in
the same way that the other slot fillers do, as may be seen by the fact that it is not subsumed under the nominal phrase when a pronoun substitutes:

(45b) . . . but yet where the stomacke is feeble, as is of the more parte of citeysms, and well nygh all they that be studyouse . . . .

Thus it is seen that adjectivals occupy distinctive positions when used in a series, but that they function only as adjuncts to nominals. It should further be noted that although N-2 is the most common subset of adjectivals found after a linking verb, any filler from N-5 to N-2 or any combination in sequence may occur except that N-3 never occurs alone and always occurs as part of a construction with N-2. For these and other reasons N-3 is recognized as a slot which occurs in an adjectival string, but it is not itself considered an adjectival slot and no filler in the N-3 slot is considered an adjectival. Furthermore, a filler of the N-7 slot must occur in a construction with a filler of N-6 or with a pronoun. If all occurs without a determiner, then it must be considered a filler for the N-6 slot.  

A sampling of adjectival combinations that occur in the text are shown below:

some other late writers
those original thynges vnmyxt and vucompound
deep red wyne
greene 'uncured' red wyne
the other three homours
the moste princypall writers
every princypall member
an ayry substance sybtyll
the more parte
my noble mayster

---

47 Doing so means that certain forms are found in more than one subset, a situation which should not be distressing (For instance, see Gleason, Linguistics, p. 119).
Up to this point only one type of phrase has been noted as a substitute for an adjectival, the construction described as N-3 plus N-2. The corpus reveals three others: the prepositional phrase and the nonfinite and finite syntactic clauses. All of these fill the N+1 slot. The prepositional phrase may sometimes have an inversion of the more common prepositional plus object: for example,

(37b) In this season bloudde increaseth, and towarde the ende therof, color.

The nonfinite syntactic clause which is often found as a single form in the N-4 slot, as was shown above, sometimes occurs in the N+1 slot where the expanded form is expected:

(37a) Also meates roasted, are better than . . . .

There was only one present participle following a linking verb:

(23b) Butter is also nourishynge, and profiteth . . . .

The infinitive phrase occurs most often after a linking verb:

(44a) My purpose was to write of the order of diete . . . .

Less commonly, it follows a nominal:

(31a) Cloues hath vertue to comfort the synewes . . . .

Dependent finite syntactic clauses regularly follow nominals.

They are usually introduced by a relative pronoun or pronominal.

(31a) Moreouer, we have sene men and women of great age, and stronge of body, whyche neuer or verve seldome, dranke other drynke, than pure water.48

48This sentence illustrates two points about Elyot's language worthy of mention. First, it may be seen that when two types of adjectival modification on the phrase level follow the nominal, words and phrases take precedence over clauses. Again one could posit an N+2 position, but it seems unnecessary to do so for the same reason that the slot was rejected on the word level: that is, the position is automatic. It is true that preposed positions are automatic also, but the fillers for those slots lend themselves to listing, whereas membership by phrase and clause structure is definable by structure rather than by listing of membership of each set. Second, the sentence points up a common
Occasionally the finite clause is separated from the antecedent by other elements; nevertheless, the antecedent remains clear.

(31b) Wherfore the sayeng of Pindarus the poete, was euere well allowed, which sayeth, water is beste.

Adverbials

3.6 Adjectivals were found to occur in two positions: as adjunct to a nominal in a morphemic nominal phrase and after a linking verb. The adjectival form represented by the N-2 slot was particularly important to further analysis since it was seen to be the head of a two-word construction whose first member was a modifier (the uninflected form very was chosen as a representative member of the set). Few adjunctivals had privilege of occurrence in the slot, lyttell and moche being strikingly predominant. Consequently, these two inflectional forms bear the weight of proof of a morphological position immediately preceding adjectivals in a nominal phrase. 49

Adjunct to adjectival

3.61 The construction represented by N-3 plus N-2 was next tested in the second adjectival position, that following a linking verb. The presence of the construction was easily verified and the N-3 position was consequently designated as adverbial.

occurrence of coordination based on syntax rather than morphology:  e.g., a phrase of great age conjoined with an adjectival stronge.

49Since moche and lyttell occur in both N-3 and N-2 slots, it was necessary to avoid circularity in determination of the two-word construction based on inflectional forms. Substitution of noninflected words reveal that those found in the N-3 slot differ from those in the N-2 slot. The findings further substantiate the need for two major word classes in spite of identity of paradigm. For comparison of noninflected forms, see the list below (3.61) and the adjectival list (3.54).
The set consists of moche, more, most, lyttell, lasse, lest, soone, nygh, and the following noninflected forms:\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
all & so & aptely & shortly \\
lyke & than [then] & chiefly & verily \\
ones & too & hardeely & \\
rather & very & metely & \\
right & & & \\
\end{tabular}

The question as to why only two inflected forms have privilege of occurrence in all their degrees is of consequence as well as interest. Their occurrence may be termed a "sequence signal," a designation used for the phenomenon by C. C. Fries.\textsuperscript{51} When moche and lyttell follow not so\textsuperscript{52} and as, one may expect (though not invariably) a finite syntactic dependent clause introduced by as. More and lasse occurring before an adjectival signals a construction (sometimes only a word) preceded by than. In addition, there is a small set of uninflected words which function like the ones above in that they precede adjectives and signal a construction following the adjectival (which by definition is also adverbial). So preceding an adjectival signals a finite clause introduced by that. To preceding an adjectival signals a nonfinite clause with a marked infinitive as the verbal. Only so and to are invariable: that is, the signal never occurs without the signalled construction.

The following examples illustrate the subset of adverbials which are adjunct to adjectives and which serve to signal a construction that may follow:

\textsuperscript{50}While every care was taken to get a substantial representative list, no claim is made for exhaustiveness except for inflected forms and closed lists such as the conjunctivials (3.8). To make a representative list where rigid definition fails is in line with current linguistic theory (for example, see Gleason, Linguistics, pp. 114-20).

\textsuperscript{51}However, Fries did not discuss these particular signals (The Structure of English [New York, 1952], pp. 240-55).

\textsuperscript{52}The not may occur in a position not immediately preceding so.
(20a) . . . they be **moch better than** porke . . . .

(17b) But yf the custome be *soo pernyciouse, that* hit needes muste be lefte . . . .

(14a) . . . it is *to harde and tediouse* to be understande.

(9b) . . . whose begining is *rather of the stomak, than of . . . .

In the sentence above *rather* appears to be inflected, but it is not an inflectional form by definition since it lacks a contrasting suffix. Sometimes it occurs in another subset of adverbials as an intensifier, but it may signal like *more*, as in 9b above,\(^{53}\) where it precedes a prepositional phrase functioning as an adjectival subjective complement.

As noted above, the signalled construction may not occur:

(24b) . . . they be *rather* laxative.

(21b) . . . he is the *lasse* unholsome.

### 3.61a

One other form bears special comment. An entire nominal phrase occasionally occurs before an adjectival functioning as subjective complement,\(^{54}\) but there seem to be rather severe restrictions both as to the formation of the nominal phrase, which may be symbolized by \((N-6)(N-4)N\) where \(N\) designates measurable time:

(19b) . . . before that they be *one month old* . . . .

The above example of a nominal phrase filling an adverbial position may be compared with the same type of construction occurring in a nominal phrase:

\(^{53}\)For further discussion see 3.82b. Hereafter, any statements concerning *more* may be taken to include *lasse.*

\(^{54}\)Traditional grammar reflects the recognition that a morphological noun is functioning adverbially by calling such forms as *month, yeres,* etc, adverbial nouns. The form is commonly discussed along with nouns in traditional grammars; and where discussions appear with sections on adverbs, the presentation often obscures rather than clarifies the dichotomy of form and function. (For example, see Pence and Emery, pp. 36, 106).
(81a) . . . if a boye of vii yeres age . . . haue not . . . .

3.61b Morphemic phrases other than the rather specialized one discussed above occur as substitutes\(^55\) in the morphologically established position before adjectivals. A sample listing follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oft(t) tymes</th>
<th>almoost(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>somwhat</td>
<td>sometyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alwa(y)e</td>
<td>therto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phrasal compound ther- plus preposition commonly follows rather than precedes the adjectival:

(17a) . . . which is lyke therto.

