

THE TWO CONSTRUCTIONS :  
“ ACCUSATIVE AND PARTICIPLE ” AND  
“ GENITIVE AND GERUND ”

A Diachronic-Synchronic Study in English Syntax

By Kikuo Yamakawa

*Assistant Professor of English Philology*

CHAPTER I

Introduction

§ 1. In modern English syntax the two categories of verbals, the present participle and the gerund, often offer delicate problems to the students. In some kinds of expression it appears so difficult to judge whether a form ending in *-ing* is used as a participle or as a gerund that some grammarians or philologists think it better not to recognize the separate categories but to unify them into one common category, terming it “*ing*-form” or merely “*ing*.”

It is true that from the morphological point of view the participle and the gerund have been confused into one form *-ing* on account of particular circumstances that have occurred in the history of the English language. But the problem is whether they have been confounded in their syntactic functions or stylistic values as well. Even those who have recourse to the common term *ing*-form or *ing* cannot help admitting that there are many cases where each of the two categories is used with the function very distinct from that of the other. Beside these ordinary cases, those where the distinction seems difficult or impossible may be said to be only exceptional. The present researcher firmly stands on the principle of recognizing the two separate categories. To him the two kinds of *ing*-form are common to each other merely in their outer speech-form, but in their intrinsic nature they should be absolutely separate from each other.

§ 2. To make our point clear, we shall below mention some of the dubious instances found in ModE.

(1) She had objected to him *praying* aloud in the evening.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(2) I recollect my mother *giving* me three raisins.—Ruskin, *Praeterita* [Jespersen].

These sentences may be interpreted in two manners according as the *-ing* forms are considered gerunds or participles. First, if *praying* and *giving* are taken as gerunds, the sentences will be understood to mean (1) “She had objected to

the fact that he prayed..." and (2) "I recollect that my mother gave...". This interpretation is based upon the historical fact that the accusative or common case, *him* and *mother*, has replaced the original genitive case, *his* and *mother's*.

The other interpretation is to regard *praying* and *giving* as participles. Here it must be noted that this is not because, as is often alleged, these participles can be paraphrased into the attributive clauses: "who prayed *or* was praying" and "who had given." Such paraphrasing would only produce a sense somewhat different from the original. It is in this respect that we see an important point concerning the theme of the present study.

§ 3. Now let us compare the following example.

(1) At this point he had just caught sight of a pale object *slipping* under.  
—Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*, "A Tragedy of Two Ambitions" vi.

In this sentence "sight of a pale object slipping under" is certainly not equivalent to "sight that a pale object slipped *or* was slipping under." *Slipping* must be understood as a participle. Yet is it all right that we should only paraphrase "*slipping* under" into "that was slipping under"?

Admitting that such an *-ing* form is a participle as *adjunct* to the preceding noun, it is involuntarily invested with the function of *predicative* at the same time. The same function is discerned more clearly in the common pattern "I saw him *coming*"; but what we can say about *coming* either in "I caught sight of him *coming*" or in "I saw him *coming*" is that it is equally in the nature of *predicative adjunct*.

As contrasted with this loose adjunctive nature of the participle, the gerund, as in "I insist upon Miss Sharp *appearing*," is more closely united with the preceding noun. In the sentence "I insist upon Miss Sharp appearing," *Miss Sharp* is combined with *appearing* so as to become sense-subject of the latter. In this way the two elements have semantically composed a relation of subject and predicate, what Jespersen calls *nexus*.<sup>1</sup>

We must notice that in such a nexal unit the nucleal element is the gerund rather than its sense-subject, as we can learn from the original form "Miss Sharp's appearing." The following example is instructive in this respect.

(2) I don't believe in interfering with anybody else's doings, or *anybody interfering* with mine.—S. Lewis, *Arrowsmith* IX. iii.

Here the supplemental nature of *anybody* as sense-subject of the gerund *interfering* is especially apparent, contrasted with the use of the "subjectless" *interfering* that has appeared in the parallel phrase. We are distinctly shown the syntactic characteristics of the gerund-construction as contrasted with those of the participle-construction.

§ 4. Furthermore, from the stylistic point of view, there should be a dis-

<sup>1</sup> According to Jespersen, *him coming* in "I saw him coming" is also a *nexus*. Accentuating the adjunctive nature of the participle in general, however, we abstain from applying the term to such a participial combination.

inction between the participle and the gerund even in such instances as (1) and (2) under §2, where it appears indifferent whether the *-ing* form may be interpreted in either way. Such phenomena, however, are nothing but the result of confusion, psychological as well as syntactical. The aim of the present study is to elucidate as far as possible what has brought about the confusion in English syntax.

As available approaches to the research, we shall primarily resort to a diachronic method. ModE "I saw *him coming*" on one hand, and "I insist on *his coming*" on the other, surely represent the two lines of development which should be traced back to the earliest period in the history of the English language.

We have found, however, that the complicate reality can never be explained away by the diachronic method alone. The fact is that most of the questionable phenomena are mainly observed in the late ModE period, as we shall describe in Chapter IV. The solution of these requires a synchronical approach. The factors should be sought for either psychologically or stylistically on the one stage of the development. This is the secondary method we shall be forced to adopt.

In order to make matters less complicate, we shall restrict ourselves to the treatment of those constructions where a participial or gerundial phrase functions as object of a transitive verb or a preposition. We shall exclude any instance where a participle or a gerund takes part in the subject of a sentence, such as "Women *having* the vote share political power with men," though this involves the important problem that concerns the constructions we are going to treat.

## CHAPTER II

### The Development of the "Accusative and Participle" Construction

#### 1. The OE Infinitive-Construction Compared

§ 5. As in ModE the pattern "I saw him coming" is parallel with the pattern "I saw him come," so in OE the participle-construction seems to have been used on the analogy of the infinitive construction. Having developed much more verbal force and syntactic capacity, the infinitive was used in this construction more usually than the participle, as in:

Riēt meowle seo hiere bearn gesihþ brandas *ƿeccan*.—*The Fates of Men*  
ll. 46-47. (A woman weeps who sees the flames cover her child.)

In OE such an expression was fairly common, apparently through the influence of the Latin construction "accusativus cum infinitivo." Here the infinitive *ƿeccan* (=cover), following the combination of the predicate verb *gesihþ* (=sees) and its accusative object *brandas* (=flames), performs the function as predicative of the object.

Now the similar function could also be performed by the present participle.

The meaning of the sentence above would hardly suffer any change if we were to supplant the infinitive *ƿeccan* by the participle *ƿeccende* (=covering). The only conceivable differences would be that the participle, with its adjunctive nature, is appended to the preceding noun somewhat more loosely than the infinitive, and that the former displays more descriptive force than the latter, with its inherent aspect denoting a durative or imperfective action. In spite of these differences, however, the two constructions have remained parallel with each other in their structural procedure, which is distinct from that of the gerundial construction.

§ 6. Before inquiring into actual instances in OE, we shall compare the expression with that in the main allied languages German and French, so as to clarify the peculiarity of the participle-construction in English. In both German and French we can find the "accusative and infinitive" construction as well as in English, but in neither of them the "accusative and participle" construction. The two English sentences "I saw the dog *swim* across the river" and "I saw the dog *swimming* across the river" must be translated into German in one way of using an infinitive: "Ich sah den Hund über den Fluss *schwimmen*." If we specially want to express in German the durative or imperfective aspect of the action "swimming" that the second English sentence succeeds in expressing so exquisitely, we shall have to use a subordinate clause in this way: "Ich sah, *wie* der Hund über den Fluss *schwamm*."<sup>2</sup>

Again, the meaning of the English "I see the dog *running*" as well as "I see the dog *run*" must be expressed in French by means of an infinitive: "Je vois le chien *courir*," or otherwise with a relative clause: "Je vois le chien *qui court*."<sup>3</sup>

These instances show not only that English is equipped with a concise and convenient means of expression as contrasted with German or French, but also that the English expression with the participle is more precise and expressive in conveying the delicate shade of meaning, and is so much the greater in linguistic value, than the corresponding expression in the two other languages. At the same time it must not be overlooked that such syntactic and stylistic potentiality<sup>4</sup> exhibited by the present participle in this construction can be traced back to the earliest stage in the history of the English language.

## 2. The "Accusative and Participle" in OE

§ 7. The use of a present participle in OE could be distinctly discerned by its representative ending *-ende* (cf. OHG *-anti*), the form in West Saxon, in which dialect the best part of the OE literature was written and has been preserved.

<sup>2</sup> Brunner, *Die englische Sprache* II. p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> Regula, *Grundlegung und Grundprobleme der Syntax* §54 II.

<sup>4</sup> It is the same potentiality of the participle that has contributed to develop the usage of the so-called progressive form, as in "The dog *is running*," which was also originated in the OE period and whose exact correspondent has never been found in any other language. Cf. Mossé, *F. P.* II. §79.

The construction "verb+object+participle" was found in the earliest period. Only, while in ModE the introductory verbs are of several kinds (cf. § 19), in OE the construction was more limited and chiefly introduced by verbs of sensuous or mental perception, that is, *geseon* (=see), *gehieran*<sup>5</sup> (=hear), *gemetan*<sup>6</sup> (=find), etc.

(1) Hie Drihten *zesawon upastizendne*.—*Blickling Homilies* [Brunner].  
(They saw the Lord ascending.)

(2) He *geseah* ænne man *sittende* æt toll-sceamule.—*Matt.* ix. 9. (He saw a man sitting at the toll-seat.)

(3) *Ʒa* mænegu wundredon *geseonde*<sup>7</sup> dumbe *specende*.—*Matt.* xv. 31.  
(The multitude wondered when they saw the dumb speaking.)

(4) *Ʒa* *gehyrdon* hyne twegen leorningcnihtas *sprecende*. —*John* i. 37.  
(Then the two disciples heard him speaking.)

(5) Heo gemette Ʒæt mæden on hyre bedde *licgende*.—*Mark* vii. 30.  
(She found the maiden lying on her bed.)

