

LMEC 6: BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

Plenaries

Anne Curzan (University of Michigan)

Revisiting the “External”/“Internal” Division

The internal-external binary, which underlies the theme of this conference, surfaces in key works in sociolinguistics and in the history of English. In discussions of language change, internal factors include those considered inherent to the system or structure of a language, such as phonological symmetry, grammaticalization, or ease of articulation. External factors bring in the lived experiences of a language’s speakers, who may come into contact with speakers of another language or new phenomena that require changes to the language. In framing the history of English, influential textbooks such as C. M. Millward’s *A Biography of the English Language* structure the story around the language’s “outer history” and “inner history,” which suggests that there are changes in language that are not affected by the lived experiences of speakers or at least by the “external forces” in their lives. This talk examines various approaches to the distinction (e.g., Brinton and Traugott 2005; Crowley and Bower 2010; Jones and Esch 2002; Labov 1994, 2001, 2010; Milroy 2003; Yang 2002) and the ways in which these approaches frame the relevance of speakers’ cognition, beliefs, and lived experiences to language change. In telling the history of English, the external-internal distinction may encourage us to weigh differently historical “events” and the day-to-day happenings in speakers’ lives. In the volume *A Companion to the History of the English Language* (2008), Haruko Momma and Michael Matto propose a “feedback loop” between language and its environment, which provides one useful alternate model. To conclude, this talk evaluates the benefits and challenges, in more integrated models of language change, of (a) embracing both internal and external factors, and/or (b) forgoing the internal-external distinction as a heuristic.

References

- Brinton, Laurel J. and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crowley, Tony and Claire Bower. 2010. *An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. 4th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Mari C. and Edith Esch (eds.). 2002. *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-linguistic Factors*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Language Change, Volume 1: Internal Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of Language Change, Volume 2: Social Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William. 2010. *Principles of Language Change, Volume 3: Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical Linguistics and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Millward, C. M., and Mary Hayes. 2012. *A Biography of the English Language*. 3rd edn. (1st edn, 1989; 2nd edn., 1996.) Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

- Milroy, James. 2003. "On the Discourse of Historical Linguistics: Language-internal Explanation and Language Ideologies". *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 39(4), 357–370.
- Momma, Haruko and Michael Matto. 2008. "History, English, Language: Studying HEL Today". In: Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the English Language*. London: Blackwell, 3–10.
- Yang, Charles D. 2000. "Internal and External Forces in Language Change". *Language Variation and Change* 12, 231–250.

Hendrik De Smet (KU Leuven)

The Modal Mystery – a Quixotic Approach

Starting in the Modern period, English has seen the rise of semi-modals like *be going to*, *have (got) to* and *want to*. At the same time, and especially in the last one-and-a-half century or so, English has seen a concomitant decline in the use of core modals, such as *shall*, *must* and *will*. While this looks like a trade-off, with one set of grammatical operators replacing another, analysts have been puzzled by the fact the changes do not in fact match in time and scale (see particularly Leech et al. 2009). The decline in the core modals is both too late and too massive to be neatly accounted for by the increase in the semi-modals.

In fact, in order to properly understand the relation between the two developments, there are two problems that need to be addressed. First, there is a *semasiological* problem. Better insight is needed into the degree of semantic overlap between the core modals and the semi-modals. It is not obvious that the semi-modals are synonymous to any specific core modals, yet approximate synonymy would be a prerequisite to assuming that one type of expression could have been replacing the other. Second, there is also an *onomasiological* problem. We do not know the full range of modal expressions that speakers of English have or had at their disposal. Modal meanings can be expressed by a variety of means, in addition to the semi-modals and core modals. This means that changes in the semi-modals do not necessarily affect the core modals or vice versa. There may be other affected parties as well.

To confront these challenges, a new approach is proposed here. A small corpus has been compiled consisting of three English translations of Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, one representing Early Modern English, one representing Late Modern English and one representing Present-day English. Because these are translations of the same source text, meaning can be kept constant. This way, it is possible to assess the degree to which one form actually replaced another (addressing the semasiological problem), as well as what range of forms writers had available at a given time (addressing the onomasiological problem).

The corpus is used to study the rise of two semi-modals, namely *have to* and *want to* in relation to their main core modal competitors *must* and *will*. It is argued that the two semi-modals initially developed outside the semasiological range of the two core modals, which they only began to replace once their grammaticalization was well-advanced. At the same time, it is argued that declines in the affected core modals were only to a limited extent due to competition with the semi-modals. The main explanation of the decline of the core modals seems to be that they developed new meanings and retracted from older semantic domains as a result, leaving "gaps" that were initially occupied by lexical expressions.

References

Leech, G., M. Hundt, C. Mair and N. Smith. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patrick Honeybone (University of Edinburgh)

Internal and External Factors in Phonological History: Either/Or or Both?

Changes in the phonological history of a language are typically seen as having either internal/endogenous or external/exogenous causation. For any novel phonological feature which was not present in an earlier stage of a variety, it is often asked: did the initial innovation that led to the new pattern emerge spontaneously from within the variety's phonology (due to system-internal pressures, the phonologisation of phonetic biases, or the realisation of pathways allowed by constraints on phonological representations), or was it imposed on a variety from without? This issue is clearly important if we want to understand the phonological history of a language (such as Late Modern English), and it is also important in general historical phonology – it has been claimed that exogeny can cause changes that are impossible in endogeny, but in order for this to hold true, we must be able to clearly recognise the difference. In this talk, I argue that – while the distinction between endogeny and exogeny does indeed describe two very different kinds of thing – it can also be oversimplistic to expect any one phonological pattern to simply have either an internal or external cause.

I focus on the phonological history of Liverpool English. Despite the now universal appreciation of non-standard dialects, histories of Late Modern English often focus on what can be worked out from written evidence (either indirect evidence from spellings or rhymes or the like, or direct evidence from comments on pronunciation or early phonological transcriptions). While this has allowed for spectacular insights into a range of developments that occurred during the period, it is not that helpful for the history of many varieties of English that were developing during the period but have not left much written evidence. Many new dialects formed due to the large population movements that were seen during the Late Modern period, and Liverpool English is one of these. I argue that we can reconstruct aspects of the history of these varieties by identifying characteristic phonological features in modern phonological material, and by (i) searching for potential exogenous seeds for these features in the varieties that came together to form them, and by (ii) opposing this with established endogenous possibilities in historical phonology. I focus on two features which are clearly characteristic of Liverpool English: “Liverpool lenition”, which affects the realisation of underlying stops, and the patterns of realisation in diphthongs.

Regular Papers

Lieselotte Anderwald (University of Kiel)

The Myth of AmE *Gotten* as a Historical Retention

In this talk, I will trace variation in the past participle of GET in some more detail over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There is a well-known British-American difference today: AmE prefers the past participle *gotten* in dynamic contexts (e.g. *she has gotten a letter*), whereas in BrE, the past participle *got* serves both stative (*I have got a letter ~ I have a letter*) and dynamic senses (*I have got a letter ~ I have received a letter*). Although the pervasive idea that AmE in this case simply retains a historical form which was lost only in BrE has already been disproved by historical corpus studies (Hundt 2009), this has not pervaded public discourse (e.g. most recently Gowers 2016). In fact, the conviction that AmE is the more conservative variety in many respects is surprisingly strong even in linguistic publications today (Schreier 2016). I will investigate in some more detail where and when this myth originates, and how it has become linked to the verb form *gotten* in particular. In order to do so, I will look at corpus data (drawing mainly on COHA), prescriptive grammar writers of the time, nineteenth-century publications on Americanisms, and the wider public discourse on American English. These sources show that the revival of *gotten* was a nineteenth-century development, but that it was not linked to the idea of it being a specific American form until the turn of the century. Once this link was established, however, it seems to have fuelled the rise of *gotten* further. The concept of *gotten* as indexing AmE linguistic conservatism is thus indeed a myth (if a powerful one).

References

- Davies, Mark. 2010–. The Corpus of Historical American English: 400 Million Words, 1810–2009. Available online at <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/>.
- Gowers, Rebecca. 2016. *Horrible Words: A Guide to the Misuse of English*. [no place]: Penguin.
- Hundt, Marianne. 2009. “Colonial Lag, Colonial Innovation or Simply Language Change?”. In: Günter Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter (eds.), *One Language – Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 13–37.
- Schreier, Daniel. 2016. Reconstructing Variation and Change in English: The Importance of Dialect Isolates. Plenary talk at ICEHL 19, Essen, August 2016.

Julia Bacskai-Atkari (University of Potsdam)

Changes Affecting Relative Clauses in Late Modern English and Equative Complementisers as Relativisers

My talk presents the results of a corpus study comparing elements introducing relative clauses in the King James Bible (1611) and the New King James version (1989), with a special focus on subject relative clauses involving a human subject. The differences indicate general changes in relative clauses that occurred during the Late Modern English period (Herrmann 2005; Kortmann & Wagner 2007): for instance, in Early Modern English *which* was available for human subjects, *that*-relatives had a higher proportion, and *as* could introduce relative clauses as a complementiser. I will

show that the changes leading to the disappearance or the reduction of alternative forms to *who* were driven both by internal and by external factors. Regarding external factors, the effect of prescriptive pressure and normalisation must be considered; however, while the New King James version reflects the changes affecting the standard variety, non-standard varieties do in fact preserve all of the Early Modern English options (see Kortmann & Wagner 2007). The reduction of these forms to regional dialects had a backward effect on the establishment of the norm: since the forms in question are available to different degrees in the various dialects, they could not compete with regionally unbound patterns. Regarding internal factors, I examine the particular case of *as* in relative clauses: the corpus study shows that this pattern was available in constructions that are syntactically free relatives, whereby the *as*-clause is taken by an equative element (*such*) in the matrix clause, and the construction expresses an equation relation between two individuals. Given the presence of the equation relation, this construction was not available for all kinds of relative clauses; however, the more general pattern involving *wh*-pronouns (and *that*-relatives) was able to replace the more specific structure.

References

- Herrmann, Tanja. 2005. "Relative Clauses in English Dialects of the British Isles". In: Kortmann et al. (eds.), *A Comparative Grammar of British English Dialects: Agreement, Gender, Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, Bernd and Susanne Wagner. 2007. "A Fresh Look at Late Modern English Dialect Syntax". In: Javier Pérez-Guerra (ed.), *Of Varying Language and Opposing Creed: New Insights into Late Modern English*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Ulrich Busse (Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg)

"Divided by a Common Language"? The Treatment of "Americanism" in Late-Modern English Dictionaries on Both Sides of the Atlantic

In the Late Modern Period, and especially during the 19th century, English grew much faster than other European languages. The second American President, John Adams (1797–1801), prophesied as early as 1780 that English would become the next global language due to the increase and the impact of the American population.

Yet it has been maintained that during the 19th century British English [BrE] and American English [AmE] were far apart from each other, not only in geographical terms. My comparison (see Busse 2015) of two 19th-century usage guides has revealed that AmE is viewed either self-consciously (by White) or presumptuously as a factor of language decay (by Alford). In the planned paper this snapshot view will be put on a broader basis.

The objective of the present paper is to compare the treatment of the term "Americanism" in British and American 18th, 19th, and early 20th-century dictionaries, in order to work out whether the paraphrase or the labelling conveys a positive or a negative stance, and if so, whether this practice changes over time and gives way to an unmarked and unbiased description.

The study combines two methodological approaches, namely socio-lexicography and meta-pragmatics. Regarding the first, John Algeo in his survey of American lexicography put the relationship between lexicography and society in this way: "Dictionaries, in both their content and their technique of making, mirror the society whose language they record. [...] [D]ictionaries tell about the people who make and use them" (1990: 2006).

Secondly, the term “Americanism” can be regarded as a keyword or a focaliser of Anglo-American linguistic relations and sentiment in the Late Modern Period. By investigating it as a meta-communicative lexeme “cultural models of communication rooted in particular practices of socio-culturally defined people” (Hübler & Busse 2012: 8) can be disclosed.

The expected results of this combined approach could give some indication of whether the “two nations [were] divided by the same language” (Milroy 2001) or not.

References

- Algeo, John (1990). *Wörterbücher, Dictionaries, Dictionnaires: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography* (HSK 5.2). Berlin: de Gruyter, vol. 2, 1987–2009.
- Busse, Ulrich. 2015. “Transatlantic Perspectives on Late Nineteenth-century English Usage: Alford (1864) Compared to White (1871)”. In: Marina Dossena (ed.), *Transatlantic Perspectives on Late Modern English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 73–93.
- Hübler, Axel and Ulrich Busse. 2012. “Introduction”. In: Ulrich Busse and Axel Hübler (eds.), *Investigations into the Meta-communicative Lexicon of English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–16.
- Milroy, Lesley. 2001. “Britain and the United States: Two Nations Divided by the Same Language?”. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 10(1), 56–89.