3.61c Infinitive phrases in the same position occur frequently:

(17a) . . . for asmoche as they do ingender thynn, watrye bloudde, apte to re\(c\)y\(v\)e putrvfaction . . . .

3.61d Prepositional phrases commonly follow the adjective, though short ones may precede:

(19a) Breadde is slowe of digestion . . . .

(17b) . . . they be not of substaunce commendable . . . .

Adjunct to verb or verbal phrase

3.62 After examination of modification of adjectivals was exhausted, attention was turned to verbs. Even casual inspection revealed that inflectional forms other than moche and lyttell occur freely. In periphrastic verbal structures, all inflected forms tend to occur within the phrase, though only a statement of statistical predominance can be made since they occasionally occur both before and after phrases. Furthermore, noninflected adverbial forms similar to those listed above as adjunct to adjectivals occur in this position also. Words occurring between the auxiliary and past participle are illustrated below:

\(^{55}\)Substitute here means 'functional substitute' and has no reference to semology.
Two important points concerning the system of the language reveal themselves at this stage of the analysis. First, the forms called sequence signals occurring before adjectivals continue to function in the position between auxiliary and past participle with only minor variations. The signal dependent upon more or lasse before adjectivals lacking inflection and moche and lyttell before those that do not is now seen to be the morpheme -er, an allomorph which occurs between the auxiliary and past participle as a second constituent of wel, yll, soon (yielding the highly irregular better and wars as well as the expected sooner). Along with more and lasse, so and to function as signals preceding the set of adverbials having the common suffix -ly, the same set having served as adverbials before adjectivals. Thus the same kind of adverbial signalling device that operated with adjectivals also operates with verbs.

(16b) ... and in a cholerike stomake biefe is better dygested than a chyckens legge . . . .

(22a) ... and so shall they be more easily digested.

While more and most occur with other comparative and superlative forms respectively, they are then in a different distributional class from that described here.

Nygh, the positive degree is found in a position preposed to adjectival. The comparative does not occur in the text.
3.62b Furthermore, an examination of the semantic nature of the inflected forms shows that well and bad, soon, nygh and farre, moche are clear indications of manner, time, place, and degree respectively. Now it becomes obvious that semantic facts which have underlain not only traditional classifications but also the pedagogical aids given school children in the form of questions (how? when? where? and how much or to what extent?) have in fact a structural basis.

3.62c Morphemic phrases are of the same types as those listed above as modifiers of adjectivals (3.61a, 3.61e), the inverted prepositional phrase occurring with great frequency:

(7a) Lyght meates, and soone altered, be therin corrupted . . . .

Many short prepositional phrases are found:

(17b) . . . a man hath bene of longe tyme accustomed . . . .

3.62d Although nonfinite and finite syntactic clauses regularly follow the verbal phrase, an occasional one is found intraperipherically:

(64a) . . . but it shall, when it kyndleth lyghtly repress it . . . .

Verbs, of course, consist of only one morphemic word and therefore any adverbial must either precede or follow it. Those which precede are found to be of the same set as those which are found between the auxiliary and past participle. A full description would provide a

---

58 Farre and further both occur after the verb, but they may now be added to the list of inflected forms as these forms are not limited to the position within the verb phrase.

59 A structural ambiguity results, but semantic considerations point to lyghtly as modifying repress. In situations of this sort, attention to stress would resolve the ambiguity, but the present analysis ruled out resort to intonational contours of ModE as an invalid test since any statement concerning intonation must be based on ModE contours.

60 Members of the set may follow a verbal phrase, but statistical probability is low.
Rule\(^\text{61}\) that members of the set of inflected words and the uninflected subset of adverbials listed above may occur either before or after the verb, but in case of periphrastic structures, the member of the set will more commonly occur after the auxiliary. In case of two auxiliaries, it seems to make little difference which the modifier follows so long as only one adverbial is involved. In case of two adverbials, one of which is \textit{not}, \textit{not} will precede the second adverbial:

\begin{equation}
(52b) \ldots \text{it may} \textit{not yet} \text{kepe} \ldots \ldots
\end{equation}

3.62\textit{e} Another subset of adverbials consists of a small group of uninflected forms commonly called \textit{particles} which invariably follow the verb and seem to share a close semantic relationship with it. The difficulty in analysis lies in the fact that some of the same forms also occur as prepositionals (3.7) in the same positions. The test for these forms is not always satisfactory, since in the active voice the decision rests with meaning. If the direct object (if there is one) seems to be the goal of the verb-plus-adverb combination or, lacking an object, if the particle seems to impart information of time, place, manner or degree, it is construed as adverbial. In the passive voice, if the particle is retained and still occurs immediately after the verb, it is likewise construed as an adverbial. In the sentence

\begin{equation}
(26a) \ldots \text{therefore if they be hanged} \quad \textit{up a while} \ldots \ldots
\end{equation}

the particle \textit{up} appears structurally ambiguous. But any semantic consideration of the sentence shows that a prepositional phrase \textit{up a while} is unsatisfactory. In this case, however, the form is arbitrarily determined by the fact that the verb is in the passive voice and the particle follows immediately.

\(^{61}\)Rule here means 'statement of occurrence'.
It should be noted that although a nominal direct object regularly follows the construction, a pronoun may occur between the verb and adverb or may follow the construction:

(61b) ... which doo drawe out bloudde.
(62a) ... and drawe theym awaye . . . .
(64b) . . . whan he draue oute theym . . . .

Examples of verb-adverb combinations found in the text are illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brynge forth</th>
<th>spytte out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haue of [off]</td>
<td>think on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help up</td>
<td>walk down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>putte awaye</td>
<td>walk up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set forth</td>
<td>wype awaye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.62f Sentence 26a above has still another surface ambiguity in the phrase a while. In this case its syntactic function must be discovered by the process of elimination. The determiner a marks the phrase as nominal. The verb is passive and can therefore have only one of two possible nominal complements, neither of which can be satisfied by the function of the subset of verbs to which hang belongs: that is, hang can have only a direct object in the active voice. The only other post-verbal position possible for a nominal construction is the adverbial noun, an analysis which satisfies both semantic and syntactic considerations.

3.62g All lengthy prepositional phrases and most short ones (but see 17b above), nonfinite syntactic clauses defined as infinitive, and dependent finite clauses which are adverbial modifiers regularly follow the verb: 62

---

62 Exceptions to dependent finite clauses as adverbial modifiers occurring finally are discussed below (3.81c).
(66a) The same we maye dayly beholde in our owne dogges.

When both occur together, the prepositional phrase precedes the syntactic clause:

(67a) I haue bene the lengar in this place, bycause I haue hadde in this griefe sufficient experience.

The infinitive clause also follows the verb:

(74b) And thus I leaue to speake of dyetes aptely belongynge to the foure complexions.

3.62h In addition to the phrasal modifiers above, participles are often used in Elyot's language in a manner that must be considered adverbial by both positional and semantic considerations (Indeed, it seems to be the positional occurrence that forces the semantic consideration, a fact which is further proof of the generally accepted linguistic theory that structure is itself meaningful). The participial forms usually conform to the requirement that, if expanded, they will have a subject in common with some nominal they supposedly modify. However, in the sentence (previously cited in another context, Chapter III, n. 36)

(30b) . . . it helpeth the cough taken with pepper and hony . . . it is obvious that taken is not to be construed as belonging to cough, the nominal to which it is juxtaposed. The force of the adverbial position after a verb(al) is strongly felt. Furthermore, it will be seen below that the adverbial position after a verb permits the occurrence of the object between the verb(al) and the adverbial (See n. 64 below).

One further example will suffice:

63 The statistical probability of occurrence of an infinitive clause modifying the verb is quite low. In fact, it may be stated that infinitive clauses are relatively rare except as objects of certain verbs and adjuncts to subjective complements.
(21a) Larkes be as well the fleshe as the broth, very holsum, eaten rosted, they do moche helpe against the colyke . . . .

Both eaten and rosted are participles, and the entire phrase eaten rosted is adjectival by all definitions. Rosted, however, not only follows a verbal, placing it in adverbial position, but it is understood by some such expansion as 'when they are rosted'. Examples of the sort could be multiplied many times over and consequently a claim is made that participles may be either adjectival or adverbial in Elyot's language.