In these examples the present participles appended to the accusative nouns and pronoun also stand in the accusative case so as to denote their adjunctive relation to the objects. The accusative case is externally clear in the ending *-ne* of *upastizendne* in example (1). The formal denotation of the case in such predicative participles, however, was often obliterated already in this period, as is seen in *sittende* of example (2), where the ending *-ende* fails to distinguish the form from that of the nominative case. But it remains true that the participle was in the accusative, whether explicitly or implicitly. This fact shows that the participle is added to the preceding noun or pronoun adjunctively, though it has involuntarily come to appear as predicative of the latter. Here is revealed the concrete cumulative style of arranging the elements of the sentence one after another according to the succession of the ideas—the style characteristic of traditional English syntax. It may be of some interest in this respect to notice that Koch (*Satzlehre* § 89) paraphrases the part "geseonde dumbe specende" in example (3) into the German construction with a subordinate clause: "als sie sah, dass die Tauben sprachen."

§ 8. The few examples cited in the previous section seem to suggest that this kind of construction is especially frequent in the West-Saxon version of the

<sup>5</sup> OED (s.v. HEAR 3) notes that the present participle used after "hear+object" is originally a "verbal substantive (i.e. gerund) with a-." Though the dictionary itself records no example illustrative of this statement, the following may be mentioned as instances of "hear+object+gerund" (cf. "The house is *building*.").

(1) Anne seem'd to hear her own death-scaffold *raising*.—Tennyson, *Enoch Arden* 175.

(2) I had never heard one(=a coffin) *making*.—Dickens, *David Copperfield* ix.

But these special phenomena with the passival *-ing* form have nothing to do with the enlightenment of the origin in regard to the form after *hear*.

<sup>6</sup> The verb has survived as ModE *meet*. With OE *findan* (=find) the "accusative and infinitive" construction was a usual one. The use, however, has become obsolete, and a participle is now usually used instead of an infinitive after *find*. Cf. OED, s.v. FIND v. 1b.

<sup>7</sup> This *geseonde* (cf. the infinitive *geseon*) is another participle, which functions as predicative in the relation of apposition to the subject *Ʒa mænegu*.

Gospels. The version was accomplished in the late OE period, extending from the last decade of the tenth century to the middle of the eleventh century, based upon the two Latin texts, the *Vulgate* and the *Vetus Italica*.<sup>8</sup> We have good reason, therefore, to infer that the frequency of the construction may be due to the influence of the Latin model.<sup>9</sup> The fact is that we can find the same use of the present participle in the Latin sentence corresponding to the OE example cited as (2) in the previous section. Below let us quote the Latin originals.<sup>10</sup>

*Vulgate*: Vidit hominen *sedentem* in telonio.

*Vetus Italica*: Vidit hominen *sedentem* ad telonium.

*Sedentem* in either text is the accusative case of the present participle *sedens*, the infinitive being *sedere* (=sit).

The Latin influence should be surely regarded as an important factor for the origin of the construction in English. But concerning the later development, we must acknowledge the potentiality inherent in English syntax itself.

### 3. *cniht wesende* / *be him lifgendum*

§ 9. With respect to the construction observed in the previous sections, we should like to mention the two OE idiomatic expressions in either of which a present participle is an essential component. The first is the phrase *cniht wesende*, used in the following way.

(1) Sægde he þæt he hine *cneoht weosende* gesawe.—*Bede* II. xv. (He said that he had seen it when a boy.)

(2) Ic hine cūðe *cniht wesende*.—*Beowulf* 372. (I know him as a boy.)

If the phrase *cniht wesende* is construed according to the original function, we may say that the noun *cniht* (=boy) is a complement of the present participle *wesende* (=being), which is appositively related to a preceding noun or pronoun. So the participle *wesende*, though devoid of the descriptive force perceived in usual participles, performs the same syntactic function, when it is related to the object of a transitive verb, as *coming* in "I saw him *coming*." In example (1) *weosende* is appositive to the subject *he*; while in example (2) *wesende* is related to the object *hine* (=him), forming thus the "accusative and participle" construction.

Hitherto we have considered the structural side of the phrase *cniht wesende*. But it seems to be more important to inquire into the semantic or lexical side of this particular expression. As is the case with similar phenomena in early English, the combination of the two elements in *cniht wesende* is closely fixed. Between them there is no longer any sense of free syntactic relation, as we feel between *was* and *a boy* in the ModE expression "when he *was a boy*." Indeed *cniht* and *wesende* are combined so fixedly that many editors or lexicographers print the

<sup>8</sup> Delcourt, *Imitation* §29, ft. 2.

<sup>9</sup> We can find an authentic confirmation of this inference in the detailed statement given in Callaway, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* p. 225 ff.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.* §61. Also compare §20.

combination as one compound word "*cniht-wesende*" or "*cnihtwesende*" and rank it as an adjective. Indeed the similar, though poetic, expression "*umbor (=child) wesende*" is used in the inflected form of an adjective in the following example.

(3) Wene ic þæt he mid gode gyldan wille uncran eaferan, gif he þæt eal gemon, hwæt wit to willan ond to worðmyndum *umbor wesendum* ær arna gefremedon.—*Beowulf* 1184—7. (I think that he will reward the sons of us two with goodwill, if he remembers all of what favours we once did to his pleasure and honours when he was a child.)

Here *wesendum* is in the dative case in concord with *willan* and *worðmyndum*, though semantically we should rather say that it is appositive to the unexpressed *him*, the personal sense of which is implied by the two dative nouns. Anyhow *umbor* has lost its status as an independent word and been attached to *wesendum* so as to form part of the one adjective.

*Cniht-wesende* or *umbor-wesende* was merely a fixed, short-lived formula, destined to become obsolete within the period of OE. That is true, but the phenomenon seems to be suggestive of the early stage in the history of the constructions that we go on investigating. Compare §§ 36, 37, 40.

§ 10. The other OE phrase that deserves our attention is *be him lifgendum*. The literal meaning of it is "by him living." *Be* (=by) here denotes a temporal relation and means "during" in ModE, *him* is the dative governed by the preposition *be*, and *lifgendum* is a participle, also inflected in the dative case, derived from *lifgan* (=live) and is placed in apposition to *him*. The striking feature is that the whole group has been invested with a particular sense "during his lifetime." Before inquiring into further details, let us see some actual examples.

(1) Constantinus...*be Diocletiane lyfgendum* Gallia rice and Ispania heold and rehte.—*Bede* I. viii. (Constantinus held and swayed the kingdom of Gaul and Spain in the lifetime of Diocletianus.)

(2) Hie *be him lifgendum* hie<sup>11</sup> gedældun.—*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (A) 718. (They parted during their lifetime.)

(3) Se Wulfwi feng to ðam biscoprice þe Ulf hæfde *be him libbendum* and *of adræfdum*.—*Ibid.* (C) 1053. (The aforesaid Wulfwig succeeded to the bishopric that Ulf had during his lifetime and exile.)

Example (3) is especially noticeable. The present participle *libbendum* (<*libban* live), a variant of *lifgendum*, is co-ordinately connected by *of adræfdum*. The latter is a past participle and is in the same dative case as the former. *Adræfdum* is the dative past participle of *adræfan* (=drive away, expel); and the preceding adverb *of* (=off, away) is prefixed to the main word so as to form part of a compound after the fashion of OE syntax. So *of-adræfdum*, meaning literally "driven away," as well as *libbendum* (=living), is appositively appended to *him*.

This indicates that the phrase *be him lifgendum* was not altogether felt as a set formula. It represents a type of syntactic combination in OE. Moreover it

<sup>11</sup> This *hie* is an accusative used as reflexive object of *gedældun* (or *gedældon*), plural pret-erite of (*ge*)*dælan* (=divide).

seems instructive to us that here is revealed an essential characteristic in early English syntax. In this combination each significant element is accumulated one after another, so that the intended meaning is analytically expressed with simple concreteness.

§ 11. It must be admitted that there is another way of explaining the OE phrase "be him lifgendum."<sup>12</sup> In OE the construction with a so-called dative absolute was fairly common, mostly due to the influence of the ablative absolute construction in Latin. In the following example the italic part is a dative absolute.

*Hym þa gyt sprechendum, hig comon fram þam heahgesamnungum.*—

*Mark* v. 35. (While he was still speaking, they came from the chief synagogue.)

The combination *hym sprechendum* in this sentence implies a temporal adverbial relation to the main statement "hig comon..." If we were to convey the implied sense of temporal relation more explicitly, we should have recourse to some formal means expressive of it. *Be* in *be him lifgendum* can be interpreted as a demanded means that has been added to express more clearly the temporal relation implied by the dative absolute "*him lifgendum*."<sup>13</sup>

Even if this second explanation may be admitted, we can still see the same characteristic in the style of expression "be him lifgendum"—appositional and so primitively concrete. But the expression scarcely survived in the ME period.

#### 4. The Morphological Change of the Present Participle in ME

§ 12. Before entering into the observation of the construction in ME we should like to survey how the form of the present participle got confused with that of the gerund in *-ing* in the course of the ME period. Generally speaking, the variant forms of the present participle in ME properly inherited from OE were *-inde* in the Southern dialect, *-ende* in the Midland dialect, and *-and(e)* in the Northern dialect. Already in the early part of the thirteenth century the old form of the present participle began to be supplanted by the new form *-ing(e)*, which had been the original ending of the verbal substantive or gerund. This supersession first took place in the Southern dialect (except the Kentish), then in the Midland, and finally in the Northern. In *The Owl and the Nightingale*, a poem written in the Southern dialect in 1225, there appears *-inge* concurrently with *-inde*. There is the trace of fluctuation between *-ynde* and *-ynge* in Langland's *Piers Plowman* (Text C), a long poem written in the West Midland dialect in 1393; while Chaucer's poems (1365—99), representative of the East Midland dialect, are decidedly in favour of *-yng*. In the Northern dialect we still see *-and*

<sup>12</sup> Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik* III. p. 78.

<sup>13</sup> We might here compare the following example, where *be* has been added to a dative absolute phrase which has no participle in it and denotes an attendant circumstance.

Gif elles *be cwicum mannum ciricgrið abrocen beo*...—*Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* [A.-S. D., Sup.] (If otherwise the sanctuary be broken through by the men living, *i.e.* without anybody being killed,....)



in *Cursor Mundi* (1300—40), but yet in Misyn's *Documents of Yorkshire* in the fifteenth century *-and* and *-ing* are used promiscuously. It may be cursorily concluded that the use of the new form *-ing(e)* went on expanding from the end of the fourteenth century down to the fifteenth century, finally contaminating the Northern dialect.<sup>14</sup>

§ 13. It would be both interesting and instructive now to inquire into the factors that had brought about the phonological and morphological confusion between *-end* and *-ing*. There are three factors to be considered.