Nuria Calvo Cortés (Universidad Complutense Madrid)

Women Writers at the End of the Long 18th Century: The Semantics of Motion in Their Choice of Perfect Auxiliaries

Towards the end of the 18th century ‘have’ was already the preferred verb to create perfect tenses. However, ‘be’ continued to be present particularly in combination with some verbs (e.g. *gone, become*). By and large, women tended to be more conservative than men and preferred to use ‘be’ (Rydén and Brorström 1987; Kytö 1997). The present study aims at analysing perfect structures with some verbs that semantically encode an idea of motion, either physical or metaphorical (e.g. *gone, come, arrive, depart, return, fall, run, grown and become*) in a corpus of novels written by four women who were all born in the second half of the 18th century, Radcliffe, Inchbald, Burney and Wollstonecraft. Two questions that are connected arise in this analysis; first, whether the women were actually conservative in their use of these auxiliaries; and second, whether the semantics of motion situations conditioned their choice of the auxiliary.

There are different elements that participate in motion situations (Talmy 2000). They include the Figure that moves, the Ground where it moves to, and the Path followed. These elements may or may not be present in the syntactic representation of the motion event. In addition, some motion verbs may lexicalize some of these elements (e.g. ‘enter’ lexicalizes Path), and some may include other semantic meanings such as the beginning or the end of the motion (e.g. *depart, arrive*).

The study will conclude that these writers may have been influenced by the semantics of motion situations in their choice of auxiliaries, as they seem to appear in the same specific contexts systematically. Nevertheless, a comparison with male contemporary writers of the studied authoresses will prove essential in complementing this analysis.

References

- Kytö, Merja. 1997. “*Be/Have + Past Participle: The Choice of Auxiliary with Intransitives from Late Middle to Modern English*”. In: Matti Rissanen, Merja Kytö and Kirsi Heikkonen (eds.), *English in Transition: Corpus-based Studies in Linguistic Variation and Genre Styles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rydén, Mats and Sverker Brorström. 1987. *The Be/Have Variation with Intransitives in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Claudia Claridge (University of Augsburg), Ewa Jonsson (Uppsala University and Mid Sweden University) and Merja Kytö (Uppsala University)

“I found it somewhat untidy”: The Socio-pragmatics of Downtoners in the Old Bailey Corpus

Intensifiers are usually taken to comprise amplifiers (e.g. *perfect(ly)*, *very*) marking a high degree of the scale, and downtoners (e.g. *partly*, *scarcely*) marking a low degree of the scale. Despite the growing body of research on intensifiers (e.g. Bolinger 1972, Peters 1993, Méndez-Naya 2008), only relatively little is known about their development in Late Modern English and this is especially true of downtoners. Of special interest are speech-related genres, as intensifiers have been shown to occur particularly in speech in Present-day English (Paradis 2008: 321; Biber et al 1999). For our data, we will turn to the Old Bailey Corpus (OBC 2.0), which includes ca. 24 million words, from 1720 to 1913. Owing to lack of audiorecorded data and speech-based data in general from the period, these records provide an opportunity to approach the speech of the period albeit via writing and a fairly formal setting.

We will investigate downtoners, a category of intensifiers comprising diminishers and minimizers. The following items are represented in the material in modest to substantial numbers: *slight(ly)*, *mild(ly)*, *partial(ly)*, *part(ly)*, *somewhat*, *least*, *faint(ly)*, *thin(ly)*, *light(ly)*, *sparing(ly)*, *moderate(ly)*, *bare(ly)*, *hard(ly)*, *scarce(ly)*, *scant(ly/ily)* – as well as *quite* and *little*, which will be disregarded here due to the former’s multifunctionality and the latter’s high frequency (to be treated in a separate study). In terms of methodology, our approach draws on principles of corpus linguistics, historical pragmatics and historical sociolinguistics and aims at both quantitative and qualitative insights.

We seek to answer the following research questions:

- Which of the downtoner forms gain ground and which forms are on their way out?
- What are the targets that speakers in the courtroom modify by using downtoners (verbs, adjectives, or adverbs)? What effects are conveyed by these uses (hedging, vagueness, precision etc.)?
- How restricted/formulaic or flexible are individual downtoner types, both with regard to forms and to co-occurrences? Are there specific collocational preferences and do these change over time?
- What are the distributions of the forms across various types of speakers with regard to speakers’ social (e.g. gender and rank) and functional (e.g. judge, witness) roles? Which are the most innovative/conservative types of users in sociolinguistic respects?

Comparisons will also be drawn to the results of our previous work on amplifiers. Our findings can be expected to reveal new information on the pragmatics of intensifiers

and their distributions across functional speaker roles over the important Late Modern English period.

References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *Degree Words*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Méndez-Naya, Belén (ed.). 2008. Special issue on English intensifiers: *English Language and Linguistics* 12(2).
- OBC = Old Bailey Corpus, available at <http://www.uni-giessen.de/oldbaileycorpus/>.
- Old Bailey Proceedings = The Proceedings of the Old Bailey, 1674–1913. Online: <http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/>.
- Paradis, Carita. 2008. Configurations, Construals and Change: Expressions of DEGREE. *English Language and Linguistics* 12(2), 317–343.
- Peters, Hans. 1993. *Die englischen Gradadverbien der Kategorie booster*. Tübingen: Narr.

David Denison (University of Manchester)

The Advance of *That*-clauses

Major grammars and dictionaries of contemporary standard English try to distinguish between factual and suasive verbs that can take plain *that*-clauses as complement, such as *accept*, *explain*, and those that can't, like *espouse*, *express*. In student writing and in journalism, an increasing number of verbs that previously occurred only with nominal object/complement, as in (1)–(2), occur more or less sporadically with a *that*-clause complement, as in (3) – examples here from BNC:

- 1) We can ignore the influence of higher-level systems.
- 2) Posters and manifestos ignored the fact that at least one in 20 of the population is black.
- 3) they conveniently ignored that the Indians had taught them how to cook local foods and prepare herbal medicines

Some cases can perhaps be written off as errors, but overall we are clearly witnessing an innovation that is spreading. Among several possible contributory factors (overuse of the thesaurus, prescriptive pressures, different subcategorization in the passive), the most obvious source is extension by analogy with verbs like *accept* that already have the option of taking either a nominal complement or a *that*-clause.

In this paper I will track developments of *that*-complementation for factual and suasive verbs in large present-day and historical corpora such as COCA, COHA and PPCMBE. I will give a quantitative account of whether or not the changes cluster in certain text types and will attempt to trace the spread of the new usage to individual verbs. Then I will address some wider problems raised by the phenomenon of this change in subcategorization: the border between error and change in admissible data; the assumption that speakers have a well-defined grammar and lexicon that either does or does not permit a particular verb to be used in a particular pattern; and the status of analogy as an explanatory principle in diachrony.

Marina Dossena (*Università degli Studi di Bergamo*)

“Sassenach”, eh? Late Modern Scottish English on the Borders of Time and Space

The origins of Highland English are generally associated with Late Modern times, when teaching Gaelic became illegal under the 1747 Act of Proscription (repealed in 1782), and therefore English became a more widespread means of communication, not least on account of the new roads that were built in the area and which facilitated travel – of troops first and of visitors later – and the circulation of printed materials. The fact that English was taught as a foreign language on the basis of supposedly Standard (i.e. Southern) English has led to the myth of Highland English being “better” than Scottish English on account of the lesser influence that Scots is supposed to have had on the language. However, this is an aspect worth investigating in greater depth, paying attention to both teaching materials and to teachers’ provenance. In addition, the same exotic quality that distanced Highland culture favoured its presence elsewhere, to the point that some Gaelic lexical items were actually recorded in Johnson’s Dictionary as early as 1755 (Dossena 2004). In later decades the greater ease of movement and the romanticization of the Highland landscape and culture contributed even more to the spread of Gaelic vocabulary outside Scotland, although this led in some cases to anachronistic labels, especially in literary accounts of the Jacobite rebellions (see Dossena, in preparation).

In this contribution I will focus on lexis in an attempt to see what mutual influences may be identified between Scottish English (where the contiguity with Scots is a well-known phenomenon) and its (carsic?) neighbour, i.e. Gaelic, at a time when language codification seems to have been pervasive, but in which the importance of popular culture does not seem to have been taken into sufficient account in most language histories. To this end, my analysis will rely both on dictionaries and on such materials as broadside ballads, letters and other manuscript sources.

References

- Dossena, Marina. 2004. “Scotticisms in Johnson’s Dictionary: A Lexicographer’s Perceptions of a Sociolinguistic Change in Progress”. In: E. Barisone, L. Maggioni & P. Tornaghi (eds.), *The History of English and the Dynamics of Power*. Alessandria: Dell’Orso, 137–153.
- Dossena, Marina. In preparation. The Prince and the Sassenach: Construing Group Homogeneity through Labels (and Anachronisms) in Late Modern Times and Beyond. Paper to be presented at the 2017 IPrA Conference in Belfast.

Anne Gardner (*University of Zurich*)

Inside the Writer’s Mind: Lady Mary Hamilton’s Draft Letters to Queen Charlotte (1781) and the Duchess of Portland (1783)

The eighteenth century was a period in which letter-writing manuals abounded and authors were expected, in more formal contexts, to send fair copies of their letters rather than spontaneously penned-down epistles which were marked by self-corrections (Auer 2008, Fairman 2008, Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2014). Draft letters offer a unique opportunity for studying the composition process of more formal letters through the self-corrections they contain, which also give insights into an author’s attempt at negotiating their position in the relationship to the addressee

while adhering to social etiquette and norms. Tieken-Boon van Ostade's analysis of a draft letter from Robert Lowth to William Warburton, for instance, shows that "Lowth's changes were not only of a linguistic nature but that they were also motivated by distinct pragmatic considerations, such as the desire to provide greater explicitness as well as the need to increase the distance with the addressee" (2008: 72).

The present paper focuses on two draft letters by Lady Mary Hamilton, one to Queen Charlotte (1781) in which Hamilton tries to resign from her position as governess in the royal household, and the second to the Duchess of Portland (1783) in which Hamilton expresses her gratitude after an extensive stay with the Duchess at her home at Bulstrode. Both draft letters reveal a concern for expressing the appropriate deference due to the addressees' social rank, which appears to have been especially challenging in the case of the Duchess, to whom Hamilton feels connected in friendship. These draft letters will be contrasted with other (diary) letters written by Hamilton in less formal contexts which show a greater freedom in expressing personal feelings and different motivations behind self-corrections.

References

- Auer, Anita. 2008. "The Letter ~~Which~~ That I Wrote': Self-corrections in Late Modern English Letters". In: Marina Dossena and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.), *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data*. Bern: Peter Lang, 213–234.
- Fairman, Tony. 2008. "Strike-throughs: What Textual Alterations Can Tell Us about Writers and Their Scripts, 1795–1835". In: Marina Dossena and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.), *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data*. Bern: Peter Lang, 193–212.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2008. "Letters as a Source for Reconstructing Social Networks: The Case of Robert Lowth". In: Marina Dossena and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.), *Studies in Late Modern English Correspondence: Methodology and Data*. Bern: Peter Lang, 51–76.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2014. *In Search of Jane Austen: The Language of the Letters*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Christer Geisler (Uppsala University)

Late Seventeenth-century Correspondence in English by Swedish Diplomats in London

This paper examines letters written in English by Swedish diplomats living in London in the late seventeenth century, and poses the following research question: To what extent was the syntax of these high-level second language learners influenced by their native Swedish? The paper will concentrate in particular on the area of relative marking. The manuscript sources, which are in the form of numerous letter drafts (in the Anglica Collection at the National Archives in Stockholm, see Tommos 1980), primarily deal with the losses of Swedish merchant ships to British privateers, and the texts are formulated as petitions to the King. Most of the letter drafts are signed by envoy Johan Leijonbergh (1625–1691).

Linguistic features of these petitions include the use of relative *who* referring to ships, and *that* referring to personal antecedents. In addition, the third personal singular present tense ending is frequently *-th* rather than *-s*. The letter drafts contain additions and corrections, indicating subsequent editing. As an interest in early

learner varieties is gaining ground, this manuscript material offers us a glimpse into the language and editing practices of Swedish diplomatic correspondence of the late 1600s.

References

Tommos, Sören. 1980. *The Diplomatic Collection in the Swedish National Archives*. Stockholm: Liber Förlaget.