Adverbial as adjunct to adverbial

3.63 Where two adverbials occurred together, the nature of modification was relevant to the analysis. In some cases the forms appeared independent of each other (except for not as the first constituent, the occurrences of two morphemic adverbial words juxtaposed were rare); in others there appeared to be on the adverbial level a construction of the sort represented on the adjectival level as N-3 + N-2. The construction was found to function in rather rigid fashion. The differences between the two types of juxtaposed adverbials is illustrated by the following sentences:

(29b) . . . it causeth one to spytte out easily the fleume . . . .

(20a) But I haue found in some countrays mutton which . . . mought be well nygh compared to kydde . . . .

Both the sentences have two juxtaposed forms that are in adverbial positions. They are different in function, however, in that the first member out combines with the verb spytte in a construction previously explained as verb-plus-adverbial, whereas the first member of the second group is a constituent in a construction with nygh. Further examination reveals that a construction of two inflected adverbials functions in two ways: (a) the first member is an intensifier, or (b) it becomes a part
of a sequence signal functioning in the same way as before adjectivals (3, 61). Instead of an inflected form, the second member of the construction may be an adverbial characterized by the -ly suffix:

(21a) Partryche, of all fowles is most sonest digested . . . .

(66b) . . . god . . . corrected theyr errors mooste gentilly . . . .

Very, cleane, to, and quyte belong to an uninflected subset of intensifiers:

(34b) . . . and with a spunge deaped in cold water, take that cleane away, which wolde be burned to the vessell . . . .

So, as, and to continue to function as sequence signals with clauses as described above, and one other form needs to be added to this list in the position of adverbial before adverbial: the morpheme the, which forms a construction with more or lesse. It, too, is a sequence signal, though of a negative kind, since a clause introduced by than never occurs when the precedes more or lesse. Both are illustrated in the following sentences:

(47a) Exercise beinge a vehement motion, therof nedes must ensue hardnes of the members, whereby labour shal the lesse greue, and the body be the more stronge to labour.

One distinctive feature of adverbials in this position is that they are limited to morphemic words. The set is small and has severe restrictions on its occurrence. To this extent it differs drastically from the sets occurring as modifiers of adjectivals and verb(al)s where the positions are open not only to words, but to phrases and clauses as well.

64Only an adverbial modifying another adverbial has privilege of coming between a verb and an adverbial (except that the direct object may immediately follow a transitive verb). When the two adverbials form a construction their position in the predicate may be symbolized V (DO) (ADV) ADV.
In summary, adverbials are found to be much less tractable than adjectivals. In the present analysis, co-occurrence of adverbials was discussed only when they formed a construction. Obviously there is much more to be said about the order in which adverbials occur in relation to one another. For example, many adverbial noninflected words, phrases, and clauses are found to occur initially in spite of the fact that the analysis has acknowledged no such position except with certain clause structures (3.81c). The inverted forms must then be recognized by the fact that they have been listed as adverbials elsewhere in sets or by semantic considerations. Although these undefined occurrences are of importance and a statement of rule necessary to a complete grammar, their intricacy and endless variations are considered a subject for separate analysis, belonging to interrelationships on a higher syntactic level than that analyzed here.

**Prepositionals**

3.7 It was noted that few adverbials inflected for degree, but that the importance of the set was in inverse proportion to its size since it established syntactic positions open to quite large subsets composed of noninflected members. Apart from these large subsets, however, there is a relatively small uninflected subset occurring after verb(al)s whose members function with them in such a way as to change or refine the meaning of the verb(al)s with which they occur, but which may be defined in terms of characteristic word order. The word order is structurally ambiguous, however, when the particle occurs between the verb and a nominal, since some of the same members occur in another construction.

---

65 That is, no member of the set occurred intraperiphrastically or immediately before verb(al)s.
to be defined as prepositional phrase. Whereas the particle which is
adverbial functions with the verb as the last member of a construction,
a few identical linguistic forms function as the first member of a con-
struction whose second required member is a nominal or, if it is a pro-
noun, it is in the objective or genitive case. The particle function-
ing in the latter phrasal construction is a prepositional and the entire
phrase is found to fill syntactic positions of nominals, adjectivals, and
adverbials, the last two being statistically predominant.

3.71 In addition to members of the set of adverbials which share
membership with prepositions, there are other particles, as well as a few
forms from other word classes, which function as prepositionals. As in
other major syntactic positions, some forms are found to be morphemic
phrases. These will be called phrasal prepositionals in order to avoid
terminological ambiguity. All prepositional forms found in the corpus
are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepositionals</th>
<th>Phrasal prepositionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>above</td>
<td>as concernynge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>as to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afore</td>
<td>accordyng to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exception must be noted that the particle may occur without
an object after certain verbs in the passive voice (See 3.73).

All the two-syllable words having a-, be-, un-, or to- as the
first syllable are historically phrasal, of course, but there is nothing
in the text to suggest that they were so considered by Elyot. On the
other hand, orthographical practices suggest hesitancy, at least, as to
whether forms like into, unto, etc. are one or two words.

Also, a construction commonly occurring as a prepositional
phrase is a combination of the bound form ther- plus a prepositional.
The phrase may always be paraphrased as prepositional plus it: e.g.,
thereto 'to it'.
Most of the words above occur with great frequency and in a simple fashion, that is, followed by a determiner, with or without other adjectives, and a nominal. A few of the forms warrant special comment.

3.72 Four of the words have developed from the participial form of a verb: durynge, (as) concernynge, sauynge and accordinge to. The forms could be analyzed here as participial forms functioning adverbially, but they do not satisfy the description of adverbial participles as defined above (3.62h). Furthermore, much of the semantic force of the notional idea of the root morphemes seems weakened to the point that

68Curme explains the forms as verbals which detached from the subject "of the principle proposition" and consequently became "attached to a verb, thus becoming a preposition . . ." (pp. 158-9).
the morphemic word or phrase may be treated in a frame with other
prepositionals.\(^{69}\)

\[\begin{align*}
(39b) \text{accordynge to} & \quad \text{their complexions} \\
(41a) \text{concernynge} & \quad \text{the generall usage} \\
(Aiiia) \text{durynge} & \quad \text{my lyfe}
\end{align*}\]

Among the prepositional particles listed, only \textit{as} and \textit{for} are
diffuse and difficult to analyze. The problem is not solely that they
belong to other large word classes,\(^{70}\) since such forms as \textit{after} and
\textit{before} also belong to several word classes without causing undue dif­
 dificulty in the analysis. The latter, however, carry clear semantic con­
notations of time or place, whereas \textit{for} and \textit{as} appear semantically empty.
As function words, both introduce nominals which may be viewed as ap­
positives or illustrations of some antecedent nominal. The following
sentence illustrates the usage:

\[\begin{align*}
(44b) \text{Moreouer take hede, . . . that stiptik or restrainyng meates} \\
& \quad \text{be taken at the begynnynge, \textit{as} quinces, peares, and medlars, lest} \\
& \quad \text{they may let . . .}
\end{align*}\]

In the sentence above, it should also be noted that the appositive phrase
is so far removed from the nominal to which it is related that the under­
standing of the sentence is dependent upon the semantic equation of
"stiptik or restrainyng meates" with "quinces, peares, and medlars."

\(^{69}\text{No suggestion is intended that all prepositionals are contextu­}
\text{ally interchangeable. Four prepositionals which could reasonably be}
\text{accepted in all three contexts were selected. One might find, for ex­}
\text{ample, \textit{after my lyfe} and \textit{after the generall usage}, but not likely \textit{*after}
\textit{their complexions.}}\]

\(^{70}\text{As occurs in three major classes; \textit{for} occurs in only two, but}
\text{its uses within subsets are sometimes separated by a rather fine line.}\]
In a loosely comparable fashion, *for* may introduce the subject of an infinitive phrase when the entire phrase follows a subjective complement in a clause having as its grammatical subject the form *it*.

(43a) ... it is not possible for man to esteem so just a proportion of the qualities of that which he receueth . . . .