(1) Special significance should be attached to the fact that the confusion first took place in the Southern dialect, where the old traditional form of the present participle was *-inde*, a form weakened from OE *-ende*. As the ending of the gerund, on the other hand, *-ing* had been retained in the Southwestern dialect till about 1250, but after that the form was scarcely found, the ending *-ing* having been generally established (cf. § 33). Moreover there was a growing tendency to confuse *-inde*, as the ending of the present participle, with *-inge* in the Southern (except Kentish) dialect about that time.

Now it is inferred that the Southern participial form *-inde* had the least resistance to be superseded by *-inge*; the other forms *-ende* and *-and(e)* were retained much longer, in clear contrast with the gerundial form *-yng* or *-ing*. The reason may be easily ascribed to the phonetic contiguity between the two forms *-inde* and *-inge*.<sup>15</sup> The process from *-nd* [nd] to *-ng*, which is supposed to represent the sound [ŋg], is merely the result of the simple substitution in the points of articulation, that is, the shifting from alveolar to velar. Furthermore we may assume that the substitution had been greatly prompted by the presence of the preceding vowel *i*, for in the points of articulation [i] is much closer to the velar [ŋ] than to the alveolar [n]. In short, it was phonetically easier to pass from *-ind* to *-ing* than to pass from *-end* or *-and* to *-ing*.

(2) Besides the articulatory assimilation of [ind] to [iŋg], there is another phonetical process to be assumed.<sup>16</sup> The pronunciation of both *-ind(e)* and *-ing(e)* had already become indistinct in the thirteenth century, and it is probable that both the endings were soon pronounced [in'] with the paratalized *n*. The morphological confusion can be attributed to this phonological levelling.

We should be reminded, in this respect, that the modern dialects of Northumberland and the southern counties of Scotland have preserved the formal distinction of a present participle and a gerund, but that with the general obscuration of the final consonants, the endings have resulted in most cases in [-ən] (<*-and*) on one hand and [-in] (<*-ing*) on the other.<sup>17</sup>

The two phonetical factors mentioned about under (1) and (2) must not be

<sup>14</sup> The description in this section mainly depends upon Mossé, *F.P.* II. §§ 131—139.

<sup>15</sup> Mossé, *F.P.* II. § 156.

<sup>16</sup> Langenhove, *The Origin of the Gerund* § 2. 3. 5 (c); Brunner, *Die englische Sprache* I. p. 169, II. p. 349.

<sup>17</sup> OED s.v. *-ING*°.

considered separately. They probably acted simultaneously, reciprocally influencing each other, to bring about the confusion.

(3) The next to be considered is an external factor. OED (s.v. -ING<sup>2</sup>) says that the confusion between *-inde* and *-inge* "is specially noticeable in MSS. written by Anglo-Norman scribes in the thirteenth century." As we shall see in some examples quoted in the following sections, there were a number of works in those days which had been translated, either directly or indirectly, from the originals written in Old French or Norman French. It is very likely that the scribes of those translations were often encumbered by the confused use of the French verbal ending in *-ant*<sup>18</sup> when they were going to express a present participle or a gerund in English. From the geographical situation, we can judge that the effect of the scribal influence was most apparent in the literature of Southern England.

These are the factors that were considered to cause the confusion of *-inde* and *-inge* in the Southern dialect. Here we see the reason why the transition of *-end* to *-ing* took place later in the Midland and Northern dialects, which are usually more radical in morphological changes.

##### 5. "Verb+Object+Participle" in ME

§ 14. We are in a position to observe the actual examples of the "accusative and participle" construction found in ME. The farther we advanced into the ME period; the wider we came to see the construction expanded in use. The commonest kind of verbs that introduced it were, as in OE (cf. §7), verbs of sensuous or mental perception. Let us first cite the examples containing this kind of verbs.

(1) He *saw* his wyves moder *liggyng*e and shakun.—Wyclif, *Matt.* viii. 14. (He saw his wife's mother lying and shaken.)

(2) He *saugh* a mayde *walking*e him biforn.—Chaucer, *C. T.*, "The Tale of the Wyf of Bathe" 30. (He saw a maid walking before him.)

(3) In erth I *see* bot syn *reynand*.—*The Towneley Mysteries* ((c. 1450)) [Mätsner]. (On earth I see only sin reigning.)

(4) I haue seyne Charite also syngen and reden, Ryden and rennen in ragged wedes, Ac *beddyng* as beggeres *bihelde* I hym neuere.—Langland, *Piers Plowman* (B) xv. 219–221 ((1377)). (I have seen Charity also sing and read, ride and run in ragged garments, but I never beheld him begging as beggars.)

(5) I *herde* thi fader *spekyng*e.—Wyclif, *Gen.* xxvii. 6. (I heard thy father speaking.)

(6) When that she *hereth* any herde tale Or in the hegges any wight *steringe*,....—Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* iii. 1235–6. (When she *i.e.* the nightingale hears any shepherd speak or any person stirring in the hedges,...)

(7) We *heren* hors *nyngene* and cokkes *crowinge*.—*The Voiage and Travaile*

<sup>18</sup> Compare the second footnote (51) under §38.

of *Sir John Maundeville* ((c. 1400)) [Koch]. (We hear horses neighing and cocks crowing.)

(8) He *foonde* hem *slepinge*.—Wyclif, *Matt.* xxvi. 40. (He found them sleeping.)

(9) He...*fand* him *slowmand* on slepe.—*The Wars of Alexander* ((c. 1400-50)) [Koziol]. (He found him sleeping.)

Of the examples above, the first four contain the verb "see" or its synonym "behold", the next three the verb "hear," and the last two the verb "find." In example (1) the present participle *liggyng* (=lying) is used co-ordinately with the past participle *shakun* (=shaken). In example (3) we had the old participial form *reynand*. This is because the work from which this passage is quoted was written in Yorkshire, where, as in the other districts in North England, the form in *-and* had been retained in the fifteenth century. Examples (4) and (6) present a common syntactic feature. In (4) the sentence including a participle-construction is co-ordinated by *ac* (=but) with a parallel sentence including an infinitive-construction introduced by the predicate verb *haue seyne* (=have seen). In (6) the verb *hereth* introduces the two co-ordinate expressions combined by *or*, where the participle *steringe* (=stirring) appears in the same functional position as the infinitive *tale* (=tell a tale). These phenomena show that the "accusative and participle" construction had been becoming as popular as the "accusative and infinitive" construction (cf. § 5). It is moreover conceivable that the participles here have displayed the special descriptive value with their imperfective aspect, as contrasted with the perfective aspect implied by the infinitives, though in such poetic examples we should also recollect the metrical influence upon the expression.<sup>19</sup>

§ 15. In ME it was not only verbs of perception that were used to introduce the construction in question. Below we shall cite some examples that contain other kinds of verbs.

(1) Thus *left* me that lady *liggyng* aslepe.—Langland, *Piers Plowman* (B) ii. 51 ((c. 1377)). (Thus that lady left me lying asleep.)

(2) I *lefte* hem *lyyng*e there.—*Chevalere Assigne* ((a. 1400)) [Koziol]. (I left them lying there.)

(3) *Lete* I this noble prince Theseus Toward Athenes in his wey *rydinge*.—Chaucer, *Anelida and Arcite* 45-46 ((c. 1374)). (I will leave this noble prince Theseus riding on his way towards Athens.)

(4) A man that is joyous and glad in herte, it him *conserveth flourishinge* in his age.—Chaucer, *C.T.* ((c. 1386)) [Mätsner]. (...in heart, it conserves him flourishing....)

<sup>19</sup> Compare the following ModE examples:

(1) Thee I *have heard relating* what was done Ere my remembrance; now *hear me relate* My story, which, perhaps, thou hast not heard.—Milton, *Paradise Lost* viii. 203-205.

(2) I *see* women *marrying* indiscriminately with staring burgesses and ferret-faced, white-eyed boys, and men *dwell* in contentment with noisy scullions, or *taking* into their lives aciduous vestals.—Stevenson, *Virginibus Puerisque* i.

(5) My dowte dothe *aprevyn* Cryst *levynge* fful bolde.—*Ludus Coventriae* ((14..)) [Mätsner]. (My doubt does approve Christ living very boldly.)

The verb *leave*, as in examples (1) and (2), began to be used in the thirteenth century in the construction where its object is followed by some appositive adjunct, meaning either "allow to remain" as here or more concretely "depart from."<sup>20</sup> The present participle has naturally performed the function as such an appositive adjunct of an object.

In example (3) the predicate verb *lete* (=let), which is usually accompanied by a bare infinitive as objective complement, would now appear curious in introducing a participle-construction. The meaning here denoted, however, is not causative; *lete* is rather synonymous with "leave." The present participle *rydinge* implies the durative state of a person denoted by the object "this noble prince Theseus." We can see that the sense of ModE *let* has been specialized as compared with that of the verb in Chaucer's age.<sup>21</sup>

The use of the verbs in examples (4) and (5) seem to be somewhat special even in ME. *Conserveth* in (4) would be replaced by *keeps* in ModE. The meaning of (5) would usually be expressed in ModE by the construction: "...approve Christ to be living..." (cf. OED, s.v. APPROVE v.<sup>1</sup> 4).<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless these special cases show the potentiality of the present participle that has enabled the "accusative and participle" construction to become so popular in the ModE period.

§ 16. The peculiar ME use of the present participle in the same function is seen with factitive or causative *make*, which is now usually used with a bare infinitive as objective complement.

(1) New tithand That *makes* me ful wele *lykand*.—*The Proces of the Sevin Sages* ((c. 1320)) [Mätsner]. (The new message that makes me very well pleasing.)

(2) Some men wille noght understande, þat þat mught *mak* þam *dredande*.—Rolle of Hampole, *The Pricke of Conscience* ((c. 1340)) [Koch]. (Some people will not understand that that might make them dreading.)