Victorina Gonzalez-Diaz (University of Liverpool)

Intensificatory Repetition in English: A Diachronic Account

This paper focusses on what Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 561) call “intensificatory repetition” i.e. the juxtaposition of two tokens of the same adjective for emphatic purposes (e.g. *long long way*). Probably because of its low frequency in the language, the attention that intensificatory repetition has received is scarce and often centred on aspects of its PDE distribution. The present case-study adopts a corpus-based (PENN collection), diachronic standpoint to explore when and how it became established in the language.

The investigation confirms the existence of two intensificatory functional subtypes; namely, intensificatory affection (e.g. *poor poor you*) and intensificatory degree (e.g. *long long way*) and suggests that the affective subtype appeared first as a by-product of adding pragmatic force to formulaic terms of address in dialogic contexts (e.g. good[, good my lord]). Such force was iconically re-conceptualised as emphasis of degree, thus giving rise to the intensificatory degree subtype that has become (relatively) more frequent in PDE (e.g. [good [good my lord]] > [[good, good] friend]). More importantly in relation to the current Cfp, the data show that it is only in LModE that the intensificatory degree type develops into a construction and begins to compete with other intensifying structures (e.g. [ADV-ADJ_{DEG}] patterns as in [*very happy*] or clusters formed by two cognitive synonyms; e.g. [*great big*]).

Overall, the paper suggests that stable constructions such as fixed social formulae can evolve in usage and contribute to the development of productive constructions (intensificatory adjective repetition) and points to the 19th century as the period where the premodifying options of the NP string were structurally enlarged. Moreover, it shows the potential of dialogic contexts as sites for the development of new syntactic constructions (cf. Traugott 2010: 10).

References

Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, E. C. 2010. “Dialogic Contexts as Motivations for Syntactic Change”. In: A. Hamilton-Brehm and R. Cloutier (eds.), *Studies in the History of the English Language V: Variation and Change in English Grammar and Lexicon: Contemporary Approaches*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 11–27.

Peter Grund (University of Kansas)

From “Ludicrously Faintly” to “Warmingly, in a Modulated Voice”: Speech Description and Stance in Late Modern English

The dynamics of speech representation have recently received increasing interest among English historical linguists, and we are starting to patch together a picture of the varying forms and functions of speech representation in different periods of English (e.g., Moore 2011; Camiciotti 2007; Busse forthcoming; Walker and Grund forthcoming). However, while earlier studies have primarily focused on speech reporting expressions (e.g., *said*, *answered*) and the type of representation (esp. direct and indirect speech), I have shown that writers also have other means of representing a speech event, including adverbs such as *She replied briskly* and *He answered very hastily* (Grund forthcoming a and b). Such “speech descriptors” contribute significantly to the characterization of the speech and often reveal the writer’s/reporter’s attitude (or stance) to what was said.

This paper extends my earlier research on speech descriptors in Early Modern English to Late Modern English. Based on a Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET3.0), this paper focuses on speech descriptors in narrative fiction, a genre where speech representation is common and where there are thus many opportunities for descriptors to occur. As these descriptors take a number of different forms and therefore cannot easily be identified automatically, in this first step, I concentrate on descriptors that occur together with the reporting verb *say* (in various forms), which is the most common reporting expression in the corpus texts. I chart the frequency of speech descriptors over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, looking at their form (e.g., adverbs, prepositional phrases, etc.) and contextual functions (esp. in relation to stance). Preliminary findings indicate that there is a great deal of variation among individual texts and over time.

In addition to enhancing our understanding of speech representation in LModE, this paper also contributes more generally to the study of stability and change on levels beyond the grammatical and the syntactic, by considering variation in a pragmatic, textual feature.

References

Primary

A Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET3.0). 2013. Compiled by Hendrik De Smet, Hans-Jürgen Diller and Jukka Tyrkkö.

Secondary

Busse, Beatrix. Forthcoming. *Speech, Writing and Thought Presentation in 19th-Century Narrative Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Camiciotti, Gabriella Del Lungo. 2007. “Discoursal Aspects of the *Legends of Holy Women* by Osborn Bokenham”. In: Susan Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 285–305.

Grund, Peter J. Forthcoming a. “Description, Evaluation and Stance: Exploring the Forms and Functions of Speech Descriptors in Early Modern English”. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*.

Grund, Peter J. Forthcoming b. “Beyond Speech Representation: Describing Speech in Early Modern English”.

Moore, Colette. 2011. *Quoting Speech in Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, Terry and Peter J. Grund. Forthcoming. “ ‘Speaking Base Approbious Words’: Speech Representation in Early Modern English Witness Depositions”. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*.

Raymond Hickey (University of Duisburg and Essen)

Modelling the Development of English in Ireland and Scotland

The development of new varieties of language has been the subject of at least two major models with regard to forms of English which arose during the colonial period in overseas territories of England. These are (i) Peter Trudgill’s New Dialect Formation (NDF) model (Trudgill 2004, 2008; Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis & Maclagan 2000) and (ii) Edgar Schneider’s Dynamic Model (Schneider 2003, 2008). Trudgill’s model is deterministic in nature and sees the quantitative representation of features in early NDF as pivotal; it furthermore vigorously rejects the operation of sociolinguistic factors in this early phase. Schneider’s model does not share these standpoints but concentrates more on the swing away from an exonormative model towards an endonormative one. Both Trudgill’s and Schneider’s models are unidirectional, linear models which describe a progression of stages from the beginning of a variety to a later time, usually close to the present.

However, for locations close to Britain – within the geographical setting of the British Isles – neither the Trudgill nor the Schneider model account for the historical developments in any fully satisfactory manner. For the present paper the history of English in Ireland and Scotland will be reviewed. The periodisation of English in both these countries (Hickey 2007, Kopaczyk 2013) and critical assessments are reviewed. Then an alternative model for capturing generalisations concerning English in Ireland and Scotland is presented. This is the Diversification Model (Hickey 2016) which consists of four identifiable stages:

- 1) INITIATION: rise of varieties through internal development, transportation or language contact/shift
- 2) DIVERSIFICATION through social layering
- 3) CO-EXISTENCE of vernacular and supraregional varieties on a vertical scale
- 4) CONTINUATION – the phase in which the *relative equilibrium* of Phase 3 is broken by a number of possible developments, e.g. (i) the relationship between vernacular and supraregional varieties can become less obvious through developments in only one of these varieties leading to realignment or (ii) vernacular and supraregional varieties can merge with only one surviving, usually by the vernacular variety losing its most local features. In both these cases there can be a return to Phase 2 with renewed diversification later, i.e. one can have a *cyclic* process.

Key to this model is the operation of *sociolinguistic factors* and the *co-existence of several varieties* at any one time and place. The latter is realised through social layering which results in a vertical continuum at the bottom of which are the most vernacular forms of language and the top of which is the supraregional variety of the region or country in question. In the current paper the appropriateness of a model which handles co-existing varieties in single countries will be examined and the key notion of supraregionalisation will be used to account for the presence of vernacular and less locally bound varieties in both Ireland and Scotland.

References

- Hickey, Raymond. 2003. "How do Dialects Get the Features They Have? On the Process of New Dialect Formation". In: Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Motives for Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 213–239.
- Hickey, Raymond. 2007. *Irish English. History and Present-day Forms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hickey, Raymond. 2016. A Third Way for Variety Formation: The Diversification Model. Paper presented at the ISLE4 Conference, 18–21 September 2016, Poznan.
- Kopaczyk, Joanna. 2013. "Rethinking the Traditional Periodisation of the Scots Language". In: Janet Cruickshank and Robert McColl Millar (eds.), *After the Storm: Papers from the Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ulster Triennial Meeting, Aberdeen 2012*. Aberdeen: Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ireland, 233–260.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2003. "The Dynamics of New Englishes: From Identity Construction to Dialect Birth". *Language* 79(2), 233–281.
- Schneider, Edgar. 2007. *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2004. *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2008. "Colonial Dialect Contact in the History of European Languages: On the Irrelevance of Identity to New-dialect Formation". *Language in Society* 37(2), 241–254.
- Trudgill, Peter, Elizabeth Gordon, Gillian Lewis and Margaret Maclagan. 2000. "Determinism in New-dialect Formation and the Genesis of New Zealand English". *Journal of Linguistics* 36, 299–318.

Tomoharu Hirota (University of British Columbia)

From *Do*-less to *Do*: The Acquisition of *Do* Negation by *Have To*

From a diachronic perspective, the semi-modal *have to* has followed the general tendency towards *do* periphrasis in the English verb system, undergoing the changeover from *do*-less negation (*I have not to go*) to *do* negation (*I do not have to go*). Except for Krug's (2000: 103–106) brief treatment, however, there have yet to be diachronic quantitative studies on the change in question. This paper thus inquires about when and how *do* negation emerged with *have to* in American and British English.

Harnessing a number of historical corpora (see below), I will demonstrate that *do* negation of *have to* was established around the 1870s in American English and around the 1930s in British English, both of which occurred quite late, given the general timing of the regulation of *do* under negation (by around 1700; see Ellegård 1953: 162–163). For the development of *have to* towards *do* negation, Krug (2000: 106) adduces two factors: a) *do*-less negation with *have to* was infrequent and thus weakly entrenched, hence open to analogical leveling and b) as the bondedness between *have* and *to* increases, interpolation between the two becomes disfavored (*not* in this case). It will be seen, however, that these factors do not adequately account for the present data, especially the longer retention of *do*-less negation in British English. I will instead propose a constructional approach (e.g. Goldberg 2006; Traugott & Trousdale 2013) where the language user is hypothesized to have an abstraction over the semi-modal *have to* and the main verb *have*, and argue that the

abstraction plays a crucial role in elucidating 1) why *have to* adopted *do* negation at different historical points between the two varieties and 2) why *have to* could still accept *do*-less negation in Late Modern English, a negation strategy that became largely obsolescent by then.

Corpora

The Brown Family (extended). Available online at <http://cqpweb.lancs.ac.uk/>.

Alexander, Marc and Mark Davies. 2015-. Hansard Corpus 1803–2005. Available online at <http://www.hansard-corpus.org>.

Davies, Mark. 2010-. The Corpus of Historical American English: 400 million words, 1810–2009. Available online at <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/>.

De Smet, Hendrik, Hans-Jürgen Diller and Jukka Tyrkkö. 2011. The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, version 3.0.

References

Ellegård, Alvar. 1953. *The Auxiliary Do: The Establishment and Regulation of Its Use in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krug, Manfred. 2000. *Emerging English Modals: A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mikko Höglund (Stockholm University)

Adjective Complementation Patterns and Constructions in 19th Century British and American English

The present paper examines adjective complementation, and the aim is to observe the development of different complementation patterns in 19th century British and American English, mostly focusing on non-finite complementation. The data for the study is collected from the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET), the Corpus of Early American English Literature (CEAL), and the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA).

The objective of the present study is to chart quantitative changes in the occurrence of different complementation patterns of adjectives. It has been observed previously (e.g. Vosberg 2003, Rohdenburg 2006) that the English complementation system has gone through notable changes in recent centuries, and one of the goals here is to see whether this is seen in the adjective complementation patterns in the 19th century.

Pilot studies have shown that whereas in the early 19th century some adjectives occurred with several different complementation patterns, in the 20th century material there was much less variation. For instance, the adjective *necessary* used to occur somewhat frequently in three different constructions, all with *to* infinitive complements, (control, extraposition, and tough construction) in the early 19th century, but was only observed in one (extraposition) in the 20th century data. Based on this, it is hypothesized that at least a part of the complementation system has gone through some sort of standardization process in the 19th century.

A further aim of the present paper is to compare the development of adjective complementation in British and American English. Regarding American English, the

turn of the 19th century was a critical time for the formation of the new variety of English, and it has been observed that while there was a desire to establish a distinguishable language variety for the new nation, in many respects, however, the development of American English followed British English (see e.g. Rohdenburg and Schlüter 2009). Thus, this paper will investigate the relationship of the development of adjective complementation in the two varieties, BrE and AmE, and also how this may have been affected by the relevant socio-political circumstances in the 19th century in the US and UK.

References

- Rohdenburg, G. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System". In: C. Dalton-Puffer, D. Kastovsky, N. Ritt and H. Schendl (eds.), *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500–2000*. Bern: Peter Lang, 143–166.
- Rohdenburg, G. and J. Schlüter (eds.). 2009. *One Language, Two Grammars? Differences between British and American English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vosberg, U. 2003. "The Role of Extractions and Horror Aequi in the Evolution of *-ing* Complements in Modern English". In: G. Rohdenburg and B. Mondorf (eds.), *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 305–327.

Magnus Huber (University of Giessen)

Sociolinguistic Factors in the Rise of Gerundial Complements after Aspectual Verbs in Late Modern English

The ongoing replacement of the infinitive by gerunds in verbal complements in the recent history of English has led to non-categorical variation like *She started to walk ~ walking home*, with no (or as yet little) meaning differentiation.