Elsewhere in the corpus *for*, like all other prepositionals except *as*, occurs as a link between an antecedent and its object in such a way as to consider the prepositional phrase a modifier of the antecedent:

(Aii) Galen the most excellent phisition fearyd, that in wrytyng a compendious doctrine *for* the curing of syckenes . . . .

3.73 When the relative pronoun is the object of a preposition that is closely attached to the verb, the preposition immediately follows the verb:

(62b) Semblably, if they be hastilye stopped from the course, *whiche* they haue been used *to*, therby do increase . . . .

(32a) ... and to cause the meate that is eaten, to perce and discende unto the places of digestion, *whiche* are the pourposes *thate* drynke serueth *fore*.

Also, in the verb-preposition construction after the past participle the preposition immediately follows the verb:

(Aiva) ... yet some of them hearyng me spoken *of*, haue said in derision . . . .

There is a structural difference between the particle described here and that one described as adverbial (3.62e), since in the latter the nominal may appear either before or after the particle. It need only be noted that certain verb(al)s followed by closely attached prepositionals which in turn have objects are transitive and thus may undergo passive construction, or, conversely, that objects of prepositionals following some specified verb-prepositional combinations may become subjects in a passive construction, in which case the prepositional is
retained with the verb. With either definition the structural distinction in the active voice between the nominal which may occur either before or after the adverbial and the nominal which may occur only after the prepositional is retained and the retention clarifies the definition of prepositional phrase.

One peculiarity concerning the construction discussed above should be noted in Elyot's language. Occasionally there is found a pleonastic prepositional following a verb(al) in the active voice when the prepositional phrase has been placed in initial position:

(20a) Of falowe dere, he nor any other olde writer doth speake of, as I remembred.

Finally, lyke occurs as both adjectival and adverbial (meaning 'equally') in Elyot's language. A problem arises as to the analysis of lyke in such sentences as the one below:

(27b) To this fruité lyke as to figges . . . .

Since lyke occurs with both as and (un)to, it could be added to the list of phrasal prepositionals. However, in these constructions its occurrence is limited to a position immediately following a nominal or a position after a linking verb:

(26a) They which are in tast bytter or harryshe be lyke to them that are soure.

At the same time, sentences like the one below require lyke either to be placed in the set of prepositionals or to recognize a type of ellipsis that seems to defy any formal proof:

(24b) . . . but that the melone is rounde lyke an apple . . . .

In view of these facts, lyke is rejected as the first member of a phrasal prepositional, but lyke is included in the set of simple prepositionals.
Conjunctivals

3.8 Prepositionals and conjunctivals are alike in some ways: both classes consist of noninflected words belonging to closed sets, and both have as their main function the signalling of another construction. However, the two sets differ in significant ways. First, the preposition is an immediate constituent of a construction whose other constituent is its object; thus, it both signals a construction (its object) and becomes a part of a larger construction, a prepositional phrase. On the other hand, the conjunctival exhibits a much greater variety both in the kinds of constructions it signals and the relationship it holds with the signalled construction. For example, an initial and may serve no grammatical purpose other than signalling a sentence, a redundant function since a preceding period followed by a capital letter regularly gives the same information; but and linking two adjectivals which serve as subjective complement coordinates the two so that they may function as a single construction (but it must be noted that either one alone could function in the same way). Thus one may see that the syntactic information given by the second and is more relevant than that given by the first (or conversely that the information given by the first is repetitive whereas that given by the second provides a means of interpreting the syntactic function of the construction within which it occurs). The differences among the constructions signalled by conjunctivals (that is, the differences in their morphological and syntactic descriptions) as well as the places where the conjunctivals occur (that is, initially or medially) require that the set of conjunctivals be

\[71\text{Sets that are small enough to list conveniently and fill positions which do not readily grant privilege of occurrence to members of other morphological or syntactic sets are considered closed.}\]
listed in three major subsets. The classification into subsets is gov-
erned by the way in which the construction introduced by the conjunctival
is to be understood as (1) a part of a larger construction, (2) gram-
matically equivalent to one or more other constructions, or (3) gram-
matically independent of the construction with which it appears. The
three subsets of conjunctivals are termed subordinate, coordinate, and
transitional.

Subordinate conjunctivals

Subordinate conjunctivals are the simplest of the three
types. They introduce finite syntactic clauses which enter into larger
clauses (not necessarily finite) in the syntactic position of a nominal,
an adjectival, or an adverbial. Conversely, any finite clause function-
ing in a nominal, adjectival, or adverbial position is a dependent
clause and the conjunctival that introduces the clause, but does not
fill a syntactic position within the clause, is a subordinate conjunctival.

3.81a All subordinate conjunctivals, however, do not introduce
clauses filling all positions. Examination of clauses in the text shows
that that is the only conjunctival used to introduce nominal clauses with
some regularity and in a variety of syntactic positions. In addition,
how, when, if, and whether occur at least once as conjunctivals intro-
ducing nominal clauses.

72These terms, it must be stressed, do not refer to traditional
concepts of "naming" or "modifying," but refer to the fact that a clause
may fill a position which morphological nouns and adjunctivals fill:
subjects, adjuncts to nouns, etc.

Subordinate clauses will hereafter be designated by the posi-
tions which they fill, e.g., nominal clause, etc.

73It is perhaps noteworthy that, although no valid sampling was
attempted, it was obvious that probability of occurrence of nominal
clauses was statistically much lower than for adjectival and adverbial
clauses.
After verbs of supposing, thinking, and meaning, that as a sub-
ordinate conjunctival often does not occur; nevertheless, since the
absence of that is contrasted by its presence in other similar sentences,
the clause structures which follow verbs of the type named above and
serve as direct objects are taken to be nominal clauses. The following
sentences illustrate the option:

(41a) I suppose, that in Englande, yong men . . . may well eate
the meales in one day . . .

(48a) . . . if they put to some sweete oyles . . . myst with a
lyttell sweete oyle of roses, I suppose they do wel.

The nominal clause may be the object of a preposition:

(24b) Melones and Pepones be almooste of oone kynde, but that the
melone is rounde lyke an apple, and the innermeste parte therof is
used to be eaten.

The most common use of the nominal clause introduced by that,
however, is as a postponed subject after the expletive it. The occur-
rence is rare after an intransitive verb or a linking verb, but is fre-
quency after the passive voice:74

(Aiilb) It semith, that phisicke in this realme hathe ben well
estemid, sens the hole studye of Salerne . . . .75

(45a) . . . it were moche better, that he dyd neither drynke the
one, nor the other, but rather . . . and after rest . . . .

(36b) . . . and if it be perceiued, that he is replete, than must
be withdrawen and minished some parte of that nutriment . . . .

74 The frequency of occurrence of this use of the passive con-
struction is of interest and possible importance, since the end result
of the use of the expletive is that the clause follows the verb. Cf.
the hypothetical sentence "... if somebody perceiueth that he [a child]
is replete ... " with sentence 36b below.

75 This clause could, of course, be analyzed as a subjective
complement, but it should be noted that it is semantically empty.
Other examples of nominal clauses follow:

(45b [01]) . . . that the tyme moste conuenient for exercise is, whan bothe the firste and seconde digestion is complete as wel in the stomake, as in the vaines . . . .

(36a) . . . who being demanded, how a man mought lyue longe in helthe, he answered . . . .76

(66a) Calle to thy remembrance, if thou hast alway rendred unto every man condigne thankes or benefite, of whom thou hast kyndnes receyued, or if thou hast alway remembred, euery one of theym, that haue doone to the any commoditie or pleasure.77

(75b) . . . if it be halfe concocte, than must suche thynges be ministred as maye helpe to profite concoction, haunya ge regarde to the quality and temperaunce of the iuyce, that is to saye, whether it be thychke or thynne fleumatyke or cholerike; whyche shalbe perceyued . . . .78

3.81b Since adjectival clauses have already been shown to relate to the antecedent in a special way requiring that the word introducing the clause must itself function within the clause (2.22 and 3.22), it is not surprising to find only two subordinate conjunctivals introducing adjectival clauses: where and whan. It should be noted that where is also a member of the set of relative pronominals, except that only a specified allomorph, the bound form wher- (3.32a), may occur in that function.