(3) Þe sternes þou *made* on þe sky *standande* and the planettes in þeire course *passande*.—*Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse* ((c. 1440)) [Koch]. (Thou made the stars standing in the sky and the planets passing in their course.)

<sup>20</sup> OED s.v. LEAVE v.<sup>1</sup> 3d, 7b. Also compare example (10) under § 20 and example (1) under § 23.

<sup>21</sup> In the following example *lete* seems to introduce a similar construction, but actually *rominge* (=roaming) should be viewed in another light.

And thus I *lete* him sitte up-on the pyrie, And Januarie and May *rominge* myrie.—Chaucer, C.T., "The Marchantes Tale" 973—4. (And thus I leave him sitting on the pear-tree, with January and May roaming merrily.)

The phrase introduced by the second "and" is not dependent on the predicate verb *lete*, but is rather independently attached to express an attendant circumstance like an "absolute construction."

<sup>22</sup> The form *aprevyn* (cf. OED, s.v. APPREVE) is the northern and especially Scottish equivalent of *approve* (=approve). It is originally the adapted form of OF *a(p)preuve*, the tonic stem of *aprover*.

The present participles above, which all happen to appear in the old distinct form *-and(e)* in the examples quoted from the Northern or Midland works, seem to be what have been turned into adjectives rather than the original verbals. Especially, *lykand* (=pleasing) and *dredande* (=dreadful) in examples (1) and (2) clearly denote permanent static conditions, not imperfective actions or movements.

In any case, this use of the present participle has now become obsolete. Instead we should now use either a real adjective if some resultant state is to be expressed as predicative of the object, or a bare infinitive if we are to express an action of one agent caused by another. Unlike an infinitive, in general, a present participle ordinarily denotes the durative and imperfective aspect of an action, and so is unfit to express an ingressive or effective action involved by the causative sense of the verb "make."

As a rare instance of ModE, which seems a remnant of the ME usage here described, we can cite:

(4) What *makes* the bread *rising*?...What makes the mutton five-pence a pound?—Goldsmith, *The Good-Natur'd Man* iii.

The participle *rising* in "What makes the bread rising?" is capable of implying the current situation that the price of the bread is really rising, so that it has a unique semantic value that cannot be perceived in the infinitive *rise*. Although the expression may sound rather curious to a present-day speaker, a light, vivid and expressive style is displayed in this short sentence.<sup>23</sup>

#### 6. "Preposition+Object+Participle" in ME

§ 17. Just as a transitive verb introduces an "accusative and participle" construction, so a preposition can be used as an introductory word for the same construction. The latter usage, however, was only gradually developed in the ME period (cf. § 10). *With* is the chief preposition in this use.

(1) Pe stok nest þe roote growand Es the heved *with* nek *folowand*.—Rolle of Hampole, *The Pricke of Conscience* ((c. 1340)) [Curme]. (The stock growing next the root is the head with the neck following.)

(2) Ho razt hym a riche rynk...*With* a starande ston *stondande* alofte. —*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* ((c. 1360)) [Koziol]. (She reached him a rich man with a glittering stone standing aloft.)

(3) Upon hir humble face he gan biholde, *With* fadres pitee *stiking* thurgh his herte.—Chaucer, *C.T.*, "The Phisiciens Tale" 210-1 ((c. 1386)). (Upon her humble face he beheld, with the father's pity sticking through his heart.)

(4) All his shelde was to shew shynyng of gold, *With* þre lions lyvely *launchound* perin.—*The Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy* ((c. 1400))

<sup>23</sup> Besides OED (s.v. MAKE v.<sup>1</sup> 45) records a special obsolete idiom concerning falconry "make a hawk flying" as in:

If you woulde *make* your hawke *fleing* to the Partridge, or Feasant,....—Turberville, *Falconrie* ((1575)).

[Koziol]. (All his shield was to show the shining of gold, with three lions lively leaping therein.)

(5) Oure inhabetting...is an Ilee...*With rynand* all aboute our erd an endles wattle.—*The Wars of Alexander* ((c. 1400—50)) [Koziol] (Our dwelling is an island with an endless water touching all about our ground.)

The construction began to be seen in the fourteenth century,<sup>24</sup> and as we shall observe later (§ 25), has kept on growing lustily in the ModE period. That the *-ing* form there is a present participle, not a gerund, is evidently proved by the form *-and(e)* in the examples, except (3), which are cited from the works written in Northern England or Northwestern Midland. Functionally it is adjunctively related to the preceding, or, as in example (5), following, noun and at the same time adds some complementary predication about the latter. The noun, in turn, is connected with the preposition *with* to the main part of the sentence. The construction represents an additional or cumulative style of expression—the style so characteristic of the tradition of English syntax.

§ 18. It is possible to interpret the *with*-construction as the more explicit substitute for the "nominative absolute," which had been turned from the "dative absolute" in OE. Similar interpretation has been described concerning OE *be him lifendum* in § 11. In view of the general equivalency we may admit the theory that the two constructions have been fused; yet it must be noticed that there is a striking difference in the stylistic features between them. The *with*-construction has far more natural adaptability to grow on in English syntax than the absolute construction.

As to the nature of this construction, furthermore, Kellner (*Historical Outlines of English Syntax* § 154) says that it "has a certain resemblance to that used in Gothic and Old Norse," as if to suggest the presence of some influence exerted by those old Germanic languages. Whatever origin it may be primarily ascribed to, the expression "*with nek folowand*" is so characteristic of English syntax that we may safely affirm with Curme (*Syntax* p. 156) that "it is native English."

#### 7. "Verb+Object+Participle" in ModE

§ 19. In ModE the use of the "accusative and participle" construction has become much more wide-spread. It has been introduced not only by verbs of perception but by several other kinds of verbs. In the syntactic use of these verbs, we see a remarkable parallelism between the two constructions "accusative and infinitive" and "accusative and participle" as in the following couples of sentences.

{ I saw him come.	{ I don't like him to go there.
{ I saw him coming.	{ I don't like him going there.

<sup>24</sup> OED (s.v. *WITH* prep. 36) records the one example belonging to the late thirteenth century though it contains an adjective instead of a present participle. It is:  
*With one halte ope þe mere forth rod þis holi man.—The Early South-English Legendary* ((c. 1290)). (With one halter open this holy man rode the mare forth.)

It is evidently true that the participle-construction has made rapid advance especially since the beginning of the ModE period, so much so that it seems as if it had been endeavouring to vie and catch up with the infinitive-construction. In this respect we cannot agree with the remark of Koch (*Satzlehre* § 133) that the participle-construction has been gradually displaced by the infinitive-construction. Although we cannot help admitting the concise facility of the infinitive-construction, the fact is that the present participle has been and will be growing in this use with its inherent potentiality, both semantic and stylistic.

Now it would be convenient to classify the introductory verbs into three groups from the semantic point of view,<sup>25</sup> so that we may be able to arrange the examples more systematically. Those groups are:

a. Verbs of sensuous or mental perception, such as *see, hear, find, feel, observe, watch, perceive, notice, catch*, etc.

b. Verbs that imply or involve a durative state, such as *leave, keep, have, get, send*, etc.

c. Verbs of psychological state or activity, such as *understand, remember, recollect, imagine, fancy, like, hate, want*, etc.

Of these groups of verbs, we can first notice that only a few belonging to groups a and b are in the same use as in OE and ME, but all the others have come to be newly used with the construction in the ModE period. It is true that many of them introduce the "accusative and infinitive" construction as well, but we must also observe that some belonging to groups b and c, such as *keep, remember, recollect*, etc., can only be used with the "accusative and participle" construction.

§ 20. First we shall see the examples quoted from works in the first three centuries of the ModE period. Most of them show the continuation of the usage in OE and ME which contains such verbs as *see, hear, find, leave*, etc. There must also be exemplified the use of the important verbs *feel, observe, keep* and *imagine*, which has newly been found in ModE. The examples will be arranged according to the groups of verbs mentioned in the previous section.

a. (1) Sone after none thys mother...*Sawe* from the body, the soule *departyng*.—*Prymer in Englysche and Laten* ((1536)) [OED]. (Soon after noon this mother saw the soul departing from the body, *i.e.* of her son.)

(2) And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he *saw* a man, named Matthew, *sitting* at the receipt of custom.—A. V., *Matt.* ix. 9 ((1611)).

(3) As I *heard* once a doctor of Divinite...earnestly *defendyng* his cause with examples....—T. Wilson, *The Rule of Reason* ((1551)) [OED].

(4) I *hear* him *coming*.—Shakespeare, *Hamlet*. III. i. 55 ((1600—1)).

(5) O, thus I *found* her, *straying* in the park, Seeking to hide herself.—*Id.*, *Tit. A.* III. i. 88—89 ((1593—4)).

(6) I...*find* thee knowing not of beasts alone,...but of thyself.—Milton,

<sup>25</sup> The classification, however, is far from strict. It should be understood, for instance, that *find* and *feel* sometimes have the sense that ought to make them belong to group c.

*Paradise Lost* viii. 437-9 ((1667)).

(7) When the Genowayes *felt* the Aitowes *pearcyng* (=piercing) thorough their heads, armes and breastes....—Grafton, *A Chronicle of England* ((1568)) [OED].

(8) Then all on a sudden (I) *felt* myself *falling* perpendicularly down for above a minute.—Swift, "Works" [Jespersen].

(9) It was there, from the window, that the young lady happened to *observe* one of my little boys *playing* in the street.—Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield* xxxi ((1766)).

As to example (2) some comment should be made. In Tindale's version of 1526, earlier than the Authorized Version from which the quotation has been taken, the infinitive is used in this very passage instead of the present participle, in this way: "...he sawe a man *sytt* (=sit) at the receyte off custume...". According to Delcourt (*Initiation* § 141), the infinitive here is used only by Tindale and Coverdale (whose version was published in 1535), every other biblical translator, either older or newer, having recourse to the present participle.<sup>26</sup> This proves that the participle is more adapted to the context than the infinitive in spite of the syntactic parallelism of the two verbals.<sup>27</sup>

Example (5) should also be noticed in that there is an apparent pause (printed as a comma) between "found her" and "straying." This phenomenon reveals that the participle in this construction is intrinsically adjunctive and is liable to be connected with the preceding noun or pronoun more loosely than is the gerund or even the infinitive in similar constructions (cf. § 22).

b. (10) Then did *leave* us *sticking* in the myre.—A. Fleming, *A Panoplie of Epistles* ((1576)) [OED].