A number of studies have explored the diachronic development of this "Great Complement Shift" (Rohdenburg 2006) since about the mid-1990s. Most of these are based on corpora of written texts and address internal factors in the restructuring of the English verbal complements (e.g. Cuyckens, D'hoedt and Szmrecsanyi 2014). The historical development of verb complementation in spoken English has not attracted much attention so far, nor have external factors.

This paper will address this situation by investigating the development of complements of verbs of inception (*begin, commence, start*), continuation (*continue*) and termination (*cease*) in speech-related Late Modern English texts and consider the role of sociolinguistic factors. Over 3,600 tokens were extracted from the Old Bailey Corpus 2.0 (Huber, Nissel and Puga 2016), a 24-million-word corpus of court proceedings from 1720–1913. Speaker gender and social class are known for 2,300 of these, enough for a variationist analysis over different subperiods.

Overall, gerundial complements rise from a mere 9% in 1720–1768 to 38% in 1866–1913, but with marked differences: while *begin* (4% > 30%) and *start* (0% > 72%) show an increase of gerundial complements, *cease* (100% > 11%), *commence* (100% > 51%) and *continue* (49% > 23%) exhibit a decrease. The lower classes lead in the introduction of the gerund by 9 percentage points. No significant differences can be detected when gender alone is considered, but a cross-tabulation with class reveals that in the lower social classes, men lead in the adoption of gerunds by 11 percentage points.

References

- Cuyckens, Hubert, Frauke D'hoedt and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. 2014. "Variability in Verb Complementation in Late Modern English: Finite vs. Non-finite patterns". In: Marianne Hundt (ed.), *Late Modern English Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 182–203.
- Huber, Magnus, Magnus Nissel and Karin Puga. 2016. Old Bailey Corpus 2.0, 1720–1913. <http://fedora.clarin-d.uni-saarland.de/oldbailey/>.
- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System". In: Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Nikolaus Ritt, Herbert Schendl and Dieter Kastovsky (eds.), *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500–2000*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 143–166.

Tohru Inoue (Seijo University) and Laurel J. Brinton (University of British Columbia)

A Far from Simple Matter Revisited: The Ongoing Grammaticalization of Far From

Lieberman (2003) discusses the syntactically "odd" *far from fulfils* as involving structural reanalysis of *be far from V-ing* with subsequent "lexicalization" of the adjective + preposition. Although rare in standard corpora, *far from V* examples in Google Books point to this construction's wide acceptance (see Beaver 2003).

This paper is a corpus-based, diachronic study of *far from* (see list of corpora below). In Present-day English *far from* belongs to a class of constructions (*close to*, *near to*, *next to*) which have undergone grammaticalization. Figurative meanings of *far from* (see OED, s.v. *far*, adv.) begin to occur in the 16th c. (cf. Akimoto 2001). The shift from BE *far from* NP (1a–b) to BE *far from* Adj (1c) represents grammaticalization of the adjective (*far*) plus preposition (*from*) construction into a coalesced downtoner in predicate position: *far from* comes to serve as a minimizer meaning '(not) to any extent' (Quirk et al. 1985: 597, 599).

- (1) a. There reuerence although in some respects superstitious, **was far from popish Idolatrie** (1580; EEBO)
b. we **are far from answering the will of God**, (1586; EEBO)
c. though their dealings with others, specially meaner men, **be far from honest or good** (1625; EEBO)

Whether (1c) represents a structural reanalysis of (1b) (see Kajita 1977; summarized in McCawley 1988) or not is explored on the basis of historical data.

BE *far from it* may be used metaphorically in the late 17th c. (2a), with the fully independent form appearing a century later (2b). The latter serves as a grammaticalized pragmatic marker meaning 'not at all true'.

- (2) a. so hypocrits haue the shewe of piety, but in truth are **far from it** (1598; EEBO)
b. What! is not my Sword as good as yours to the full? No really; **far from it** (1694; EEBO)

Late Modern English represents the penultimate stage in the grammaticalization of *far from*, in which its context of use spreads from predicate to attributive position (3):

(3) A pit in my chin has a **far from** disagreeable effect (1749; OED)

Contra Liberman (2003; also van Riemsdijk 2001: 21–28), the further extension of *far from* to the preverbal position (4a) can be seen as the final stage in its grammaticalization to adverbial status, growing out of the gerund construction (1b) and its use preverbally in the perfect (4b) or passive (4c) (cf. Inoue 2010):

- (4) a. He very **far from kissed** the hand; he held it just long enough to turn me around (1912; COHA)
b. his literary labors, for which previous education ... **had far from qualified** him (1847; COHA)
c. and this balance **is far from rectified** by the movement of the precious metals (1900; COHA)

Once fully grammaticalized as an adverb, it may be extended to the position before a prepositional phrase:

(5) At week's end, the flu (and the hangovers) were still **far from under control**. (1949; COHA)

Selected Corpora and Databases

The Corpus of English Novels (CEN). Compiled by Hendrik De Smit. See <https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/cen.htm>.

The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, version 3.0 (CLMET3.0). Created by Hendrik De Smet, Hans-Jürgen Diller, and Jukka Tyrkkö. See https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/clmet3_o.htm.

Davies, Mark. 2010–. The Corpus of Historical American English: 400 million words, 1810–2009 (COHA). Compiled by Mark Davies (Brigham Young University). <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/>.

Early English Books Online (EEBO). 2003–2015. Chadwyck-Healey. ProQuest LLC. See <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>.

Google Books. Advanced Search. Available online at http://www.google.ca/advanced_book_search.

References

- Akimoto, Minoji. 2001. “How Far Has *Far from* Become Grammaticalized?”. In: Laurel J. Brinton (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1999: Selected Papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9–13 August 1999*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–11.
- Beaver, David. 2003. “How Far from the Maddening Gerund (100KG)”. *Language Log*. 5 December 2003. <http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/000193.html>.
- Inoue, Tohru. 2010. “*far from* ku no goho o megutte” [On the Usage of *Far from*-phrases]. *Seijo English Monographs* No. 42, 299–340. The Graduate School of Literature, Seijo University.
- Kajita, Masaru. 1977. “Towards a Dynamic Model of Syntax”. *Studies in English Linguistics* 5, 44–66.

- Liberman, Mark. 2003. "Far from the Madding Gerund". *Language Log*. 5 December 2003. <http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/0019.html>.
- McCawley, James D. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Proffitt, Michael (ed.). 2000–. *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED). 3rd edn. online. Oxford: Oxford University Press. See <http://www.oed.com/>.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2001. "A Far from Simple Matter: Syntactic Reflexes of Syntax-pragmatics Misalignments". In: István Kenesei and Robert M. Harnish (eds.), *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse: A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21–41.

Yasuaki Ishizaki (Nanzan Junior College)

On the Historical Development of Constructions with Locative Alternation Verb: A Diachronic Construction Grammar Approach

There have been a growing number of discussions on how Construction Grammar (CG) explains language(s) (e.g., Goldberg (1995, 2006)). Basic tenets of CG are that language is an assembly of symbolic structures with form-meaning pairings, and they are linked to other constructions in hierarchical networks. More recently, several attempts have been made to explain diachronic construction changes (e.g., Traugott and Trousdale (2013), Barðal et al (2015)), but many of the major English constructions dealt with in CG have not been studied diachronically. The constructions that allow locative alternation, illustrated in (i), are cases in point.

- (i) a. John sprayed the wall with paint. (location-as-object variant)
 b. John sprayed paint onto the wall. (locatum-as-object variant)

It is well known that in the locative alternation verbs, *load* and *spray* in particular, can be employed in at least two syntactic environments. For example, (ia) and (ib) have the following syntactic frames, respectively.

- (ii) a. [NP_X V NP_Y (with NP_Z)]
 b. [NP_X V NP_Y dir(ection) PP_Z] (cf. Iwata 2008:37–38)

In this presentation, making use of late Modern English (LModE) data from the ARCHER corpus, the British Library's Nineteenth Century Collections, and Old Bailey Proceedings, three findings are presented: first, *load* and *spray* in the LModE period were used far more frequently as past participles than as verbs. Second, unlike *load*, which came to be employed in the syntactic slot of (iia) followed by that of (iib), *spray* as a finite verb was available both (iia) and (iib) in the early stage of development. Third, in both *load* and *spray*, (iia) were more frequent than (iib) throughout history. These facts suggest that, historically, (iia), which was associated with resultative meaning, is the prototype of the constructions with the two verbs, and (iib), which was associated with the caused motion meaning, was placed in constructional networks later.

References

- Barðal, Jóhanna, Elena Smirnova, Lotter Summerer and Spike Gildea. 2015. *Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iwata, Seizi. 2008. *Locative Alternation: A Lexical-constructional Approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and Constructional Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexander Lakaw (Linnaeus University)

Prescriptive Influences on Agreement with Collective Nouns in Early 20th-century American English

Agreement with collective nouns has received a great deal of attention in English corpus linguistics. Previous research (e.g. Levin 2001, Hundt 2006) has shown that present-day AmE strongly prefers singular agreement with collective nouns, as illustrated in (1). However, much less is known about this phenomenon in the LME period, in which collective nouns were “notoriously troublesome as to number, and there has been much fluctuation over time” (Denison 1998: 99). Lakaw (forthcoming) shows that the present-day preference for the singular was not yet established in 19th-century AmE, and that plural agreement (exemplified in (2)) was still frequently used. He furthermore suggests that the shift towards the singular must have occurred in the early 20th century.

- (1) The *army was* not in winter quarters now; it was in the field fighting, (COHA, 1913)
- (2) the *army have* gone into winter quarters (COHA, 1823)

This paper presents a study on the influence of prescriptivism on agreement with collective nouns in early 20th-century AmE. The agreement patterns of 20 collective nouns (e.g. *army, government, society*) were investigated in COHA, and the resulting shares of singular and plural agreement were correlated to prescriptive comments from a collection of American grammars, school books and style guides (drawn from publicly available sources, e.g. Google Books) from the same time period to examine their influence on the emerging agreement patterns. This method is based on Anderwald’s (2016) *quantitative grammaticography* and is here applied to explain the aforementioned synchronic variability and thereby to contribute to the study of the emergence of the main varieties of English.

Preliminary findings in 19th-century AmE grammars indicate that collective noun agreement was frequently commented on. Indeed, it turns out that variation in agreement was in fact promoted. However, the preference for singular agreement, which we can witness today, seems to be the result of changes in the stance of 20th-century American grammars towards this topic, as exemplified by Mason (1928: 303), who in his college grammar argues that “[o]rdinarily [...] a Collective noun requires a Singular verb”.

References

- Anderwald, L. 2016. *Language between Description and Prescription: Verbs and Verb Categories in Nineteenth-century Grammars of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Denison, D. 1998. "Syntax". In: S. Romaine (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language: 1776-1997*, Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92–329.
- Hundt, M. 2006. "The Committee Has/Have Decided ... On Concord Patterns with Collective Nouns in Inner and Outer Circle Varieties of English". *Journal of English Linguistics* 34(3), 206–232.
- Lakaw, A. Forthcoming. "Diachronic Shifts in Agreement Patterns of Collective Nouns in 19th-century American and British English". ICAME 36 conference proceedings.
- Levin, M. 2001. *Agreement with Collective Nouns in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Mason, L. 1928. *A College Grammar*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Elisabetta Lonati (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Stabilising Scientific Lexicon in 18th-century British Encyclopaedias and Specialised Dictionaries: Focus on Medical Terminology

The general aim of the research is to illustrate how scientific terminology was stabilising in 18th-century British encyclopaedias and specialised dictionaries. The specific purpose of the present contribution focuses on medical terminology: medicine represents a complex disciplinary area undergoing dramatic changes over the century, which essentially means necessary linguistic changes at various linguistic levels: orthography (lemmatisation and standardising spelling variants), lexicology (semantic load, that is specialisation vs. general usage), and lexicography (inclusion and internal organising strategies, encyclopaedic content, pragmatic issues).

The sources include the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1768–1771), and Rees's *Cyclopaedia, or An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* (1778–1788),¹ as regards universal encyclopaedias. James's *A Medicinal Dictionary* (1743–1745), Barrow's *A New Medicinal Dictionary* (1749), Motherby's *A New Medical Dictionary* (1775; and subsequent editions), and Hooper's *A Compendious Medical Dictionary* (1798), as regards specialised medical dictionaries. They are mainly addressed to a semi-professional readership and devoted to the recording, categorising, and organising of specialised material(s). Except for James's and Barrow's works, all the texts were published in the second half of the century: it is in this period that the attention on establishing accurate disciplinary terminology (form and meaning) becomes essential in professional settings.