76 The relative pronoun who which introduces a construction having the nominal clause as retained object is in sharp contrast to the semantically empty it of 36b above, since it is agnate with (Gleason's term for structurally related sentences [Linguistics, p. 199]) a hypothetical "someone demanded whom how a man mought . . . ." See also n. 75 above.

77 It is rare that one is able to find a structural frame to test constructions larger than words as explicit as the one offered here: ": . . calle to thy remembrance some chyldere . . . ." (17a).

78 Elyot uses that is to say to introduce a paraphrase of any construction. The clause above is taken to be a paraphrase of "the quality and temperance of the iuyce" and here is further classified as an appositive, since it is a restatement of a nominal construction. Thus it is seen that a nominal and a construction in an N+1 position may be separated by a transitional phrase (see 3.83). Cf. "double profite, that is to say, helthe of body and increase of substance" (44a).
Examples follow:

(81a) ... but this mater will I leue to a nother place where I intend to speake more abundantly of it, if it be not the sooner amended.

(Aiib) Sens this noble wryter found that lacke in his tyme, whan there flourysshed in sundry countrayes a great multitude of men excellent in al kyndes of lerning, as it yet doth appere . . . .

3.81c Of all word classes, adverbials were found to be least orderly. The heterogeneous character was due partly to the fact that classification of adverbials was based on relationships with three other classes rather than with one, as with adjectivals, and partly because adverbials are not as strictly ordered in relation to the word(s) they modify (or are adjunct to\textsuperscript{79}) or in relation to each other as are adjectivals. The problem is compounded in working with adverbial constructions larger than words. It is therefore necessary to place more severe restrictions upon the subordinate conjunctivals which introduce clauses than are needed for those classified above (3.81a and 3.81b). It must be required that subordinate conjunctivals introduce only full finite clauses, that is, those having both subject and predicate\textsuperscript{80}. Making such a requirement provides a means of classifying adverbial clauses (and consequently the conjunctivals introducing them) by a combination of methods, no one of which is entirely satisfactory alone. The most important single criterion is that applied to inflected adverbials: Position in relation to verb(al)s, adjectivals, and other adverbials. Such

\textsuperscript{79}Hence adjunct to cannot here be interpreted as 'juxtaposed to', though on the morphological level the stricter requirement of juxtaposition was necessary.

\textsuperscript{80}The effect of the restriction is the exclusion of all constructions which are customarily explained in traditional grammars on the basis of ellipsis.
a test does indeed show that clauses fill adverbial positions, though shorter constructions such as complements and prepositionals may occur between the verb(al) and the modifying clause.

The situation is not solved, however, because some of the clauses which follow the verb are introduced by words or phrases which also precede clauses that are initial in sentences. Nevertheless, in these cases may be seen complementary distribution in which the main clause is signalled by an adverbial if, and only if, the dependent clause is initial. Thus the introductory conjunctival and the adverbial introducing the main clause may be posited as a set of correlative constructions; and while the occurrence of the signal for the main clause is not invariable, it occurs regularly enough to establish a pattern. The set is as follows:

(21a) Although they be of some men commended, yet experience proueth them to increase melancholye, and are of a small nourisshinge.

(16b) More ouer, fruytes and herbes, specyally rawe, wolde be eaten in a small quantitie, all though the persone be very cholerycke, for asmoche as . . . .

(Aiib) Sens this noble wryter found that lack in his time, whan there flourysshed . . . ., why shuld I be greuyed with reproches . . . .

(Aivb) Moreouer I wote not why phisitions should be angry with me, sens I wrate and dyd set fourth the Castle of helth for their commodity . . . .

(17b) But yf the custome be soo pernyciouse, that hit needes muste be lefte, thanne wolde it be withdrawn by lyttelle and lyttelle in tyme of healthe, and not of syckenesse.

The term signalling used here and in the following sections refer to "sequence signals" (See 3.61).
(24b) And being well ordred, they wyll be metely concoct, if corruption in the stomake do not prevent them ... .

(45b) Wherfore whan the vryne appereth in a temperate coler, not red nor pale, but as it were gilt, than shuld exercise haue his begining.

(24a) They be most holsome whan they be poched, and moste unholsome whan they be fryed.

(44b) ... where the stomake is colde or weake, there wolde fyne meates be first eaten, for in a hot stomak ... .

(26a) The roughe tasted appuls are holsome, where the stomake is weake by distemperance of heate or moche moysture ... .

Two other correlative constructions may be classed with the set, though the signals function in a different way: so ... that and suche ... that. In addition to their functions as signals, so may modify an adjectival or adverbial and suche may modify a noun:

(17b) But yf the custome be soo pernycioue, that hit needes muste be lefte, thanne wolde it ... .

(24a) ... there is caused to be in our bodyes, suche alteration frome the nature, whiche was in men at the begynnynge, that nowe all fruites generally are noyfull to manne, and do ingender yli humours, and be ofte tymes the cause of putrified feuers, if they ... .

In addition, bycause, er, lest, onles, vntyll, whyle(s), and (so) that serve as simple conjunctivals introducing adverbial clauses in a position following a verb(al). Of the group only that belongs to other subsets of conjunctivals, and it is noteworthy that the nominal clause and the adverbial clause introduced by that did not co-occur in the text.

Nor is a separation between nominal and adverbial clauses difficult since

82Historically because, onles, and vntyll are phrases, but there seems to be no reason to treat them separately here. Interestingly, bycause does occur in one initial position, but is in coordination with a prepositional phrase and is consequently not classified as conjunctival in this one sentence:

(24b) ... but by reason of the slyppernes of their substance, and bycause al meates whiche be moyste of their nature, be not byndyne, they ... .
it was established above (3.81a) that if the clause immediately follows a transitive verb or is in the post-verbal position after an introductory expletive, it is nominal. Furthermore, there can be no ambiguity with an adjectival clause introduced by that, since by definition that both introduces and functions within its clause. Still another protection against ambiguity, present in the conjunctival preceding adverbial clause, is the possibility of using the longer construction, so that, with which the shorter form is in free variation.

In addition to the members of the set listed above, there is a large group of phrasal conjunctivals some of which have somewhat elaborate construction. They are as follows:

Phrasal conjunctivals

after (that)  considering that
before/afore (that)
except (that)
as (if)
for as moche as
in soo/as moche as

After, before (along with its allomorph afore), and except also belong to the set of prepositionals; therefore, a different analysis could be posited of prepositional phrase consisting of a prepositional and its object, a nominal clause introduced by that. However, the same words without that also introduce adverbial clauses, a fact which suggests that the single words are merely in free variation with the

---

83 Phrases will be termed phrasal conjunctivals by analogy with phrasal prepositionals, the latter a necessary inversion to avoid ambiguity with prepositional phrase.
Examples of both types follow:

(26b) Quynces . . . restraine the stomake, that it may not digest well the mete, except that they be rosted or soden . . . .

(23a) . . . but the bloud made of the udder is better than that, which cometh of the stones, excepte it be of calues and lambes.

Consydering that poses a problem because one does not expect a participial form to occur in closed sets, the very name signifying inhospitality to other classes. However, six prepositionals have participles as their provenance; and although consydering is not a member of the set of prepositionals, it shares with those six the common characteristic of having no antecedents to which they may relate. The frequent use of consydering that and the fact that the first word cannot be satisfactorily classified within the framework of the definition of participle (that is, it lacks an antecedent when used as a constituent in a conjunctival construction) justifies its placement as phrasal conjunctival:

(35a) . . . it must nedes be a necessary and conuenient drynk, as well in syknes as in helth: consyderinge that barleye corne, wherof it is made, is commended, and used in medicine . . . .