(11) So poor, that it is hardly able to *keep* the Pot *boiling* for a Parsons Dinner.—Heylin, *Ecclesia Restaurata* ((1661)) [OED].

From such use as in the last example *keep the pot boiling* has come to mean figuratively "go on providing one's livelihood" or, further generalized, "keep anything going briskly" (cf. OED, s.v. *Pot sb.*<sup>1</sup> 13e).<sup>28</sup>

c. (12) Be now the father and propose a son,  
Hear your own dignity so much profaned,  
See your most dreadful laws so loosely slighted,  
Behold yourself so by a son disdained;  
And then *imagine* me *taking* your part  
And in your power soft *silencing* your son.

—Shakespeare, *2 Hen. IV* v. ii. 92-97 ((1597)).

<sup>26</sup> Compare example (2) under § 7 and also § 8.

<sup>27</sup> Compare also the note of OED (s.v. *SEE v.* 1e): "In early examples the infinitive is often found when we should now use the complementary participle."

<sup>28</sup> OED also records a following example.

To employ them, as a literary man is always tempted, to keep the domestic pot *a-boiling*.  
—Lowell, *My Study Windows* ((1870)).

Here *a-boiling* shows that *boiling* is a gerund. But since this is a far later quotation than example (11) above, which is the earliest one in this use given by OED, we might judge that *boiling* in this expression is originally a participle and that the appearance of the gerundial form is rather a temporary phenomenon due to the analogy of "set a thing going" or "send a person packing" as described in § 23.



The example has been quoted in a longer context, though the construction in question is found only in the last two lines. This is because we want to show clearly that *taking* and *silencing* are present participles. They might be interpreted as gerunds if only the sentence were to be considered separately (cf. § 55). We can see in this context that the two *-ing* forms are expressed as predicatives of the object, as are the past participles *profaned*, *slighted* and *disdained* in the three preceding lines. The successive constructions here are symmetrically paralleled with one another, so that the whole forms a concrete, cumulative style.

§ 21. After the nineteenth century onwards, the number of verbs used with the "accusative and participle" construction has remarkably increased. Below it would be sufficient to mention one example for each verb.

a. (1) He had walked about half an hour when he *saw* Cornelius *coming* along the path.—Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*, "A Tragedy of Two Ambitions" iv.

(2) While we were disputing about the ring, I *heard* a mournful voice *calling* "Án-tonia, Án-tonia!"—Cather, *My Antonia* I. iii.

(3) When, one day, from the top of Talfound Hill, he *beheld* the sea *lying* open to his view,....—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(4) After all she had said of Mrs. Driffield it must seem strange to me that I should *find* them *sitting* there together chattering away and laughing.<sup>29</sup>—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* vii.

(5) One...got nearer and nearer the sea, *felt* the cold and wet and discomfort *growing* on one, and....—Belloc, *On Nothing*, "On Railways and Things."

(6) As she spoke, she *observed* him *looking* at her earnestly.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*.

(7) She just *watched* her only friend *eating* it.—Galsworthy, *Caravan*, "The Bright Side."

(8) Winterbourne *perceived* at some distance a little man *standing* with folded arms nursing his cane.—H. James, *Daisy Miller* ii.

(9) One day, climbing on Great Gable, he *noticed* a girl *waving* excitedly from a dangerous-looking ledge.—Hilton, *Good-Bye, Mr. Chips* iv.

(10) As he chuckled he *noted* the numbness *creeping* into the exposed fingers.<sup>30</sup>—London, *To Build a Fire*.

(11) Ashurst *eyed* her *laying* them (=the dresses) against her own modish

<sup>29</sup> The participles *chattering* and *laughing* in this example, though functioning as predicate appositive in relation to the object *them*, are dependent on *sitting*, and so cannot be considered to be in the same status as the latter. That is also the case with example (8).

<sup>30</sup> In the same context the sentence immediately following this contains a *that*-clause as object of *noted*, as follows:

Also, he noted that *the stinging* which had first come to his toes when he sat down *was already passing away*.

Though the verb *note* more usually introduces a subordinate clause and the construction is required especially when we intend to express some longer and more intricate content of fact as in this quotation, yet we see that the expression of the participle-construction in example (10) above can adequately form part of a simple, straightforward style. Cf. also § 21

figure.—Galsworthy, *The Apple-Tree* vii.

(12) I *detected* myself *staring* more frequently at the open doorway and blank window than I could find warrant for doing.—Bierce, *Can Such Things Be?*, "The Secret of Macarger's Gulch."

(13) Though celebrated for the amount of work he got through, she never *caught* him *doing* any in this house of theirs.—Galsworthy, *The Dark Flower*, "Spring" ii.

Many of the verbs in these examples are indeed used with the "accusative and infinitive" construction as well, but it is noteworthy that some are incapable of introducing the infinitive-construction. It would be difficult to find any instance where *eye* or *detect*, as in example(11) or (12), is accompanied by its object and an infinitive instead of a present participle. As to *catch*, as in the last example, Curme (*Syntax* p. 125) affirms that it is the participle, not the infinitive, that is regularly used after it.

These verbs, from their semantic implication, usually require the objects that refer to some concrete persons or things; and if the writer wants to add some further complementary expressions denoting manners or circumstances of actions, they will naturally assume the nature of adjectival or even adverbial adjuncts. Especially *catch* in the sense "come upon suddenly or unexpectedly" is also construed with "a person *in* or *at* some action" (OED s.v. CATCH v. 9). This informs us that the use of a participle is more suited than that of an infinitive in the context where the complementary addition to the object is more in the adjunctive nature.

§ 22. In order to reveal the intrinsic nature of the participle-construction more manifestly, we shall quote some instances where the participles are added to the objects with apparently looser combination.

(1) And suddenly he *saw* her at her window, *looking* out.—Galsworthy, *The Apple-Tree* iv.

(2) And he *heard* a voice—Alicia's—*speaking*. "The lovely, lovely world!"—Id, *Caravan*, "Spindleberries."

(3) Very early that morning two brothers...*found* a good way from Brenzett, an ordinary ship's hencoop, *lying* high and dry on the shore, with eleven drowned ducks inside.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(4) *Watching* his friend, *lying* there, with that smile, and the candle-light on his face, Ashurst shuddered.—Galsworthy, *The Apple-Tree* vii.

When we compare example (2) above with example (2) under the previous section, we can discern that common characteristic of the participles after the noun "voice" which is fundamentally adjunctive rather than predicative. It would be instructive further to compare the following example.

(5) I was still occupied with my idle fancies when I *heard* a taxi *stop* at the door, the bell *ring*, and in a moment Alroy Kear's booming voice *telling* the butler that he had an appointment with me.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xi.

Apart from the difference in the aspects denoted by the verbals, we must observe that the combination between *Kear's...voice* and *telling* is looser and less nexal than that between *a taxi* and *stop* and *the bell* and *ring*.

Again with the verb *see*, the participle performs an evidently characteristic function of adding a concrete perceptive description to the object. But when the verb implies a more abstract or figurative sense and has to be accompanied as its object by the expression of some visual or mental content comparable to an abstract fact, the resultant construction is "see+ a subordinate clause"<sup>31</sup>. The transition from the one construction to the other is sometimes delicate, and moreover much depends upon contextual restraints and rhetorical technique. Nevertheless we can see the distinct stylistic features in the respective constructions. The following passage quoted from the last part of the *Tale of Two Cities* describes what Sydney Carton is supposed to see in his mind's eye just before his execution.

(6) I see the lives for which I lay down my life...in that England which I shall see no more....I see the good old man, so long their friend, in ten years' time *enriching* them with all he has, and *passing* tranquilly to his reward. I see that I hold a sanctuary in their hearts, and in the hearts of their descendants hence.—Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* III. xv.

Here the three different constructions appear side by side with the same verb *see*. First it is followed by a single substantive object, next by a participle-construction, and then by a *that*-clause. In the last construction the abstract implication of the verb is structurally symbolized to the highest degree, while the two others are still suggestive of the concreteness in its literal sense.

§ 23. b. Among the group of verbs which imply or involve a durative state and which have been used with the construction during the last two centuries, *leave* and *keep* should be first mentioned. Compare examples (10) and (11) under § 20.

(1) She gave me an uncertain look and, saying she would go and see, left me *standing* in the passage.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* viii.

(2) They (=Railways) *keep* the small towns *going*.—Belloc, *On Nothing*, "On Railways and Things."

Besides these, what specially attracts our attention is the use of *have*. *Have*, construed with an object and a predicative, may mean "get (something) into a specified condition" (OED s.v. HAVE *v.* 17a); but it is only recently<sup>32</sup> that the present participle has come to appear as predicative of the object. The rise of this new usage is apparently due to the analogy of the well-established construction "have+object+bare infinitive" as in "I will have him *come*." Below some actual examples will be given.

<sup>31</sup> OED s.v. SEE *v.* 3, 4.

<sup>32</sup> OED does not record this use of *have*. It may be inferred from Poutsma (*Gram.* xx. 21a) that Jane Austen is the first to use *have* in this construction, as follows:

I am sure, from his manner, that you will *have* him *calling* here soon.—*Persuasion* ((1818)).

(3) "You know we *have* an author *living* here," he said.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* viii.

(4) When the day comes, they make off by motor-car, and as likely as not *have* a steam-yacht *waiting* for them on the coast.—Milne, *If I May*, "The Etiquette of Escape."

We can see that the intrinsic meaning of *have* in this use is neutral and colourless, and so the complementary participle displays a good deal of predicative force, often, as in the examples above, expressing the durative aspect. Herein lies the stylistic value of the participle as contrasted with that of the infinitive, though the constructions are parallel.<sup>33</sup> It is but natural, however, that *have* is made to imply a causative or passive sense by the context, just as when it is accompanied by an infinitive-construction.

(5) I won't *have* you *swearing* in front of the boy.—Greene, *The Basement Room* i.

(6) He'll hate *having* a lot of strangers *barging* in on him like this.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* iv.

At any rate the present participle is more descriptive and so seems to be more favoured in modern colloquialism than the bare infinitive in the same use.