The approach is mainly qualitative in nature: the analysis is carried out on a selection of medical terms representing macro-areas of interest in medical research and practice for the period considered (e.g. inflammatory diseases, infectious and contagious diseases, frequent epidemics, endemic diseases, etc.). Macro-areas themselves have been selected according to recurrent topics of interest in contemporary medical reference works (such as, for examples handbooks and

¹ Chambers's *Cyclopaedia* (1728, and subsequent editions), and Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755), will be relevant reference works for their role over the century.

compendia recording the most frequent diseases and affections), compiled by medical practitioners and/or physicians.

From a quantitative perspective, instead, specific sections in each dictionary will be analysed: particularly letters A, H, I/J, and P (to balance the number of terms included in different parts of the dictionaries, and systematically compare a relevant number of sample words). A first survey of the sections above mentioned highlights clear differences of inclusion between the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and Rees's *Cyclopaedia* on the one hand, and medical dictionaries on the other. However, some methodological similarities are also emphasised: the tendency to reduce the number of spelling variants (ex. Latin vs. English, or English vs. Latin), according to the nature of the work(s) under scrutiny (medical dictionaries vs. general encyclopaedias); or the tendency to focus on necessary and useful contemporary contents (starting from definitions), thus (de)limiting the inclusion of scholarly digressions within the single entries, and focussing on the specific topic expressed by the headword(s). This process of selection and reduction makes *form* and *content* (semantic and pragmatic load) come closer, and stabilise their relationship as a *disciplinary* one.

The fact that, towards the mid-century and later, reference works known as “scientific” dictionaries are more frequently compiled and published than in the past, suggests a new perspective on science as a whole, and medicine in particular. This means that disciplinary areas become professional areas whose boundaries are being more strictly defined: terminology is conceived as a distinctive professional mark.

Primary Sources

AAVV. (1768–)1771. *Encyclopaedia Britannica; or, a Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, Compiled upon a New Plan*. [...] Edinburgh.

Barrow, John. 1749. *Dictionarium Medicum Universale: Or, A New Medicinal Dictionary*. [...] London.

Chambers, Ephraim. 1728. *Cyclopaedia: Or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*. [...] London.

Chambers, Ephraim. 1741. *Cyclopaedia: Or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*. [...] London.

Hooper, R. 1798. *A Compendious Medical Dictionary*. [...] London.

James, R. 1743–1745. *A Medicinal Dictionary*. [...]. London. [3 vols.]

Motherby, G. 1775. *A New Medical Dictionary; Or, General Repository of Physic*. [...] London.

Rees, Abraham. 1778–1788. *Cyclopaedia: Or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*. [...] *By E. Chambers, F.R.S. With the Supplement, and Modern Improvements*. [...] London.

Secondary Sources

Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2010. “Examining Equivalence”. *International Journal of Lexicography* 23(4), 387–409.

Béjoint, Henri. 1994. *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Béjoint, Henri. 2010. *The Lexicography of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biber, Douglas and Susan Conrad. 2009. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canziani, Tatiana, Kim Serena Grego and Giovanni Iamartino (eds.). 2014. *Perspectives in Medical English*. Monza: Polimetrica International Scientific Publisher.

- Considine, John. 2008. *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Considine, John and Giovanni Iamartino (eds). 2007. *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in Historical Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cunningham, A. and Roger French (eds.). 1990. *The Medical Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fissel, Mary E. 1991. "The Disappearance of the Patient's Narrative and the Invention of Hospital Medicine". In: Roger French and Andrew Wear (eds.), 92–109.
- Jones, Claire. 2004. "Discourse Communities and Medical Texts". In: Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.), 23–36.
- Kafker, Frank A. (ed.). 1994a. *Notable Encyclopedias of the Late Eighteenth Century: Eleven Successors of the Encyclopédie*. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution.
- Kafker, Frank A. 1994b. "William Smellie's Edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica". In: Frank A. Kafker (ed.), 145–182.
- Kermas, Susan and Thomas Christiansen (eds.). 2013. *The Popularization of Specialized Discourse and Knowledge across Communities and Cultures*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Lane, Joan. 2001. *A Social History of Medicine. Health, Healing and Disease in England, 1750–1950*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lindemann, Mary. 2010. *Medicine and Society in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lonati, Elisabetta. 2013. "Health and Medicine in 18th-century England: A Sociolinguistic Approach". In: Susan Kermas and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), 101–128.
- Lonati, Elisabetta. 2014. "Medical Entries in 18th-century Encyclopaedias: The Lexicographic Construction of Knowledge". In: T. Canziani, K.S. Grego and G. Iamartino (eds.), 89–107.
- McConchie, R.W. 1997. *Lexicography and Physicke. The Record of Sixteenth-century English Medical Terminology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McConchie, Rod et al. (eds.). 2006. *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- McConchie, Rod, Alpo Honkapohja and Jukka Tyrrkö (eds.). 2009. *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- McConchie, Rod. 2009. " 'Propagating What the Ancients Taught and the Moderns Improved': The Sources of George Motherby's *A New Medical Dictionary; Or, a General Repository of Physic, 1775*". In: Rod McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja and Jukka Tyrrkö (eds.), 123–133.
- Pirohakul, T. and Patrick Wallis. 2014. "Medical Revolutions? The Growth of Medicine in England, 1660–1800". *Economic History Working Papers* 185, 1–46.
- Rieder, P. and Micheline Louis-Courvoisier. 2010. "Enlightened Physicians: Setting Out on an Elite Academic Career in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century". *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 84(4), 578–606.
- Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds). 2004. *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta (eds). 2011a. *Medical Writing in Early Modern English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Taavitsainen, Irma and Päivi Pahta. 2011b. "An Interdisciplinary Approach to Medical Writing in Early Modern English". In: Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.), 1–8.
- Taavitsainen, Irma, Andreas H. Jucker and Jukka Tuominen (eds). 2014. *Diachronic Corpus Pragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tyrrkö, Jukka. 2006. "Tokens, Signs, and Symptoms: Signifier Terms in Medical Texts from 1375 to 1725". In: Rod McConchie et al. (eds.).
- Yeo, Richard. 1991. "Reading Encyclopaedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730–1850". *Isis* 82(1), 24–49.
- Yeo, Richard. 1996. "Ephraim Chambers's Cyclopaedia (1728) and the Tradition of Commonplaces". *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57(1), 157–175.
- Yeo, Richard. 2001. *Encyclopaedic Visions. Scientific Dictionaries in Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1987. "Translational Equivalence in a Bilingual Dictionary: Bāhukośyam". *Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 9, 1–47. [Reprinted in Zgusta, Ladislav. 2006. *Lexicography Then and Now: Selected Essays*. Fredric F.M. Dolezal et al. (eds.). De Gruyter, 236–261.]

Ayumi Miura (Kansai Gaidai University)

What Should We Blame It On? Information Structure and Syntactic Change of *Blame* in the Nineteenth Century

In Present-day English *blame* is the only known verb which chooses *for* and *on* when the positions of the direct object and the prepositional object are switched (e.g. *Mira blamed Terry for the accident* vs *Mira blamed the accident on Terry*). This "blame alternation" (Levin 1993) has a relatively short history, with the *on*-construction emerging about five centuries after the *for*-construction (Miura 2016). The *OED* has the following as the earliest evidence for the *on*-construction and the sole example from the nineteenth century:

I call this bad management, and I blame it upon you. [1835 *Fraser's Mag.* 11 617]

What is blamed represents given information. Considering that the sentence actually ends with *you, Mr Francis Baring*, principles of information structure and syntactic weight may have resisted the *for*-construction (*I blame you, Mr. Francis Baring, for it*; Zwicky 2007). The *OED* quotations database suggests that, until the middle of the twentieth century, the *on*-construction continued to be restricted to the expression *blame it on X*, which is labelled in Alfred Ayers' *The Verbalist* (1881) as "a gross vulgarism which we sometimes hear from persons of considerable culture" (Lieberman 2007). In contrast, the evidence for *blame X for it* is limited to a couple of instances in the early eighteenth century.

However, such distinction between *for*- and *on*-constructions is slightly weakened by the nineteenth-century American English data in COHA, which include sporadic instances of the pattern *blame X for it* from the beginning of the century. Through a close analysis of the examples of the two constructions, this paper will explore the possibility that gradual reconsideration of the information structure of the *for*-construction was one of the conditioning factors for the rise and gradual

spread of the *on*-construction. The British English data from CLMET will also be used for comparison.

References

- CLMET = Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, version 3.1.
https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/downloads/clmet3_1.
- COHA = Corpus of Historical American English. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/>.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lieberman, Mark. 2007. "Blame It on Kipling". *Language Log*, posted on 26 December. <http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/005260.html>.
- Miura, Ayumi. 2016. "Historical Development of the Syntactic Patterns of *Blame*: An *OED*-based Study". *English Language and Linguistics* 20(2), 251–272.
- OED* = *Oxford English Dictionary*. <http://www.oed.com/>.
- Zwicky, Arnold. 2007. "Blameless". *Language Log*, posted on 30 December. <http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/005272.html>.

Fujio Nakamura (Aichi Prefectural University)

The Ascent and Demise of the Participial Progressive in Seventeenth- to Nineteenth-century English

The usage of the participial progressive, such as *being going*, which first appeared in Middle English, has been believed to be rare throughout the history of English (Jespersen 1931 [1970], Poutsma 1926 and Scheffer 1975). The reason for its rarity is ascribed to the unfavourable prosody of double *ing*-forms (Bolinger 1979). Contrariwise, Ross (1972) deals with the possibility of this usage in Present-day English, and Visser (1973) quotes 13 unambiguous examples collected from mid-sixteenth to early nineteenth centuries. After a deft summary of previous studies including Halliday (1980), Denison (1985) states that this usage appeared in eighteenth-century grammar books, and calls our attention to evidence from Late Modern English.

Recently, analysing 142 volumes of diaries and correspondence primarily written between 1600 and 1900 and paying attention to the order of the main clause and the *ing*-clause, Nakamura (2016) attempts to demonstrate that the participial progressive continued to be used in diaries and letters perhaps to convey dynamic connotations of the action in progress, plans or arrangements. Providing a large number of examples with participial *being* directly followed by Verb-*ing*, he reports that this usage could be used with great freedom at the time, even by men of the cloth (such as W. Nicolson and J. Woodforde) and the educated (including A. Charlett, Master of University College, Oxford, J. Evelyn, and S. Pepys).

In this present conference, the above linguistic facts will be reinforced through further analyses of ARCHER 3.2, CEECS, The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic Part, Lampeter and Newdigate, for clarification of the following points:

- a. What semantic function the participial progressive assumed;
- b. Who favoured this usage;
- c. In what chronological process this usage became obsolete;
- d. What differences this usage made from the simple Verb-*ing* form, and;
- e. Why this usage declined and disappeared.

References

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. "The Jingle Theory of Double-*ing*". In: David J. Allerton, Edward Carney and David Holdcroft (eds.), *Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis: A Festschrift for William Haas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 41–56.
- Denison, David. 1985. "Some Observations on 'Being Teaching' ". *Studia Neophilologica* 57, 157–159.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1980. "On Being Teaching". In: Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (eds.), *Studies in English Linguistics: For Randolph Quirk*. London and New York: Longman, 61–64.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1931 [1970]. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part IV. Rpt. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Nakamura, Fujio. 2016. *Unveiling "Rare" Usages in the History of English*. Tokyo: Eihōsha.
- Poutsma, Hendrik. 1926. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Part II, Section II. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Ross, John R. 1972. "Doubl-*ing*". *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 61-86.
- Scheffer, Johannes. 1975. *The Progressive in English*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Visser, Fredericus Th. 1973. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Part III, Second Half. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Minna Nevala and Arja Nurmi (University of Tampere)

Being Wilde: Representation of the Public Image of Oscar Wilde

Already in the nineteenth century the popular press had information contents which were often mixed with entertaining characteristics (Conboy 2010). The press generally used melodramatic fiction in presenting the darker sides of social life including rudimentary psychological analyses and a fascination with shocking detail (Conboy 2010; Mayr & Machin 2012). Newspapers feasted on such topics as the corruption of the upper classes and famous people. One such person, Oscar Wilde, was involved in two major trials during 1895 for sodomy and gross indecency, and as a consequence his representation in the media changed.