Among phrasal conjunctivals, only the forms for as moche as and in soo/as moche as need further comment. These forms occur with great frequency, but with no structural devices similar to the forms cited as correlative. It will be seen in the following section (3.82) that as, with and without certain signals that will be cited below, introduces

---

It could, of course, be further argued that after certain prepositionals that may not occur before a nominal clause, but such arguments appear unnecessarily tedious, nor does the point seem significant. However, the question involved in selecting one analysis over another is a pertinent one: which analysis (that is, word by word or phrasal) reveals more information. The answer is, of course, dependent upon the kind of information sought. In this case, two levels of syntactic information are available, but the higher level seems to give more information about the total clause structure, hence the decision to classify the phrasal form as a conjunctival.
a variety of syntactic constructions. These phrasal conjunctivals listed above, however, never introduce constructions other than clauses. Thus the preliminary phrase appears to be an intricate system for signalling a subordinating conjunctival as with the result of separating its function from that of as in other functions:

(32b) ... in as moche as it is colde and slowe in decoction, it lowseth not the bealy nor prouoketh vrine.

(32b) ... but yet they doo harme to olde men, forasmoche as they do stoppe the cundites of the splene, the lyuer, and the raynes.

Coordinate conjunctivals

3.82 Coordinate constructions are those which function syntactically alike in larger constructions. They are coordinate in the sense that no construction is a part of another, even though they combine to form a single larger construction, the largest being one sentence comprised of two or more independent finite clauses. On the level of independent finite clause structure there is a difference in the way that the coordinate constructions interrelate; and this difference provides the basis for classification into subsets, as will be explained below.

85 The term compound is carefully avoided in relation to coordinating conjunctivals because its traditional connotations have little bearing on the analysis made here. Furthermore, the analysis given below requires a redefining of compound and complex sentences, a problem not immediately relevant to the study of establishing word classes.
There are only two groups of coordinating conjunctivals.

The membership of the first set along with the preceding correlative partners which are taken to be sequence signals is as follows:

(both . . .) and (also)\(^\text{86}\)
(not only . . .) but (also)
(either . . .) or (els)\(^\text{87}\)
(neyther . . .) nor/ne
(as wel . . .) as

There seem to be some minor environmental restrictions in the set. Except for as, the members may freely occur with or without the signal. Furthermore, all members may introduce constructions of any size except as which is limited to smaller constructions of words, phrases, and non-finite clauses. Nevertheless, the most distinctive feature of coordination exhibited by the set above is the lack of limitation on the size or type of syntactic construction that may be coordinated. Also, though the second constituent introduced by the conjunctival immediately follows the first constituent, the statement implies a misleading simplicity when one considers the number of possible coordinate constructions within larger ones. Something of the complexity of interrelationships is illustrated in the sentence below:

(25b) Dry figges and old, are more hot and dry than newe gathered, but being much eaten, they make yll bloudde and iuyce, and as some do suppose, do ingender lyce, and also anoyeth the lyuer and the splene, if they be inflamed, but hauinge the power to attenuate or make humours currant, they make the bodye soluble, and do clense the raynes.

\(^{86}\)Sometimes also as a part of the correlative construction with and becomes an anaphoric substitute for and. It does not substitute for but, however.

\(^{87}\)The words are given separately here, but the occurrence of orels spelled as one word is common enough to posit it as a variant of or.
In the sentence one finds coordination of simple adjectivals, nominals, and verbals along with larger constructions of nonfinite clauses, predicates of finite clauses, and main clauses. Nor is this complexity an exaggerated example.

One form needs some explanation. As wel ... as is not commonly listed by grammarians as governing a coordinate construction, but examination shows that in every case the construction following as is equivalent to the construction following as wel:

(18a) ... which be in power contrary to the distemperance, but the degrees are alwaye to be considered, as welle of the temperaunce of the bodye, as of the meates.

Coordination, however, is not always a simple matter. Often the reader is called upon to reconstruct or fill in a hiatus in structure.

For example, in the sentence

(84b) If the body be hotter, colder, moyster, dryer, leaner, fuller, the colour more pale, or swart, the eyes more holowe, than is accustomed to be, it signifieth that the body is disposed to sicknes or already sicke

the first part of the sentence exhibits complete parallelism of structure if one will grant the omission of the linking verb after colour and eyes. The end of the sentence causes more difficulty. If, however, one remembers that the adjectival position of subjective complement may be filled by a past participle, then disposed to sicknes is seen to be coordinate with already sicke.

88 That a reader is able to do this without undue difficulty is of importance to the growing body of linguists who are primarily concerned with psycholinguistics.

A suggestion for another way to look at the phenomenon is offered below (3.82b).

89 This part of the sentence is easily understood simply because it is in accord with modern usage, whereas the second part is not and is consequently troublesome and awkward to a modern reader.

90 See discussion above (3.45).
Not all constructions may be so neatly explained. Word usage sometimes causes difficulty, for example, as in heate, colde, moyste, or dry (3b). At other times word order obscures coordination, for example, heare blacke or darke aburne curled (3a).

This group of coordinating conjunctivals has an ultimate effect upon clause structure such as is exhibited elsewhere only by inflection for plurality: that is, concord between subject and verb. If a subject of a verb(al) is a coordinated construction, its number may be affected, though all coordinating conjunctivals do not function alike in this matter. Lack of a sufficient number of coordinated subjects using all conjunctivals prohibits conclusive statements, but secondary evidence (that is, a singular or plural verb of an adjectival clause having a relative pronominal subject whose antecedent is in question) tends to support the following statements:

(1) And pluralizes the construction.93

(2b) . . . where heate and moysture haue souerayntie . . . .

(2) Or does not change the number from that of one of its members.

(52a) In qualitie, as where the bloud, or other humour, is hotter or colder . . . .

(22b) The lunges or lyghtes are more easy . . . .

91Elsewhere Elyot coordinates heate and drythe (Biiib), a form which suggests that a noun form for the adjective dry has not stablized at this period of time.

92There is no suggestion that the coordination was obscure to the reader of Elyot's day.

93However, a counterexample must be cited: "Moreouer in wynter, runnynge, and wrastling is conuenient" (47b). But cf. discussion above (2.31).
(3) **Nor** functions like **or**.

(33b) There is *neither meate nor dryanke* . . . .

Evidence is too slight to justify further statement of rule.

3.82b The subset of coordinating conjunctivals consists of only two members:

(as . . . ), (not so . . . ) as
(-er), (more) than

As noted, these conjunctivals may not occur without the signal, a fact that was accepted as the basis for separating the two sets. They differ in several other significant ways. **As** and **than** may follow a syntactic clause of any type. Unless the second (or signalled construction) is a full clause, it is not immediately adjacent to the construction with which it is coordinate. The problem, then, is to determine the form with which it is coordinate. This is done by following the analytical method of inspection, commutability within a frame, and complementary distribution. The frame to be used in mapping the construction under question onto the sentence is that portion of the sentence up to

---

94 However, the signal -er/more is not invariably followed by than and the construction which it governs. Also, it should be remembered that as is a member of several other word classes and in some cases other than the one described here may occur alone.

95 There are important differences between the goal of this analysis and the traditional one of determining the elliptical or missing construction. The goal here is to determine with what construction in the first clause an overt construction following than/as is coordinate.

96 There is a difference in meaning of frame here from that used earlier in establishing syntactical word classes on the basis of morphological ones. In this case there is no one model for a single function (e.g., *The boy is/are tall*); but in every instance the model is a clause up to the conjunctival as/than (exclusive of the signal). The difference should not be disturbing if one keeps in mind that there is no morphological word class to provide a model of the first type; hence another technique must be used.
the conjunctival. The signal itself is not a part of the frame. For example, in the sentence

(36b) Moreover sugar . . . is not so sweete as our hony . . . .

the frame is sugar is sweete.97 Casual inspection shows hony to be a nominal, since it is so marked by the determiner our. The presence of only one nominal position in the sentence, the subject, automatically resolves the problem. Hony may be declared coordinate with sugar. One further example will suffice:

(27b) The damaske prune rather bindeth than lowseth.

The frame is the damaske prune bindeth.98 Again, there is only one possibility since the one form in question is an inflected verb. Mapping the questioned form onto the frame yields the damaske prune lowseth, proving that the two verbs are coordinate.99

The examples used have been extremely simple ones and no claims are made that the study has been exhaustively treated. To do so would

97Moreover need not be included, since it has no relevant syntactic function (3.83), and not so is removed because it is the signal.

The deletions are modifying clause structures which have been removed to highlight the problem being investigated. They do not affect the basic sentence structure.