With respect to this use of *have* we must next consider the parallel use of *get*.

(7) A pretty girl like Darling Jill has *got* everything *coming* her way, anyhow, and she knows it.—Caldwell, *God's Little Acre* ii.

(8) I ache all over, an' I *got* it *coming*.—Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath*.

The usage seems to be popular in modern American colloquialism. *Has got* in example (7) might be interpreted as colloquial variant of *has*, but we must observe the difference of expressiveness between *has got* and *has*. *Has got* expresses an active sense of securing something for oneself, while simple *has* suggests a somewhat passive, neutral idea. In *has got* we can recognize the active force of the verb *get*, which has invested the collocation "*get*+object+*~ing*" with a more factitive sense, as compared with "*have*+object+*~ing*." "*Get it coming*," as in example (8), is also the variant of the idiomatic expression "*have it coming* (to one)," which means "deserve something," as for instance in:

(9) You *had* it *coming* to you.—Paine, *Comrades of the Rolling Ocean* [D.A.].

Here also we can feel that *have* implies the neutral sense of experience, while *get* is more expressive in itself and so fitter to lively colloquialism.

Next we shall mention some more examples with similar expressions where the main verbs are more active in their sense and are more liable to imply a causative force.

(10) To alarm him would but *send* him *dashing* to his camp with his fatal

<sup>33</sup> In the following example the free position of the participle should be noticed; for such inversion would be felt awkward in the case of the infinitive.

One day we went to tea at Mrs. Greencurt's, who *had staying* with her a cousin, the wife of an Oxford don,....—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* viii.

news.—Bierce, *In 'the Midst of Life*, "A Horseman in the Sky."

(11) But in the light, porous soil of my garden on the chalk hills digging goes with a swing and a rhythm that *set* the thoughts *singing* like the birds.—Gardiner, "On a Distant View of a Pig."

(12) The private member...*started* the ball *rolling* by attacking the government.—*Daily Express* ((1901)) [OED].

The *-ing* forms used after these verbs *send*, *set* and *start* may be interpreted to be originally gerunds. In the expression "*send* a person *packing*," which means "dismiss him summarily," *packing* may have been corrupted from *on packing*, *a-packing*.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, as to the idiomatic expression "*set* a thing *going*," OED (s.v. *Set* v. 114 b, c, d) illustrates that *going* has come from *on (to, or obs. in) going*, *a-going*.<sup>35</sup> The similar expression "*start* an engine *running*" is analogous to "*start* an engine *to run*"; and from its ingressive nature *running* had better be explained as a gerund.

All these unprepositional *-ing* forms, however, express the durative aspect of some resultant action or movement so descriptively that, from the PE point of view, we can safely affirm they are now felt as participles. The reality is that the simple *-ing* form has been favoured in PE more than the prepositional *-ing* form: "That set me *thinking*" is now much commoner than "That set me *to thinking*." In the diachronical process from the gerund to the participle here perceived, there is represented a characteristic tendency in English syntax.

§ 24. c. Most verbs of mentality have newly come to be used with the "accusative and participle" construction from the nineteenth century onwards. The question arises here whether the *-ing* forms may be gerunds, not participles (cf. § 55). But from what has been observed about example (12) under § 20, we can infer that they are genetically participles. Moreover, in the following examples, we should notice the rather loose combination of the *-ing* forms with the preceding nouns or pronouns, to which they have added some descriptive predication with their durative or imperfective aspect.

(1) Imagine yourself in the dock, on whatever charge it may be, and *imagine* this and that friend *coming* forward to speak for you.—Milne, *If I May*, "Not Guilty."

(2) But *fancy* Caroline *travelling* across the continent of Europe with a chit of a girl, who will be more of a charge than an assistance.—Hardy, *Alicia's Diary* vii.

(3) He *pictured* the saturnine Gottlieb not at all *enjoying* the triumph but, with locked door, *abusing* the papers for their exaggerative reports of his

<sup>34</sup> Compare the third footnote (28) under § 20. OED (s.v. *PACK* v.<sup>1</sup> 10b), however, records no instance where the prepositional gerund is used. The first quotation with this construction is exemplified from as early as the sixteenth century:

I would...*send* him *packing*.—Nashe, *The Unfortunate Traveller* ((1594)).

<sup>35</sup> According to OED, the use of the type *in going* is first exemplified from c. 1440, that of the type *a-going* from 1530, and that of *going* from 1577, the quotation of which is:

The...Gadarits *set packing* the stoutest of them.—M. Hanmer, *The Auncient Ecclesiastical Histories*.

work.—S. Lewis, *Arrowsmith* XXIV. i.

(4) I *recollect* my old governor *caning* me in that little room.—Thackeray, *Pendennis* [Jespersen].

(5) Willcox expedited the deed, and I *remember* him *telling* me he had a great pleasure in making it ready.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(6) I can *understand* the landlord *deciding* to throw in the walls and the roof.—Milne, *If I May*, "Fixtures and Fittings."

(7) I don't quite *like* my children *going* away from home.—Hardy, *Tess* vi.

(8) I don't *want* you *bumping* around in a wagon much.—Cather, *Obscure Destinies*, "Neighbour Rosicky" i.

In example (1), we should notice the parallel constructions: "*imagine*+object +*in the dock*" and "*imagine*+object+*coming*." Here *coming* is apparently placed in the same syntactic position as the prepositional phrase *in the dock*, and therefore should be interpreted as a participle that functions as predicative adjunct of the object. The same cumulative style of expression can be especially remarkable in example (3). The two participles *enjoying* and *abusing* introduce the vivid supplementary description about the object which is in itself concrete enough. The patterns "*like*+object+*~ing*" and "*want*+object+*~ing*" as in examples (7) and (8) are modern substitutes for the older "*like* or *want*+object +*to*-infinitive." The newer expression is felt more descriptive and so seems fitter to the vivid colloquial style, as is the case with "*have*+object+*~ing*" described in the previous section.<sup>36</sup> It is the function of the participle, not the gerund, that is corresponding to that of the infinitive in this kind of construction. It would be instructive now to notice that as to the verb *like* OED (s. v. *LIKE* v.<sup>1</sup> 6c) records an example of a concrete construction with a past participle dated 1805<sup>37</sup> earlier than examples with *to*-infinitives which are quoted from 1849 and 1887, apart from a much earlier example (1534) of an abstract construction with a *that*-clause as object.

It must be admitted that there are some instances in ModE where some of the verbs here exemplified also introduce the construction that is distinctly gerundial. The phenomenon will be afresh observed in § 55.

#### 8. "Preposition+Object+Participle" in ModE

§ 25. The use of the construction governed by the preposition has been remarkably expanded in the ModE period. First after *with* the construction has grown more and more popular. Cf. §§ 17, 18.

(1) I stood like a man at a mark, *with* a whole army *shooting* at me.—Shakespeare, *Much Ado* II. i. 254.

<sup>36</sup> Speaking particularly, we perceive another difference. In most instances the participle-construction follows the negative forms of the main verbs, while there is no such restriction with the infinitive-construction.

<sup>37</sup> The quotation is:

Would he *like* the subject *discussed* in newspapers?—J. H. Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*.

(2) They are to be fish'd for there, *with* your hook alwaies *touching* the ground.—Walton, *The Compleat Angler* [Jespersen].

(3) It's a gloomy thing...to talk about one's own past, *with* the day *breaking*.—Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* II. v.

(4) A man all in a heap in the bows of the boat, slept *with* both arms *embracing* the stem-head and his cheek laid on the gunwale.—Conrad, *Youth*.

(5) It was a soft grey outside, *with* heavy clouds *working* across the sky, and occasional squalls of snow.—Cather, *My Antonia* xii.

This expression with a noun or pronoun as its nucleus accompanied by a complementary participle is so well suited to the vivid, concrete style of PE that the examples would be too numerous to be here mentioned. In example (4) a phrase containing a present participle is co-ordinated with a parallel one containing a past participle. Example (5) is especially noteworthy in that as object of the preposition *with* the combination of noun and participle "(heavy) clouds *working*..." runs parallel with a nominal expression followed by a prepositional adjunct "(occasional) squalls of snow." Here we can see the nature of the participle as predicative adjunct revealed externally.

§ 26. Before inquiring into the instances introduced by other prepositions, we shall observe those where *look at* and *listen to* introduce their objects followed by participles. This is apparently a new construction developed on the analogy of the older expression "*see or hear*+object+participle."

(1) The general *looked* stolidly *at* a distant regiment *swarming* slowly up the hill through rough undergrowth.—Bierce, *In the Midst of Life*, "The Affair at Coulter's Notch."

(2) It is nice to...*listen to* the school bell *sounding* dinner, call-over, prep., and lights out.—Hilton, *Good-Bye, Mr. Chips* i.

In these examples the adjunctive nature of the participles seems more apparent, for *look at* or *listen to* expresses more distinctly a physical action that requires some concrete person or thing as its object, so that the attendant participle can be interpreted as more adjunctive or complementary than in the construction introduced by *see* or *hear*. In the following example we can perceive still more clearly the adjunctive nature of the participles that conduces to form a concrete, descriptive style.

(3) He got up painfully, *looked* at the flames, *at* the sea *sparkling* round the ship, and black, as ink farther away; he *looked at* the stars *shining* dim through a thin veil of smoke in a sky black, black as Erebus.—Conrad, *Youth*.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> The corresponding infinitive-construction after *look at* or *listen to* is found mainly in modern American English.

*Look at* that horse *jump*.—[Zandvoort].

I've got a religion of my own, and if it's good enough for me, *listening to* a Universalist preacher *preach* would only make me dissatisfied with what I've got.—Caldwell, *Georgia Boy*, "The Day We Rang the Bell." This is stylistically more compact but less descriptive than the participle-construction that we have described here.

§ 27. Similar modern phenomena are seen when *the sight of, the sound of* and other synonymous expressions precede the combinations "object and participle." They participate in the formation of the same concrete and cumulative style as verbs of perception, *see, hear*, etc., are liable to form with the corresponding construction.

(1) He dreaded *the sight of Mrs. Baines waiting* in the hall.—Greene, *The Basement Room* v.

(2) All I know is that at the end of three weeks I *caught sight of* Smith's lunatic *digging* in Swaffer's kitchen garden.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(3) We become optimists *at sight of* the first crocus in the garden *pushing* its way into the light.—Lynd, "It's a Fine World."