In this study, we have a particular focus on negative labelling: what are the negative attributes and descriptions associated with Wilde during and after the trial, and how was his public image changed. Negative labelling means creating and maintaining negative impressions by using labels which give a less favourable, and often false, image of the target. It can often be used as a strategy which denotes that "no normal person" will be able to do what "a fiend", like Wilde, has done. Such linguistic evaluation carries an element of judgment, since when expressing, for example, our reluctance to be associated with a particular person or group, we simultaneously assess the characteristics of them as negative (Martin and White 2005). We will also discuss the evidentiality of claims in the data: how much of the hearsay nature of the discussion is made clear and what kinds of topics are discussed as more alleged in terms of e.g. reporting verbs.

Our data is drawn from the *19th Century British Library Newspapers* and *The Times Archive*. We focus on mentions of Wilde in 1894–1896, in a wide variety of both rural and metropolitan British newspapers from the more scandalous to the more staid.

References

- Conboy, Martin. 2010. *The Language of Newspapers: Socio-historical Perspectives*. London: Continuum.
- Diamond, Michael. 2003. *Victorian Sensation, or the Spectacular, the Shocking and the Scandalous in Nineteenth-century Britain*. London: Anthem Press.
- Martin, James R. and Peter R.R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mayr, Andrea and David Machin. 2012. *The Language of Crime and Deviance: An Introduction to Critical Linguistic Analysis in Media and Popular Culture*. London: Continuum.

Ayumi Nonomiya (Seikei University)

The Two Types of *Ye* in Eighteenth-century Plays

This study focuses on the two different types of *ye* in eighteenth-century plays: *ye* [ji:] used as the “older” second person pronoun; *ye* [jə], which represents the shortened pronunciation of *you* (Nakayama 2014). I studied ten comedies and ten tragedies in the eighteenth century to investigate if the difference of genre affects the use of *ye*. The data of *ye* were collected electronically using electronic texts and WordSmith. The data were categorised according to the number and the case of *ye*. My previous studies (Nonomiya 2014, forthcoming) show that genre influences the use of second person singular pronouns YOU and THOU. Comedies, which usually feature contemporary British people, use the contemporary pronoun YOU most of the time (over 80% in average). Tragedies, in contrast, often employ the archaic pronoun THOU because of their grave style. This difference also seems to be observable in the use of *ye* in the two genres. In the comedies, *ye* is mostly used to represent the shortened pronunciation of *you* [jə], especially in the form *d’ye*. In the tragedies, in contrast, *ye* is often used as a nominative plural pronoun, especially as a vocative (e.g. “ye gods”). My study suggests that *ye*, along with THOU, has lost the original meaning and has been enregistered as a marker of archaic language, as seen in the present-day English (see Wales 1996: 76–77 for the change of the values of THOU). It should also be noted that the occurrences of *ye* (either as the archaic pronoun or as the shortened pronunciation of *you*) are much fewer than THOU (see Walker (2007) for the decrease of *ye* in the seventeenth and eighteenth century). This suggests that *ye* has lost popularity earlier and its use was much more limited than THOU.

References

- Nakayama, Masami. 2014. “The Complex Behavior of the Second Person Pronoun *Ye* in 19th-century English Novels”. *Studies in English Literature* 55, 95–115.
- Nonomiya, Ayumi. 2014. “THOU and YOU in Eighteenth-century English Plays”. *Token* 3, 211–234.
- Nonomiya, Ayumi. Forthcoming. *Second Person Pronouns in Eighteenth-century Dramas*. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield.
- Wales, Katie. 1996. *Personal Pronouns in Present-day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, Terry. 2007. *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eva Pettersson (Uppsala University), Gerold Schneider (University of Zurich) and Michael Percillier (University of Mannheim)

Spelling Normalisation of Late Modern English: A Comparison of VARD and Character-based Statistical Machine Translation

Mapping diachronic spelling variants to their PDE equivalents is required to search historical texts or to apply natural language processing like part-of-speech tagging or syntactic parsing. We compare and combine the rule-based spelling normalisation tool VARD2 (Baron and Rayson 2008) to a data-driven, probabilistic approach using character-based statistical machine translation (Pettersson et al. 2013). As application corpus, we use ARCHER, a genre-balanced English corpus (Biber et al. 1994). We apply spelling normalisation to texts from 1600 to 1849, and evaluate our approaches, based on 30 randomly selected, manually annotated documents, stratified by century. After assessing inter-annotator agreement, we address the following research questions:

1. How well do the approaches perform, measured by precision, recall, F1-score and total number of correct words?
2. Does a version of VARD2 re-trained on the period perform better than the standard settings? For this purpose, we have manually annotated 109 documents.
3. Does performance increase if only texts from the matching century are used?
4. What is the overall performance, and the performance by century?
5. Does the data-driven probabilistic approach of character-based statistical machine translation (SMT), which does not need the laborious creation of carefully tailored rules, achieve similar performance to VARD2?
6. Can VARD2 and SMT be combined to increase overall performance?

We show that the best single overall model, re-trained VARD2, allows us to reach above 99% correct words, at up to 97.5% precision. The best F1-score of 83.4% is achieved by combining a re-trained version of VARD2, SMT and a Levenshtein metric in an ensemble system. We also show that training by century typically achieves even better results.

We add a qualitative interpretation of the different approaches, discussing specific strengths and weaknesses of the individual approaches.

References

- Baron, Alistair and Paul Rayson. 2008. "VARD 2: A Tool for Dealing with Spelling Variation in Historical Corpora". In: *Proceedings of the Postgraduate Conference in Corpus Linguistics, Birmingham*. Aston University.
- Biber, Douglas, Edward Finegan, and Dwight Atkinson. 1994. "ARCHER and Its Challenges: Compiling and Exploring a Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers". In: Udo Fries, Peter Schneider and Gunnel Tottie (eds.), *Creating and Using English Language Corpora: Papers from the 14th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Zurich 1993*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1–13.
- Pettersson, Eva, Beáta Megyesi, and Joakim Nivre. 2014. "A Multilingual Evaluation of Three Spelling Normalisation Methods for Historical Text". In: *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities (LaTeCH) @ EACL 2014, Gothenburg, Sweden*, 32–41.

Rita Queiroz de Barros (University of Lisbon)

“Stamped with the Lexicographic Stamp”: A Case-study on the Treatment of Slang in OED1

Though resulting from an innovative notion of dictionary – conceived as an inventory of the language and not as a “domain of proper and normative usage” (Mugglestone 2005) – the first edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED1) is usually considered a natural product of Victorianism, with an unwanted but inescapable prescriptive bias (Brewer 2011). OED1’s attention to slang – that “free and easy ‘shirtsleeves’ essentially spoken language” (Partridge 1933) – is therefore assumed to be restricted to slang occurring in literature and in EModE glossaries (Greene 2005) and to display a proscriptive tone (Mugglestone 2005), which only the subsequent editions would temper (Gilliver 2016).

However, this perception of OED1 should be reexamined. Slang was the object of great interest in LModE, during which the heights of prescriptivism produced a class of what were felt as “deviant registers of the language” (Agha 2015), that speakers overtly criticised but were fascinated with (Hakala 2011). Such an interest – shown in coeval slang dictionaries (Coleman 2008), literature (e.g. Dickens’s novels) or press articles (e.g. Sala 1853) – was certainly shared by OED1’s editors, for whom slang, though not part of the common core, was an important piece in the English vocabulary (Murray 1884).

The aim of this paper is to investigate the inclusion and treatment of slang in OED1. For this purpose, I will present a case-study in which I check the consideration of c. 150 words explicitly labelled as slang and asked to be “stamped with the lexicographic stamp” in a press article published in 1853 (Sala 1853). Based upon a 1961 reprint of the first complete edition of OED1, this analysis confirms a stronger receptivity and tolerance to slang than claimed so far, allows for a reappraisal of the relevance of the different types of source texts of the dictionary and motivates a review of the controversial concept of slang both in LModE use and in the literature.

References

- Agha, Asif. 2015. “Tropes of Slang”. *Signs and Society* 3(2), 306–330.
- Brewer, Charlotte. 2011. “Johnson, Webster and the *Oxford English Dictionary*”. In: Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the English Language*. Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell, 113–122.
- Coleman, Julie. 2008. *A History of Cant and Slang Dictionaries: Volume III – 1859–1936*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilliver, Peter. 2016. *The Making of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greene, John. 2011. “Some Thoughts on Slang”. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 24, 153–171.
- Hakala, Taryn S. 2010. *Working Dialect: Nonstandard Voices in Victorian Literature*. PhD thesis presented to UMichigan.
<https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/78771>.
- Mugglestone, Lynda. 2005. *Lost for Words. The Hidden History of the Oxford English Dictionary*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Murray, James. 1884. “General Explanations”. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Part 1: A–Ant*. Oxford University Press, xvii–xxiv.
- Partridge, Eric. 1933. *Slang: To-day and Yesterday, with a Short Historical Sketch and Vocabularies of English, American and Australian Slang*. London: Routledge.

Sala, George Augustus. 1853. "Slang". *Household Words* VIII(183), 73–78.

Paul Rickman and Juhani Rudanko (University of Tampere)

Semantic Roles and Complement Selection: A Case Study with Evidence from COHA

Consider the examples in (1a–b), from COHA, the Corpus of Historical American English:

- (1) a. I am just plain scared to look at my own work. (1953, FIC)
b. ... a man who is scared of looking at a fireball. (1980, FIC)

In (1a) the adjective *scared* selects a *to* infinitive complement, and in (1b) the complement of *scared* is of the *of -ing* type, involving the preposition *of* and a gerund. Each type of complement is sentential, and it may be assumed that each also involves an understood subject. Taking into account that the adjective *scared* assigns a semantic role to its subject in each case, the complement constructions in question are of the subject control type.

When selected by the adjective *scared*, the *to* infinitive and *of -ing* constructions can be fairly similar in meaning, and the present paper investigates the use and meaning of each type and variation between the two in the last two centuries. A survey is given of the incidence of each type in each decade of COHA, with comments on *scared* from the point of view of the Great Complement Shift (Rohdenburg 2006). The study then turns to factors influencing the variation between the two types. Attention is paid to the Extraction Principle (Vosberg 2003) as a non-semantic factor, and some earlier work on semantic differences is reviewed, but the focus is on a new semantic principle to differentiate between *to* infinitives and gerunds. This is the Choice Principle (Rudanko 2017). The principle concerns the semantic role of the subject of a sentential complement, and establishes a connection between that subject and the type of complement on the basis of the agentivity of the subject in question. The paper investigates the applicability of the Choice Principle in the case of the adjective *scared* over several decades of COHA, and the implications of the principle for interpreting *to* infinitives and gerundial complements in Late Modern English.

References

- Rohdenburg, Günter. 2006. "The Role of Functional Constraints in the Evolution of the English Complementation System". In: C. Dalton-Puffer, D. Kastovsky, N. Ritt and H. Schendl (eds.), *Syntax, Style and Grammatical Norms: English from 1500–2000*. Bern: Peter Lang, 143–160.
- Rudanko, Juhani. 2017. *Infinitives and Gerunds in Recent English. Studies on Non-Finite Complements with Data from Large Corpora*. London: Palgrave Macmillan/Springer.
- Vosberg, Uwe. 2003. "The Role of Extractions and *Horror Aequi* in the Evolution of *-ing* Complements in Modern English". In: G. Rohdenburg and B. Mondorf (eds.), *Determinants of Grammatical Variation in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 305–327.

Patricia Ronan (University of Dortmund)

Triggers for the Use of Light Verbs versus Non-light Verbs in Late Modern English Correspondence

It is well-known that light verb constructions constitute a feature not only of Present Day English, but also of earlier periods of English (Brinton and Akimoto, eds. 1999, Akimoto 1999). These constructions fulfill a number of functions that centre around syntactic and pragmatic aspects of language use as described in Brinton (1996).

The current research aims to quantify these features in Late Modern English text and compare them to the use of corresponding simple verbs in the same corpus, as e.g.

1. ... & has **given** her my best **advice** as he wont [will not?] goe [go?] home, (1789, PRONI 9605322)
2. ... a letter from a friend in Philadelphia, in which he **advices** me to guard my countrymen against quitting their native country ... (1783, Linenhall 9407166)

By comparing light verb and simplex attestations, we will illustrate to what extent the semantic, pragmatic and syntactic features commonly identified as driving forces behind the use of light verb constructions are overrepresented relative to simple verbs, and to what extent they might thus be understood as triggers for the use of the light verb constructions.

As the genre of source texts influences the type of light verb constructions used (Kytö 1999), the data source is the late 18th century component of CORIECOR, the Corpus of Irish English Correspondence, based on letters written to and by immigrants to America (McCafferty and Amador Moreno 2012). They largely consist of texts by poorly educated writers, who arguably focused little on their writing style. Data have been extracted with broad AntConc searches for target verbs and been analysed manually.