98Interestingly, although the morpheme -er is the signal, the entire word must be removed because the remaining rath- is a portmanteau morpheme. It was apparently so in Elyot's language also, since it did not occur alone, though it is, of course, of OE provenance.

99The method used may be compared with that used by Eugene A. Nida who relates a second construction to the first by calling attention to "zero-anaphoric substitution" (A Synopsis of English Syntax, rev. ed. [The Hague, 1966], pp. 131, 152).
require a separate study. The only claim made is that sufficient evidence has been offered to demonstrate a workable technique for determining coordinate structures after as and than when they are preceded by their correlative signals.

The examples below are given to illustrate the variety of constructions that are coordinate with some portion of the preceding clause:

(40a) . . . so that concoction or digestion is as weke in them as in those, whyche are aged.

(27a) Finally the iuyce that it maketh in the bodye is not so commendable, as that which is ingendred of lettyse . . . 101

(80b) Finally this dare I affirme, that the reumes which of late time have been more frequent than they were wont to be xl. yeres passed . . . 102

100 In fact, Nida himself, whose interest was the syntax of the English sentence rather than the establishment of word classes, disclaimed exhaustiveness because of the intricacies involved. He declared the problem "one of the most complex grammatical problems in English" (Ibid., p. 152, n. 9). It may well be more so in ModE than in Elyot's language. For example, there was no sentence in the corpus of the type He is better than we thought.

101 This example was chosen to show that when the signalled construction may substitute for more than one member of a word class, one must resort to semantic appropriateness. In the sentence above, substituting the construction in a frame for bodye (a noun for which the pronoun that could substitute) yields unsatisfactory results semantically, whereas using a frame for iuyce yields an acceptable sentence. It should be noted that the placement of the signal seems to be of no particular help in mapping.

102 This sentence is extremely complex, but the fact that coordination of syntactic function is more important than mere coordination of words is underscored. It is only by mapping they onto which that an antecedent for the personal pronoun may be discovered. By entirely different means, one determines that which has as its antecedent reumes; hence, ultimately, the nominal antecedent of they is reumes.

Although the analysis is a synchronic one and no comparative statement is required, readers may be interested that the controversial question of whether than is a preposition did not arise, since there was no instance of the form followed by an objective pronoun found. There was, however, one instance of than they.
**Transitional conjunctivals**

3.83 Insofar as it was possible to do so, all words, phrases, and clauses up to this point have been considered from a purely structural view. There remain, however, a number of forms which have not been taken into account. Their function in a sentence is peripheral to the basic structure, as may be deduced from the fact that a sentence is syntactically complete whether they occur or not. They seem to be important to the analysis of discourse larger than sentences; but because very little systematic work has been done to date beyond the sentence, they are considered here within the framework of the sentence. A further difficulty is the fact that some members of other sets are also members of the set of transitional conjunctivals. Nevertheless, examination of the text indicates that a division into two major subsets may be based on whether the conjunctivals appear initially as signals of structures as large as finite independent clauses or whether they appear both initially and before smaller structures of a variety of types. The two sets may be called clause signals and qualifiers.

3.83a Clause signals are as follows:103

```
  albeit  otherwhile
  and  partly
   but  perchance
```

103 There seems no reason to separate morphemic words and phrases since all are spelled consistently as single words except *not withstand-ynge*. It is included in this list, however, because although it was used with great frequency and was never spelled as a single word, *withstand-ynge* was not used alone except as a verbal.

104 The words *and* and *but* pose a special problem because they qualify in some instances for membership in both sets, coordinate and transitional; but a restriction may be placed upon them so that they may be said to be clause signals only if they are initial. Such a restriction is justified by the fact that the syntactic function of coordination is more basic to sentence structure than the other category is.
consequently
contrarywyse
for
generally
(in) lykewyse
moreover
neuertheless
not withstandynge

A subset of clause signals limited to initial position in the sentence may be placed with the group above. They are *firste*, *secondly*, *thirdly*, *fourthly*, *finally*, *laste*, and *nexte*.

Another subset consists of a few clause structures which occur with sufficient frequency to suggest that they are stereotypes or congealed clauses which carry little meaning except the structural signal. Only the first one is troublesome. In some sentences it appears to be a nominative absolute; but usually it serves as a signal only. The inventory of the subset is as follows:

(alway) forsene that
As touchynge the subject . . . .
But to retouorne to the subject . . . .
But to say as I thynke . . . .

The following examples illustrate the use of the clause signal:

(16b) *Foreseene alway*, that they eate withoute gourmandyse, or leaue with sommme [sic] appetyte. 105

(28a) *Generally* alll herbes raw, and not sodden, do ingender cold and watry iuyce, if they be eaten customably, or in abundance: albeit some herbes are more comestible . . . .

105 Wherfore and therefore function elsewhere as relative pronominal and prepositional phrase respectively (3.32a, 3.54), but as clause signals they lack antecedents.

106 Quirk and Wrenn recognize an OE structure similar to a Latinate nominative absolute ([*Gefultumigendum* Gode], p. 66), except that the participle may precede the nominal form (in this case a clause) rather than follow. Elyot's uncertain usage of the phrase suggests that it may be an archaism. In the sentence cited, as in many others, it is impossible to determine what is intended as the independent element. Alway more commonly precedes than follows forseene, but often does not occur at all.
Therefore if they be rype, they do least harme of any fruites, or almoste none.

Malowes are not colde in operation, but rather somewhat warme, and haue in them a slypernesse; wherefore being boyled and moderatly eaten with oyle and vynegar, they make metely good concoction in the stomake, and . . . .

Finally, there are three words apparently serving only stylistic purposes: 0, alas, and ye. There were not enough examples of their uses to make more than highly tentative statements. 0 does not introduce a full sentence, that is, one having both subject and predicate; but its occurrence in two successive utterances could not likely be accidental. All three forms are illustrated below:

(44a) Alas how longe wyll men fantasy lawes and good ordynaunces, and neuer determyne them.

(Aiva) Q royall harte, full of very nobility.

(66a) The terrible lyons and panthers, haue ben seene in their maner, to render thankes to their benefactors, ye and to obiecte their owne bodyes and lyues for their defence.

3.83b A second set of transitional conjunctivals, the qualifiers, is a small set consisting of only three words: also, onely, and specyallye. The chief reasons for classifying the members in a separate set are their mobility and the fact that when they occur in a position filled by members of morphological word classes they do not convey the same kind of semantic information that other members of the set filling the same frame do. For example, before water the corpus yields clere

107 For the difference between the clause signal and the relative pronominal, compare the sentence above with "And the brothe, wherin they be sodden . . ." in which wher- clearly has brothe as its antecedent.

108 Although semantic considerations are of no structural importance, the purpose of a frame for testing word classes is to test the structural sameness or difference, a decision that is intuitively based on semantic acceptability in relation to other members of the set.
water (62a) and warme water (55b). Only appears in the same position, but in some subtle way is incompatible within the same frame with clere and warme:

(31b) Also the true folowers of Pythagoras doctrine, dranke only water, and yet lyued longe . . . .

Nor does the ambiguous position between verb and noun make the difference, as may be seen by the following sentence:

(32a) . . . if men from their infancye, were accustomed to none other drinke, but to water only, moderately used, it shuld be sufficient . . . .

Also and only have already been shown to have special structural importance when they occur in correlative constructions with and and but (3.82a). The anaphoric use of also may be seen in the sentence

(44a) Herbes as well sodden as unsodden, also frutes, whiche do mollifie and louse the bealy . . . .

Finally, although specially is not so structurally important as the other two forms, it shares their mobility, as may be seen by the following examples:

(14b) The causes, wherby the ayrre is corrupted, be specially foure.
(20b) Chickens in sommer, specially if they be cockrelles are very conuenient . . . .
(27a) Pomegranates be of good iuyce, and profytable to the stomake, specially they, which are sweete: but in . . . .