(4) He felt *the glance of* the policeman *running* over him like a chilly insect.—Galsworthy, *Caravan*, "Virtue."

(5) Here she was, making him positively look forward to *the glimpse of* her safety bicycle *careering* along the lakeside road.—Hilton, *Good-Bye, Mr. Chips* iv.

(6) *The spectacle of* a bevy of girls *dancing* without male partners seemed to amuse the third (*i. e.* of the brothers).—Hardy, *Tess* ii.

(7) All of a sudden, I was startled by *the sound of* the full organ *pealing* on the ear, accompanied by rustic voices and the willing quire of village-maids and children.—Hazlitt, *Table Talk*, "Why Distant Objects Please."

(8) *Sounds are heard of* a cell door *being* closed and locked, and approaching footsteps.—Galsworthy, *Justice* III. ii.

(9) Then I sat up right into the night, thinking that every movement of the wind outside or of the drip of water was *the little pad of* his step *coming* up the flagstones to the door.—Belloc, *On Nothing*, "On a Dog and a Man Also."

(10) As I entered the kitchen, I sniffed *a pleasant smell of* gingerbread *baking*.—Cather, *My Antonia* I. ii.

Examples (1) to (6) contain nouns of visual sense and examples (7) to (9) nouns of auditory sense. In example (10) the noun denotes olfactory sense, another kind of sensuous perception. In such contexts these nouns first require the addition of the expression for some concrete persons or things to which they refer, and then presuppose that it may be followed by some further complementary expression of action or state concerning the concrete objects. In the process of expression, therefore, "*sight or sound + of + object + ~ing*" may be regarded as just analogous to "*see or hear + object + ~ing*." It is true that the participles in the examples above are adjuncts rather than predicatives in their syntactic relation to the preceding nouns. But generally speaking, the predicative nature is inherent in the adjunct when expressed after the head-word. This intrinsic nature as *predicative adjunct* should be equally observed in the participle of the well-established pattern "I saw (*or heard*) him *coming*," described in §§ 7, 14, 20.

In this respect it would be instructive to notice that there appears in example (8) above an instance of a preposed participle "*approaching* footsteps." Stylisti-



cally *approaching* here has brought about a compact, though less dynamic, effect, while "footsteps *approaching*" would become more suggestive of a progressive sensuous impression, the participle turning looser and more predicatival.

§ 28. We shall next enumerate some other examples that contain similar expressions where a noun or an adjective denotes some phase of mentality.

(1) And he always would come to an end, with many emphatic shakes of his head, upon that awful *sensation of his heart melting* within him directly he set foot on board that ship.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(2) In uttering those words, he was *conscious of a girl coming* down from the common just above them.<sup>39</sup>—Galsworthy, *The Apple-Tree* i.

(3) He...died, the old dilettante, sixty years later with nothing to show rather than preserve *the memory of Mrs. Baines's malicious voice saying* good night, her soft determined footfalls on the stairs to the basement, *going down, going down*.—Greene, *The Basement Room* ii.

The last is an instance of impressionistic style where the writer goes on noting down the impressions along with the stream of consciousness in the character described. The present participles, especially the latter reiterated ones, are effective as important constituents of such style, with their durative or liquid aspect. Again, the expression "the memory of...*saying*" should be compared with the expression "remember...*saying*" as in example (5) under § 24.

§ 29. In PE there are other instances belonging to the type "noun+of +noun+~ing," where the *-ing* form should also be interpreted as a participle. Here the first noun does not express any kind of perception, but is the one which makes us anticipate the addition of some concrete description by means of the following *of*-phrase. The complementary participle, with its descriptive force, performs the function of making an expatiatory predication about the second noun. To perceive the same stylistic characteristic as has hitherto been described, we should only have to observe the actual quotations.

(1) I told my poor great master Haydon...that he ought to send in a *cartoon of King John dying* of a surfeit of lampreys for the frescoes in the new Houses of Parliament.—A. Huxley, *Rotunda*, "The Tillotson Banquet" iii.

(2) But if you can actually take a *snapshot of the squire kicking* the poacher, you can prove *the practical occurrence of a banker bashing* a beggar on the head—then you explode the whole generous fiction on which the popularity of a gentry reposes.—Chesterton, *As I Was Saying*, "About Political Creeds."

(3) ...the domestic scene I beheld in the most Moslem part of Palestine, *the episode of a Moslem woman shouting and yelling* abuse of her husband across the breadth of a small lake, while the husband stood helpless and evidently

<sup>39</sup> The following example of the same type is noteworthy, because the participle is more loosely connected with the preceding pronoun, so as better to manifest the concreteness of the cumulative style.

While Martin stood at his bench he was *conscious of her, humming* at a table in the corner.—S. Lewis, *Arrowsmith* XXI. iv.

unable to think of any repartee.—*Ibid.*, "About Loving Germans."

It must be noticed that in example (1) "a cartoon of King John *dying*" is not exactly equivalent to "a cartoon of King John *who was dying*." To *King John* the attachment of *dying* is more direct or intuitive than that of the relative clause. *Dying*, though expressed as an adjunct, is suggestive of some potential nature as predicative. In example (3) "a Moslem woman *shouting* and *yelling*..." is in a parallel manner followed by the clausal construction "the husband *stood*..."

§ 30. When a word-group as object of a preposition expresses some abstract content of a fact or information, we are liable to have recourse to a gerund as sense-predicate of the group (cf. §§ 46,47,54). In reality, however, it is sometimes difficult for the writer, in his linguistic sense, to decide whether he is going to express some idea as an abstract synthetic content or resort to a concrete, analytic style of expression. Accordingly there are occasional manifestations of his psychological fluctuation as to the use of the *-ing* form. In the modern Globe Edition, we see:

- (1) *Clown* Good madonna, why mournest thou?  
*Olivia* Good fool, for my brother's death.  
*Clo.* I think his soul is in hell, madonna.  
*Oli.* I know his soul is in heaven, fool.  
*Clo.* The more fool, madonna, to *mourn for* your brother's  
soul *being* in heaven.

—Shakespeare, *Twel. N.* I. v. 72—77

In the last sentence above the object of *mourn for* may be interpreted as the whole synthetic group "your brother's soul *being* in heaven," of which *being* is a gerund. But there is an interesting proof. In the Folio edition the same sentence runs as follows: "The more foole (Madonna) to mourne for your brothers soule, being in heauen," with a comma before *being*. Indeed, if we turn to the whole context above quoted, we shall see that it would not only be suited to this simple remark but also, in a better way, enlighten its meaning to understand *your brother's soul* as the primary object of *mourn for*, and *being in heaven* as a supplementary adjunct that has a peculiar prominence of its own. According to this interpretation *being in heaven* will mean "now that it is in heaven" or "even if it is in heaven", and so invest this statement of *Clown's* with a new sense of lively humour.

In this way the presence of a pause between the noun or pronoun and the *-ing* form often makes it clear that the form has been used as a participle in this kind of construction.

(2) *Think*, for example, of the woman she admired most, Lady Bexborough, *opening* the bazaar.—Woolf, *Mrs. Dalloway*.

(3) Every now and then he still *heard of* her, *living* down there, *spending* her days out in the woods and fields,...and steadily *growing* poorer and thinner and more eccentric; *becoming*, in short, impossibly difficult, as only English women can.—Galsworthy, *Caravan*, "Sprindleberries."

We shall later (in § 54) deal with the gerund-construction introduced by *think of* or *hear of*; but in the examples above it is out of question that each *-ing* form is a participle. In the characteristically cumulative style revealed in example (2), the loose participle after the pause evidently plays an essential part. In example (3) the feature of the style is more striking. The succession of the participial phrases has displayed a climactic descriptive force.

§ 31. The expression "*think of* + object + participle," as exemplified by (2) under the previous section, is a fairly common type of emotional, and chiefly interrogative, sentence whose tone is decidedly colloquial. In meaning and use it is approximately correspondent to the expression "*fancy or imagine* + object + participle," which we have dealt with in § 24. For an example of the type, let us now take "*Think of my brother doing it.*" In this sentence, what the speaker intends to convey as object of "think of" is not the abstract fact that his brother does it, but primarily the concrete agent "my brother," to which he goes on to add a secondary expression of the agent's action by means of the participial phrase "doing it." We shall cite two more instances.

(1) *Think of me ever being rich!*—Pycroft, *Agony Point* ((1861)) [OED].

(2) *Think of years to come, and children being born to us, and this past matter getting known—for it must get known.*—Hardy, *Tess* xxxvi.

In example (1) the use of the accusative *me* externally demonstrates that *being* is a present participle. In example (2) we may perceive synthetic entireties in "children *being* born to us" and "this past matter *getting* known." Yet it must be observed that the two groups are preceded by "years to come," the more immediate object of *think of*. In these parallel groups we should be allowed to interpret *to come*, *being* and *getting* as adjuncts to "years," "children" and "this past matter" respectively. It is not that "children *being*..." and "this past matter *getting*..." can be paraphrased into "children who will be..." and "this matter that will get..." The original stylistic value, both concrete and descriptive, can only be well displayed by the use of the simple participles.

The expression is not, however, confined to this type of emotional utterance. We can add the examples of general statements.

(3) Suddenly even the upper part of the house became unbearable to him as he *thought of* Mrs. Baines *moving* round shrouding the sofas, laying out the dust-sheets.—Greene, *The Basement Room* i.

(4) I *thought of* her with her white body, her chin so milky, in the arms of that old fat gross man and his thick loose lips *kissing* hers.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xvii.

Example (4) is of special interest. It illustrates the adaptability of the participle in the loose and cumulative style.

Associated with "*think of* + object + participle" should be considered "*the thought of* + object + participle." Here again we must observe the same characteristic of the style.

(5) Do not send any more of my books home. I have a great pleasure

in *the thought of you looking* on them.—Keats, "The Complete Works" [Curme; Jespersen].

(6) Once he slowed down to a walk, but *the thought of the freezing extending* itself made him run again.—London, *To Build a Fire*.