The findings are expected to indicate that in comparison with simple verbs, the use of light verb constructions particularly exhibits transitivity changes as well as adjectival and further modification of the verb phrase.

References

- Akimoto, M. 1999. "Collocations and Idioms in Late Modern English". In: Brinton and Akimoto (eds.), 207–238.
- Brinton, L. 1996. "Attitudes towards Increasing Segmentalization: Complex and Phrasal Verbs in English". *Journal of English Linguistics* 24, 186–205.
- Brinton, L. and M. Akimoto (eds.). 1999. *Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Composite Predicates in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Kytö, M. 1999. "Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Verbs in Early Modern English". In: Brinton and Akimoto (eds.), 167–206.
- McCafferty, K. and C. P. Amador-Moreno. 2012. "A Corpus of Irish English Correspondence". In: B. Migge and M. Ní Chiosaáin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Irish English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 265–288.

Julia Schultz (University of Heidelberg)

From *Bonbon* to *Croquette*: 18th Century French Culinary Terms and Their Semantic Integration in English

French has long provided English with a multitude of culinary terms. As cuisine is an area where France excels, the influx of borrowings from this field is not surprising. In the 18th century, too, French has served English as the source of an essential number of lexical items illustrating the diversity of French cookery.

This paper will concentrate on the culinary terms adopted from French in the 18th century. The borrowings under review were collected from the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. According to the *OED* the term *cuisine* itself represents an 18th century French borrowing. The focus of the present study will be on the semantic integration of the various French-derived culinary terms. An essential objective is to find out whether a) a particular sense a borrowing adopts after being introduced into English has its origins in French (as a result of the continuing influence of French on English) or b) whether the relevant change in meaning is due to an internal sense development within English. To make a comparison between the meaning of a borrowing with that of its French associate, French dictionaries such as the *Trésor de la langue française*, the 48 volumes of *Datations et documents lexicographiques* and the Robert *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique* were consulted.

It will become clear that some of the French-derived cookery terms underwent a sense development after their assumption into English: a variety of semantic changes can be identified in the sample of *OED* items, including broadening, narrowing, metaphor, metonymy and amelioration. As will be seen, several borrowings show a new sense in corpora of recent usage such as the *British National Corpus* or newspaper articles compiled at *LexisNexis* which has not yet been documented in the unrevised edition of the *OED2*. Such a comprehensive analysis of the semantics of the 18th century French cuisine terms has not been made in this manner before.

References

- Bréal, M. 2005. *Essai de sémantique (science des significations)*. 3rd edn. Limoges: Editions Lambert-Lucas (2nd edn. 1897).
- Chirol, L. 1973. *Les "mots français" et le mythe de la France en anglais contemporain*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Imbs, P. and B. Quemada (eds.). 1971–1994. *Trésor de la langue française: Dictionnaire de la langue du XIXe et XXe siècle (1789–1960)*. 16 vols. Paris: Gallimard. Searchable online at <http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm>.
- Mackenzie, F. 1939. *Les relations de l'Angleterre et de la France d'après le vocabulaire*. 2 vols. Paris: Droz.
- Murray, J., H. Bradley, W. Craigie and C. T. Onions (eds.). 1884–1933. *The Oxford English Dictionary; Supplement (1972–86)*, ed. by R. Burchfield; 2nd edn. (1989), ed. by J. Simpson and E. Weiner.; Additions Series (1993–1997), ed. by J. Simpson, E. Weiner and M. Proffitt; 3rd edn. (in progress) *OED Online* (March 2000–), ed. by J. Simpson. Oxford.
- Quemada, B. and P. Rézeau (eds.). 1959–1965, 2nd series 1970–. *Datations et documents lexicographiques: Matériaux pour l'histoire du vocabulaire français*. Paris: Klincksieck. Searchable online at <http://atilf.atilf.fr/jykervei/ddl.htm>.
- Rey, A. (ed.). 2001. *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française: Les mots et les associations d'idées*. 3rd edn. Paris: Robert.

- Schultz, J. 2016. "The Semantic Development of Nineteenth-century French Cookery Terms in English: Tendencies of Borrowings Relating to Dishes, Desserts and Confectionary". *Journal of Language Contact – Evolution of Languages, Contact and Discourse* 9(3), 477–512.
- Stern, G. 1931. *Meaning and Change of Meaning*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (reprint 1975).
- Traugott, E. C. 2006. "Semantic Change: Bleaching, Strengthening, Narrowing, Extension". In: K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (xi). 2nd edn. Oxford: Elsevier, 124–131.
- Traugott, E. C. and R. B. Dasher. 2005. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (reprint 2007).

Polina Shvanyukova (University of Bergamo)

Frequency and Usage of Deontic and Epistemic Modal Structures in Nineteenth-century Letter-writing Guides

The paper focuses on a small corpus of model letters in four nineteenth-century letter-writing guides in English (Cann 1878, Cooke 1850 [1770], Penholder 1890, Sadler 1835/1854). The investigation aims to uncover patterns of usage and frequency of modal auxiliaries and other devices used to express modality. The underlying assumption of the study is that in model letters of the nineteenth century we find features associated with both prescriptive, and descriptive linguistic trends characteristic of that specific historical period. Hence the analysis seeks to shed light on the ways in which the use of modal verbs in sample letters reflected contemporary linguistic usage at the same time promoting and imposing particular normative linguistic solutions.

The unprecedented popularity of epistolary guides, attested by a sharp increase in the number of volumes published in that period, means that we have to deal with a highly diversified, heterogeneous group of texts. I will start by briefly introducing the main structural characteristics of the guides such as general organisation, division and distribution of model letters according to categories. In the main part of my talk I will present the data on the distribution of the central modal verbs and other devices such as fixed expressions (e.g. 'to be obliged to') and lexical modals (e.g. 'perhaps', 'possible', 'necessary') used to convey deontic or epistemic modal meaning. I will discuss my finding in the light of a range of contextual factors, on the micro- as well as macro-levels following Wood (2011) and in the light of previous studies investigating change in frequency and usage of modal verbs and structures in Late Modern English and Present Day English (Culpeper and Archer 2008, Denison 1993, 1998, Leech et al. 2012).

Primary Sources

- Cann, Theophilus C. 1878 *The Comprehensive Letter-writer; A Complete guide to English Correspondence, etc.* Florence: A. Bettini.
- Cooke, Thomas, Rev. A. B. 1850 [1770]. *The Universal Letter Writer; Or, New Art of Polite Correspondence, etc.* London: Milner and Company, Paternoster Row.
- Penholder. 1890. *Saxon's Everybody's Letter Writer Being a Complete Guide to Letter Writing, etc.* London: Saxon.
- Sadler, Percy. 1835/1854. *The Art of English Correspondence Being a Collection of Letters in Both Languages on All Familiar Subjects, etc.* Paris: Truchy's French and English Library.

Secondary Sources

- Culpeper, J. and D. Archer. 2008. "Requests and Directness in Early Modern English Trial Proceedings and Play Texts, 1640–1760". In: A. Jucker and I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Speech Acts in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 45–84.
- Denison, D. 1993. *English Historical Syntax. Verbal Constructions*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Denison, D. 1998. "Syntax". In: S. Romaine (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language: 1776–1997*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92–329.
- Leech, G. et al. 2012. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, J. L. 2011. "Structures and Expectations. A Systematic Analysis of Margaret Paston's Formulaic and Expressive Language". In: J. Culpeper (ed.), *Historical Sociopragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9–37.

Massimo Sturiale (University of Catania-Ragusa)

Late Modern Newspapers as a Mirror of Linguistic (In)Stability and Change

The aim of my paper is to highlight the role of nineteenth-century British and American newspapers in promoting and reinforcing a standard pronunciation ideology, already established in England back in the eighteenth century with the need for, in Swift's words, "correcting, improving and ascertaining the English tongue" (Swift 1712) and, as a consequence, reducing linguistic variation and instability. As I have shown elsewhere (Sturiale 2014 and 2016), the debate on pronunciation, at its outset in Britain, mainly involved lexicographers and orthoepists, but later, throughout the nineteenth century, newspapers – whose readers felt allowed or even entitled to have their say – made an outstanding contribution to the reinforcement of "false myths" which in the long run were to characterise prescriptive attitudes more on a social rather than on a mere linguistic scale (see, among others, Curzan 2014, Milroy and Milroy 1999, Mugglestone 2003, Percy 2012). In Britain, the fear of "linguistic instability" led to the social stigmatisation and marginalisation of certain, mainly "provincial" accents, and the consolidation of a linguistic, yet stereotypical, North-South divide (cf. Beal 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014). In the United States, also as a result of their much acclaimed linguistic independence from Britain, the prescriptivist debate was supported by linguistic patriotism (Sturiale 2012). So, whereas in Britain orthoepists, journalists and readers were busy condemning "vulgar English pronunciation" (*Cornwall Royal Gazette*, 3 November 1837), in the United States it was important to prove that "the Americans speak better English than you Britishers" (*The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 6 January 1884).

My data will be drawn from a corpus of almost three hundred nineteenth-century "letters to the editor" and newspaper articles dealing with issues of pronunciation, published both in Britain and the US. The focus of my paper, then, will be on external factors in linguistic stability and language change.

References

- Beal, Joan C. 2009. "Pronouncing Dictionaries – I. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries". In: A. P. Cowie (ed.), *The Oxford History of English Lexicography. Vol. II. Specialized Dictionaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 149–175.
- Beal, Joan C. 2010. "Prescriptivism and the Suppression of Variation". In: Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Eighteenth-century English. Ideology and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21–37.
- Beal, Joan C. 2012. "'By Those Provincials Mispronounced': The Strut Vowel in Eighteenth-century Pronouncing Dictionaries". *Language & History. Special Issue (Guest Editors: Joan C. Beal and Massimo Sturiale), Prescriptivism and Pronouncing Dictionaries: Past and Present*, 55(1), 5–17.
- Beal, Joan C. 2014. "Words of Dubious and Unsettled Pronunciation: Standardising Pronunciation in 18th-century Britain". In: Massimo Sturiale, Carmela Nocera and Giovanni Iamartino (eds.), *English Words in Time*. Monza: Polimetrica, 81–98.
- Curzan, Anne. 2014. *Fixing English. Prescription and Language History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. 1999. *Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English*. 3rd edn. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mugglestone, Lynda C. 2003. *Talking Proper. The Rise of Accent as Social Symbol*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Percy, Carol. 2012. "Early Advertising and Newspapers as Sources of Sociolinguistic Investigation". In: J. M. Hernández-Campoy and J. C. Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 191–210.
- Sturiale, Massimo. 2012. "Pronouncing Dictionaries between Patriotism and Prescriptivism: Perspectives on Provincialism in Webster's America". In: Carol Percy and Mary Catherine Davidson (eds.), *The Languages of Nation: Attitudes and Norms*. London: Multilingual Matters, 155–171.
- Sturiale, Massimo. 2014. "The Social Construction of Standard (Spoken) English: Eighteenth-century Orthoepists as a 'Discourse Community'". *TOKEN, Special Issue (Guest Editor Marina Dossena) Late Modern English*, 3, 37–52.
- Sturiale Massimo. 2016. "'[Sir,] Who is the English Authority on Pronunciation?': Accent and Normative Attitude in *The Times* (1785–1922)". *Language and History, Special Issue (Guest Editors Joan C. Beal and Giovanni Iamartino) Towards a History of the English Normative Tradition*, 59(1), 37–47.
- Swift, Jonathan. 1712: *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue: In a Letter to the Most Honourable Robert, Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, Lord High Treasurer of Great Britain*. London: Ben J. Tooke.

Irma Taavitsainen (University of Helsinki)

Medical Texts for Different Audiences: Language Practices in the Eighteenth-century

The corpus of Late Modern English Medical Texts (forthcoming) provides unexplored material for the eighteenth century. This study focuses on the diachrony of changing thought styles, genre dynamics and stylistic changes in texts for different audiences in various channels of publication. The data for closer scrutiny is chosen according to the results of the bottom-up corpus-linguistic method of Topic Modelling (paper in preparation for the ICAME conference in May 2017). Texts dealing with fashionable topics like inoculation, longevity and sea-bathing are compared to one another.

Authors mostly belonged to the social elite and were educated professionals who wrote for their peers, but there are also writings for general audiences including households and women, and learners are well represented.

Monographs were still the most important channel for communicating new medical knowledge, but journals were gaining ground. *The Philosophical Transactions* (1665–) continued as a general scientific publication, but specialised medical journals were founded in the 1730s. The first magazine with newspaper extracts and other miscellaneous items for polite society readership was established in the same decade.