One might feel inclined to suggest that specially serves here as a structural signal before an appositive which has been postponed to the end of the sentence. It should be noted that no ambiguity results from the postponement, however, since the subject is the only plural nominal form for which they could substitute.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Summary

An analysis was made of the language of Sir Thomas Elyot as ascertained from his book The Castel of Helth. The purpose of the analysis was to produce a sixteenth century grammar using the language of a single individual. The grammatical analysis was limited to a description of word classes and that part of syntax which was relevant to their determination. The analytical method used was based upon the brief suggestions for syntactic analysis made by George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith in their important treatise An Outline of English Structures. The same three basic principles of (1) "inspection," (2) "commutability within a frame," and (3) "complementary distribution," which the authors of the text established as the basis for linguistic analysis on all levels were carefully followed on the syntactic level. On the morphological level, attention was centered on inflected words only.

Elyot's language revealed only four major word classes based on inflection: nouns, pronouns, verbs, and adjunctivals. By noting the places where word classes and syntactic functions co-occurred, certain positions were established as having syntactic functions that correlated with certain word classes: that is, nouns function as subjects, direct objects, and so forth. The position was referred to by the name of the
word class that commonly filled it (except that a suffix -al was added: nominal position, verbal position, and so forth). Names of syntactically determined word classes (noninflected words, phrases, or clauses which fill the same positions as inflected words) were also given the -al suffix. On the syntactic level, nominal and pronominal word classes converged, and it was seen that the nominal position should include any noun or nominal, any pronoun or pronominal, any endocentric phrase having a nominal as its head, or any exocentric phrase or clause that filled the nominal frame.

The position of verbs also admitted larger constructions of verbals on the syntactic level. Verbs and verbals were found to exhibit person, tense, mode, and voice; in addition, verbals exhibited phase. Trager and Smith had posited aspect and status as being pertinent; except for meaning based expressions, the former had not developed by the sixteenth century (that is, there were no "progressive" verbals) and the latter are concerned with negation, interrogation, and other matters that are primarily statements of lexicon and word order (and consequently beyond the scope of the present work).

Adjunctivals were found to be too disparate in function to justify a single set and were therefore divided into adjectivals and adverbials. Both these sets were redivided into subsets. Adjectivals were grouped according to their occurrence in relation to each other as well as to the relationships they held to the nominal(s) to which they were adjunct. There were four subsets that occurred in prenominal position, one of which was commonly preceded by members of the set of adverbials. This set and a set which included numerals appeared in subjective complement position. Furthermore, any adjectival member of
the set which immediately preceded nominals also had privilege of occurring immediately after the nominal.

Adverbials were classified according to their relationship with other word classes (adjectivals and verbals) and to other adverbials. Remarkable similarity occurred between the subsets that were adjunct to adjectivals and verbals, but the subset that was adjunct to other adverbials was quite limited. A fourth small set was granted privilege only after the verb(al); furthermore, the members of this set had such close relationship with the verb(al) that a complement was considered to be the object of the phrase (composed of verbal and adverbial).

There were two other word classes which were based on syntactic considerations only, since they lacked inflection or, having inflections belonging to other sets, they were granted privilege of occurring in the same frames as the noninflected members. The prepositionals were a closed set of forty-one members composed of both words and phrases.

Finally there was a set of conjunctivals which was further divided into three sets: subordinating, coordinating, and transitional. The first set was particularly interesting in that a system of correlative constructions of the type when . . . then functioned so as to suggest strongly that the structural import of the adverbial occurring before the main clause was to signal that the dependent clause occurred initially. The pattern of the system was strengthened by the fact that the subset of conjunctivals not having correlative construction occurred finally. That the occurrences were not invariable (but still obvious enough to be easily detected once the correlative constructions were isolated) suggests that the system may have been breaking down in Elyot's
Modern grammars often point to the existence of the correlative construction without explaining any possible structural significance.

Analysis of coordinating constructions departed notably from traditional grammar in its inclusion of those sentences which have comparisons after *than* and *as* and which are commonly treated as exhibiting ellipsis. Although the entire subject of ellipsis has been reopened in a significant way by linguists interested in transformational generative grammar, it is still under question in a constituent analysis. Therefore, it was gratifying to find that the analytical method not only provided a means of examining the phenomenon so as to avoid conjecture as to what constructions were not present, but also threw new light upon the nature of the overt construction. The entire matter of constructions after *than* and *as* was found to be extremely complex and suggested a fertile area for further detailed studies of both a synchronic and historical nature.\(^1\)

Otherwise, coordinating conjunctivals were analyzed within the framework of their correlative constructions and were found to have changed very little since Elyot's time except for a shift from the correlative *as well... as* to ModE phrasal *as well as*.

Transitional conjunctivals were a diffuse and difficult set. Very few satisfactorily concise statements could be made beyond a listing of forms which were prone to occur initially and between independent clauses. It is likely that this word class will continue to be difficult of analysis until more studies in depth have been made of sentences as

\(^1\)One important contribution to the study has been made by R. B. Lees, whose analytical method is transformation generative grammar: "Grammatical Analysis of the English Comparative Construction," *Word*, XVII (August, 1961), 171-85.
they relate to each other. The question, too, of the definition of sentence is pertinent, as well as the relationship that graphemic representations of sentences containing two or more independent clauses have to the phonological representations, and vice versa. Concise statements of those transitional forms that introduce independent clauses must await more concise statements of what constitutes grammatical independence.

Need for Further Study

The text analyzed was replete with points of significance to anyone having linguistic interests in the English of the sixteenth century: dialect, lexicon, orthographical clues to phonology, syntax on a level higher than that examined in the present analysis. However, within the framework of the analysis presented in this paper, there were two areas that were particularly inviting for further study.

One characteristic feature of the analytical method as proposed by Trager and Smith is their insistence upon the necessity for beginning an analysis at the phonological level and their use of resultant suprasegmental information in syntactic determination (for example, the familiar Long-Island-is-a-long-island analysis). Without any intent of disbelief, the present study was undertaken in a manner that simply ignored the step of phonological analysis. At the time it was assumed that graphemic clues such as punctuation would supply the needed information. Such was not the case. In fact, there were times when punctuation had to be deliberately overlooked. There were few places, however, where the analyst was conscious of a need for phonological information to aid in syntactic description. The most pressing of these places was in the description of coordination of a series of structures, interestingly, the one place where English cannot be termed binary.
The point is made not to deny the validity of, even necessity for, a phonological analysis as a first step, but to suggest that whatever success the analyst achieved was due to the unconscious use of her own ModE intonation patterns on Elyot's sixteenth century English. That it could be done implies that the intonation patterns have changed very little in the intervening centuries. It seems that the hypothesis could be tested at those points where there have been syntactic changes. For example, ModE permits an adverbial that is attached to a verb to occur either before or after the direct object if it is a noun, but only after the object if it is a pronoun (burn it down). The stress patterns, furthermore, are distinctive. Elyot's language permitted the adverbial to occur either before or after the pronoun. By using current comparative methods, further knowledge of how intonation worked in earlier forms of English could conceivably be tested, and valuable information about the suprasegmental system of the language at an earlier period be gained.

A second direction that further study could take is toward analysis of various structural signals that have had too little emphasis placed upon them. In the analysis of sixteenth century English, the meager inflectional information on adjunctival word classes was distressing until attention was drawn to the wealth of information that was being given by the very few inflectional forms that occurred in certain positions that appeared crucial to the analysis. As it turned out, the amount of information was in inverse proportion to the number of forms, moche/more/most being of greatest importance.

One of the most gratifying findings was the fact that the few inflectional forms used to signal adjunctivals were a likely source for
the traditional emphasis on semantic aspects, especially of time, place, and degree. The whole subject of signalling structural information by use of function words is open to fresh approaches. A great deal of work has been done with pronouns, for example, but very little with certain function words as they relate to clause structure. As suggested earlier, a re-examination of all correlative constructions in relation to their output of structural information would be profitable.

The study presented here demonstrates that modern linguistic methods can be advantageously employed in analysis of older periods of languages. Re-examination of these periods are of particular value in pointing up structural details of syntax that were overlooked by the grammarians working in the scholarly tradition, whose work, notwithstanding, commands the respect of modern analysts for its comprehensiveness and wealth of statements that depart relatively little from a description employing a stricter methodology than was used by earlier grammarians. Nevertheless, the departures are claimed to be of importance in clarifying the syntactic system of early sixteenth century English as represented by the language of Sir Thomas Elyot in *The Castel of Helth*. 
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