Prose style underwent noticeable changes in this century: the first half was very different from the end as novel language practices were created (McIntosh 1998, Wild 2006, Taavitsainen forthcoming). My aim is to explore how education and literacy levels were taken into account in medical writing. Corpus linguistic methods such as collocation analysis and keywords (Wordsmith) are combined with qualitative pragmatic analysis of meaning-making practices to influence readers' attitudes. Besides sociolinguistic variation, diachronic developments are traced. According to previous studies, changes take place in the spearhead writings, while texts for general audiences retain older features with modifications in their meaning-making strategies.

References

- McIntosh, Carey. 1998. *The Evolution of English Prose, 1700–1800: Style, Politeness, and Print Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taavitsainen, Irma. Forthcoming. "Letters to the Editor in *The Gentleman's Magazine*: Polite Language Use with Speech Acts in Focus". In: Irma Taavitsainen and Turo Hiltunen (eds.), *Late Modern English Medical Texts: Studies and Corpus Description*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wild, Wayne. 2006. *Medicine-by-post: The Changing Voice of Illness in Eighteenth-century British Consultation Letters and Literature*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Heli Tissari (Stockholm University)

Describing Eighteenth-century Virtues in the Natural Semantic Metalanguage

The nouns *charity, chastity, diligence, humility, kindness, patience* and *temperance* occur 2,996 times in the sub-period 1710–1780 of the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, which totals 10,480,431 words. I used conceptual metaphor analysis to study these nouns. The starting-point was that virtues were abstract concepts which could be discussed metaphorically as if they were concrete. However, the result was that in over 60% of the sentences, virtues were not discussed like abstract matters; instead, they were very much associated with people and their behaviour (Tissari 2016). It seems that they could reasonably be discussed in terms of scenarios which suggest what people think and do. Goddard (2001) has used such scenarios to describe adjectives like *patient* and *sincere* in Malay and English. He wrote definitions for those adjectives in the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). Hasada (2008) has also used the NSM to study virtues. Otherwise, there seems to be little NSM-based research on virtues (the NSM homepage). I plan to read through my data and write down characteristics of virtues in order to arrive at NSM-based definitions for the eighteenth-century nouns. That will add to NSM research on virtues and facilitate the

comparison of words for virtues in different varieties of English and in different languages. It will also be possible to compare the two methods, conceptual metaphor analysis and NSM analysis. The hypothesis is that these methods are complementary and yield different information. I am not more specific about the method because in another project, we have learned that it is challenging to use corpus data systematically to produce NSM-based definitions of words (Tissari, Vanhatalo and Siirinen in preparation). It is a further interesting aspect of this research to see what can reasonably be done with data of this size.

References

- Goddard, Cliff. 2001. “*Sabar, Ikhlas, Setia – Patient, Sincere, Loyal?* Contrastive Semantics of Some ‘Virtues’ in Malay and English”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 653–681.
- Hasada, Rie. 2008. “Two ‘Virtuous Emotions’ in Japanese: *Nasake/joo* and *Jihi*”. In: Cliff Goddard (ed.), *Cross-linguistic Semantics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- The NSM home page. Available at <https://www.griffith.edu.au/humanities-languages/school-humanities-languages-social-science/research/natural-semantic-metalanguage-homepage>.
- Tissari, Heli. 2016. On the Conceptual Structure of Virtue in the Eighteenth Century. Paper presented at the Triennial Conference 2016 of the International Association of University Professors of English, University of London, 25 July 2016.
- Tissari, Heli, Ulla Vanhatalo and Mari Siirinen. In preparation. Combining ‘Hate’ and ‘Anger’: Investigating the Finnish *Viha*. Paper to be presented at the Fourteenth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLC-14), University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia, July 10–14, 2017.

Sebastian Wagner (University of Augsburg)

Postmodification and Historical Significance in LModE Historiography

When historians compose their narratives, they do not simply chronicle past events but they judiciously select and assess phenomena based on what they deem significant for their accounts (e.g. Bondi and Mazzi 2009, Munslow 2007, Martin 2003). Since explanation and argumentation play a crucial role in the reconstruction of the past, historiographers endeavour to ascertain that their readers comprehend the importance of a historical event, action or character. One way of establishing this is by introducing seemingly non-essential information post-nominally, which is frequently found e.g.:

The war with Otto, **which naturally followed**, drew all the efforts of the Prankish king from Normandy to his eastern borderland, where for a time Lorraine passed into the hands of Lewis. (Green 1884)

Here, the postmodifying nonrestricted relative clause invites another interpretation of the propositional content of the main clause. The parenthesis provides the reader with new information on the basis of which she/he is invited not only to re-evaluate the character or event (head noun) but likewise every associated proposition that follows. The inserted informational adjunct might be understood to simultaneously

function as a means of justifying the author's choice with regard to the significance of the proposition.

The various manifestations of this evaluative practice are thought to be guided by the prevailing socio-cultural "trends" in history writing (cf. e.g. Dray 1997). Hence, the arising tension between two co-existing historiographical practices in the period-in-focus, "imaginary" history-writing with the primary aim to educate and to entertain a broadening readership versus the emerging ideal of an "objective" history, dominated by the Rankean research-oriented conception of "historiographic accuracy" (cf. Hesketh 2011), is expected to become visible in the findings.

The analysis will be based on the Corpus of Late Modern British Historical Writing, which comprises the excerpts of the works of 50 historians, published between 1700 and 1914.

References

- Bondi, Marina and Davide Mazzi. 2009. "Writing History: Argument, Narrative and Point of View". In: M. Shiro, P. Bentivoglio and F. Erlich (eds.), *Haciendo discurso. Homenaje a Adriana Bolívar*. Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela, 611–626.
- Dray, William H. 1997. "Philosophy and Historiography". In: Michael Bentley (ed.), *Companion to Historiography*. New York: Routledge.
- Hesketh, Ian. 2011. *The Science of History in Victorian Britain: Making the Past Speak*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Martin, James R. 2003. "Making History". In: James R. Martin and Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Re/reading the Past: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Time and Value*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Munslow, Alun. 2007. *Narrative and History*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bianca Widlitzki (University of Giessen)

"After You Was Put into the Coach, How Long Were You in [It] Before You Got to Whitcomb-street?" Singular *You Was/You Were* Variation in Late Modern English

The present paper presents a corpus-based analysis of singular *you was* and *you were* throughout Late Modern English, charting this variation with regard to social (social class, gender) and linguistic factors (polarity).

In contrast to other types of BE variability, such as default singulars with existential *there*, *you was* was "a late innovation" in English, emerging in the 17th century (Nevalainen 2009: 99, cf. Nevalainen 2006). After a striking rise in frequency in the early 18th century, the historical record shows a sharp decline in the second half, which is generally attributed to standardizing forces (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2002, Laitinen 2009).

The present study extends the scope of previous research in terms of genres and time frame investigated. It analyzes trial proceedings (Old Bailey Corpus, Huber et al. 2012) and dramatic dialogues (Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, Diller et al. 2011), complementing existing work on novels (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2002) and private letters (Laitinen 2009). To my knowledge, the present analysis of *you was/were* is also the first to take 19th century-data into account. Previous scholarship has focused on the 18th century.

Initial results from the trial proceedings do not show the expected mid-century drop of *you was*; instead, it remains the preferred variant up to the 1790s (229x *was*,

142x *were* in this decade). The drama corpus, however, mirrors the trajectory established for novels and letters. In preliminary tests, the trials also fail to show the gender/class pattern reported in Laitinen (2009), with well-educated men leading in both the emergence and disappearance of *was*. This may reflect a higher acceptability of *you was* among all social groups in spoken conversation. It also reinforces the usefulness of cross-genre comparisons in extending our understanding of variation and change processes, as different genres exhibit varying degrees of stability and change.

References

- Diller, Hans-Jürgen, Hendrik de Smet and Jukka Tyrkkö. 2011. The Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, version 3.0. https://perswww.kuleuven.be/~u0044428/clmet3_0.htm. 5 September 2016.
- Huber, Magnus, Magnus Nissel, Patrick Maiwald and Bianca Widlitzki. 2012. The Old Bailey Corpus. Spoken English in the 18th and 19th centuries. www.uni-giessen.de/oldbaileycorpus. 9 October 2016.
- Laitinen, Mikko. 2009. "Singular YOU WAS/WERE Variation and English Normative Grammars in the Eighteenth Century". In: Arja Nurmi, Minna Nevala and Minna Palander-Collin (eds.), *The Language of Daily Life in England (1400–1800)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 199–217.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. "Vernacular Universals? The Case of Plural *Was* in Early Modern English". In: Terttu Nevalainen, Juhani Klemola and Mikko Laitinen (eds.), *Types of Variation: Diachronic, Dialectical and Typological Interfaces*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 351–370.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 2009. "Number Agreement in Existential Constructions: A Sociolinguistics Study of Eighteenth-century English". In: Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola and Heli Paulasto (eds.), *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts: Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. New York: Routledge, 80–102.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. 2002. "*You Was* and Eighteenth-century Normative Grammar". In: Katja Lenz (ed.), *Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Language: Essays presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Heidelberg: Winter, 88–102.

Matylda Włodarczyk (Adam Mickiewicz University)

"Power and Influence" through "Stigma and Reproach"? Speech Act Profiles of Nineteenth Century Institutional (Im)politeness Cultures

The paper investigates the institutional politeness cultures of the British Colonial Office in the first three decades of the nineteenth century based on the internal and external correspondence on the Cape Colony (Theal 1897–1905). In particular, it explores the interfaces between the (im)politeness norms and the speech acts employed by the involved parties to relate to these. The questions addressed in the paper include: What is the speech-act profile of institutional correspondence? Are some speech acts (e.g. refusals) more pervasive than others (e.g. apologies)? What changes in the use of speech acts may be observed over time? Which speech acts are central to the exercise of institutional power? The analysis correlates the results of speech act identification with the results of a lexical exploration of the use of binomials. Binomials, just as other conventionalised and formulaic elements of language, are a characteristic feature not only of other specialised discourse domains,

but also of institutional correspondence. Hence, the paper pursues their place in the speech act profile of the analysed data showing their reduced prominence in the most frequently employed speech act types. In addition, the paper proposes an evaluation of some quantitative (IFID-based, *n*-gram and semantic-based analyses by means of USAS; see Rayson 2009) which are employed for the purposes of speech act extraction.

References

- Rayson, Paul. 2009. "Wmatrix: A Web-based Corpus Processing Environment". Computing Department: Lancaster University, <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/wmatrix/>, accessed August 2015.
- Theal, George McCall. 1897–1905. *Records of the Cape Colony (1793–1869)*. London: Public Record Office.

Nuria Yáñez-Bouza (University of Vigo)

“Send Me That Book, Please, Send It Me”: Double Objects in Early Grammars

In present-day standard English, verbs licensing two objects with a theme and a recipient usually allow for variation in word order between (1) and (2) below. The former is the canonical word order in standard English (Quirk et al. 1985: 726). With two pronominal objects the most frequent variant is (3) (Biber et al. 1999: 929). Besides, pattern (4) is acceptable in certain dialects of British English (Gerwin 2014: 152–179).

- (1) *I sent my sister a book.*
- (2) *I sent a book to my sister.*
- (3) *I sent it to her.*
- (4) *She sent it me.*

Historically, pattern (4) seems “to have been the rule” with pronominal objects (Visser 1963: I.623), yet this sequence has gradually become restricted in usage during the Late Modern English period (Yáñez-Bouza and Denison 2015). The timing is crucial. Bearing in mind that eighteenth-century precept rules have brought about change in the historical development of certain morphological and syntactic features (Yáñez-Bouza 2016), this paper aims to shed light on whether normative precepts played a role in the suppression of variability concerning the pattern in (4), attending to both internal and external factors.

The approach is two-fold. First, attitudes towards double objects will be explored in a collection of *c.*170 normative works published between 1586 and 1900. I will examine early grammarians’ awareness of syntactic variation, their awareness of regional variation, and their evaluative comments on correct/preferred usage. Second, the observed attitudes will be compared with parallel historical usage data. This study shows that, while there is awareness of variation due to internal factors, especially to the type of object (nominal/pronominal), the grammarians’ discussions hardly contain any comment on correctness or on regional variation. Thus prescriptivism cannot be held responsible for language change in pattern (4) of the double object construction.

References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Gerwin, Johanna. 2014. *Ditransitives in British English Dialects*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Visser, Frederick Th. 1963–1973. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Yáñez-Bouza, Nuria. 2016. “Early and Late Modern English Grammars as Evidence in English Historical Linguistics”. In: Merja Kytö and Päivi Pahta (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 164–180.
- Yáñez-Bouza, Nuria and David Denison. 2015. “Which Comes First in the Double Object Construction?”. *English Language and Linguistics* 19(2), 247–268.