As to example (5), it is indeed absurd to interpret "you" alone as object of "(the thought) *of*." But it will help us to appreciate the descriptive force of this expression if we regard *looking* as a participle. The participle is better suited than the gerund for the vivid description in the poet's mind that his friend is looking on the books, perhaps fondly taking them in his hands. In example (6), again, what is meant by the writer as subject of "made him run again" is not surely the thought of the abstract fact that the freezing extends itself, the sense which would be expected if *extending* here were to be understood as a gerund. As it is, the description is more concrete, with "the feeling," as primary object of "(the thought) *of*," considerably intensified and the participle *extending* supplemented as a predicative adjunct.

§ 32. In this chapter we have hitherto traced forward the general process of how the "accusative and participle" construction has been developed since the OE period. It is really surprising to see the tremendous expansion of the construction in the ModE period, especially after the beginning of the nineteenth century. The primary origin in OE was a limited range of usage where only some verbs of perception introduced this construction (cf. § 7). As an OE instance of the construction introduced by a preposition, we have observed a variety of "dative absolute" construction, *be him lifgendum* (cf. §§ 10—11), which, however, has not survived till the later period. Nevertheless, the stylistic feature of the idiom was in common with that of the main construction that has been preserved and expanded. Indeed the matter is often complicated by the confusion, both morphologic and syntactic, between the participle and the gerund; but it is the stylistic feature—concrete, cumulative and descriptive—as well as the syntactic function that has enabled us to trace the obscure way of the participle-construction. In the next chapter, we are going to proceed on the other parallel way of the gerund-construction, which we hope will serve, if subsidiarily, to elucidate the participle-construction in more detail.

## CHAPTER III

### The Development of the "Genitive and Gerund" Construction

#### 1. The Morphological Origin of the Gerund

§ 33. Before dealing with the construction in question, it will be proper for us to survey the general process of how the *-ing* form as gerund has been de-

veloped in the English language. In OE the endings *-ung* and, less usually, *-ing* were suffixes chiefly used to derive abstract nouns from verbs. Both the endings were mostly attached to weak verbs to form abstract nouns: e.g. *bletsung* (=blessing), *geendung* (=ending, end), *ræding* (=reading) (respectively from the verbs *bletsian*, *geendian*, *rædan*). The derivatives from strong verbs were rare, but they generally preferred the ending *-ung*.

At the end of the tenth century the formations in *-ung* were prevalent, but then set in the tendency of *-ung* being displaced by *-ing*. The causes for this transition may be considered in the three respects. (1) The first is phonological. In the point of articulation the palatal consonant-combination *-ng* is in more affinity to the high front vowel *-i-* than to the rounded back vowel *-u-*, which in its less stressed position was ready to be modified in the direction of *-i-* (cf. § 13).<sup>40</sup> It is assumed, besides, that according to the vowel-shift that took place in the late OE period, the dative plural ending *-ungum* changed into *-engum* and *-ingum*. The last influenced the other case-forms, till they all came to be levelled into *-ing*.<sup>41</sup>

(2) The second cause is functional. In OE the suffixes *-ing* and *-ung* were used to form concrete nouns from both verbs and nouns, as well as to form abstract nouns here considered. In such comprehensive use *-ung* come to appear less adaptable than *-ing*. The nouns ending in *-ing* were either feminine or masculine, or sometimes neuter, while those ending in *-ung* were almost invariably of the feminine gender. In other words, *-ing* was more multivocal than *-ung* in its original nature. This greater elasticity of *-ing* was in favour of the further advance of the same ending, so that it became established as the common form of the gerund as well.<sup>42</sup>

(3) Lastly the Scandinavian influence is to be taken into account. In Old Norse the corresponding suffix was almost unexceptionally *\*-ingo*. Brought into English at the end of the OE period, it furthered the generalization of the form *-ing* as a comprehensive suffix for both a substantival derivative and a verbal one, abstract and concrete.<sup>43</sup>

§ 34. For the causes above remarked, the use of *-ung* had gradually declined, till at the beginning of the thirteenth century the old trace of the form was only barely retained in those dialects which correspond to West Saxon in OE. For example, in *Ancren Riwle* the ratio between *-ing* and *-ung* was already four to one. There we find the indication of hesitation in the occasional indifferent use of the two forms: *biginninge*, *bircousinge* (=repenting), *gederinge* (=gathering), *lokinge*, *niminge* (=taking), *redinge*, *scheauwinge* (=showing) and *totinge* (=peeping) were seen by the side of the corresponding forms that end in *-unge*.<sup>44</sup> Finally,

<sup>40</sup> Langenhove, *The Origin of the Gerund* §1.2.3. By the way, the same section of the work describes the transition in more comprehensive details mainly from the phonological point of view.

<sup>41</sup> Brunner, *Die englische Sprache* II. p. 320.

<sup>42</sup> Mossé, *F. P.* II. §144.

<sup>43</sup> Brunner, *Op. cit.* II. p. 320; Mossé, *Op. cit.* II. §144; Langenhove, *Op. cit.* §1.2.3(g).

<sup>44</sup> Mossé, *Op. cit.* II. §145.

about 1250, *-ing* entirely disappeared, with the universal establishment of *-ing* as the ending of the verbal substantive or gerund.

It must here be remembered that the predominance of the gerundial form *-ing* has a great significance, in view of the identical form *-ing* as the present participle which had displaced *-end* in the ME period (cf. §§ 14, 15). The morphological convergency of the two categories was surely an advantageous condition under which the gerundial syntax was to attain a surprising development in the later period.

## 2. The Syntactic Development of the Gerund

§ 35. As remarked in the previous section, the gerund<sup>45</sup> or verbal substantive was originally an abstract noun. It is true that it was derived from a verb and so semantically had a verbal sense, but it primarily belonged to the syntactic category of nouns, just as did OE words in *-nes* (=ness), e.g. *rihtwisnes* (=righteousness), *gerecednes* (=narrative), etc. The substantival nature of the gerund is evident when we compare the corresponding form *-ung* in German. There the forms ending in *-ung* have remained unquestionably nouns: e.g. *Belehrung* (=teaching), *Führung* (=leading), *Lesung* (=reading), *Schaffung* (=creation), respectively derived from the verbs *belehren*, *führen*, *lesen*, *schaffen* (=create).

In OE, the verbal substantive in *-ung* or *-ing*, as a genuine noun, was naturally accompanied by some restrictive noun or pronoun in the genitive case, when it was required to express the idea of subject or object for the sense of the verb from which the substantive had been derived.

(1) Elisabeth gehyrde *Marian gretinge*.—*Luke* i. 41 [Koch]. (Elisabeth heard Mary's greeting.)

(2) Hit is fiscwylle and fugolwylle, and mære on *huntunge heorta* and *rana*.—*Bede* I. i. (It, *i.e.* Ireland, is rich in fish and fowl, and famous for hunting harts and roes.)

*Marian* in example (1) is the genitive of *Maria* (=Mary), and *heorta* and *rana* in example (2) are the genitive plurals of *heort* (=hart) and *ra* (=roe). In the former the semantic relation of the genitive to the gerund is that of subject, while in the latter the two genitives are in the relation of objects to the verbal sense of *huntunge* (=hunting). In respect of the substantival construction, it is instructive to notice that as the German translation of the passage cited as example (2), Brunner (*Die englische Sprache* II. p. 320) gives: "Es ist ...berühmt durch *die Jagd* (=the hunt) auf Hirsche und Renntiere." In the German expression, the original English gerund has been rendered into the genuine noun.

<sup>45</sup> Our use of the term "gerund" should be strictly distinguished from what is commonly adopted by philologists of early English, who take the "gerund" as identical with the inflected infinitive that originally ended in *-enne*, *-anne*. Indeed there are instances in OE and ME where *-enne* was confused with *-end(e)*, *-ing(e)*, and still in ModE the *-ing* form sometimes performs the function of a dative infinitive (e.g. "He went *hunting*"). But we should like to regard these as merely temporary or subsidiary phenomena.

§ 36. In that early period the word-order was much freer than today. When a genitive noun was in the objective relation to a gerund, the former was often placed before the latter so as to form a closely attributive construction.

(1) Swiþost he for ðider, to-eacan *ƿæs landes sceawunge*, for ƿæm hors-hwælum.—Alfred's *Orosius* [Mossé]. (Especially he went there, besides seeing the land, to get the walrus.)

In the same period there was another way of expression, where the preposed noun has no formal sign of the oblique case and is combined with the gerund so as to form one compound. Here we may say that the closeness of the combination as observed in example (1) has been heightened to the utmost extent.

(2) Siððan ongann *godspelbodung*.—Ælfric, *Homilies* [A.-S. D.]. (Then began gospel-preaching, i.e. the Christian dispensation.)

This is the most primitive way of expressing the complex idea. In the compound *godspelbodung*, *bodung* (=preaching) reveals its static substantival character. Though this kind of expression continued till late ME and its correspondent is found in ModE,<sup>46</sup> its tradition must be regarded as distinct from that of the gerundial syntax in general. We can say that the English gerund began to go on its way of syntactic progress when it had left the stage of substantival stability, proceeding towards that of verbal flexibility.

Let us now see the process by means of the representative types. The first type is *boc(-)ræding* (=book-reading), and the second *ræding boc* (=reading a book). The former represents the synthetic stage where the element of object *boc* is expressed as the first component of the fixed compound, while the latter represents the analytic stage where the object is freely expressed as a syntactically independent unit after the governing verbal *ræding*. The transition from the old synthetic stage to the new analytic stage is dated at the end of the twelfth century.<sup>47</sup>

§ 37. We are now in a position to inquire into the old stage of *boc(-)ræding* in more detail. The following is the quotation from early ME.

(1) Man ƿær ne ge spædde butan *man myrringe* and *feoh spillinge*.—*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (E) 1096 ((1121—2)). (There was spread nothing but the injury of men and the loss of money.)

Here it would seem that *man* and *feoh* in *man myrringe* and *feoh spillinge* were merely the first components of the compounds, which happened to appear in two separate words in consequence of the scribal habit. It is also conceivable, however, that there had dawned the potentiality of the first elements, sooner or later, being felt to be accusative objects, as syntactic units, of the second.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>46</sup> In ModE there is a somewhat free kind of compound-nouns belonging to the same type. As to their origin, however, none can be traced back to the OE usage here remarked. In the following instances the dates given after the respective words denote those of their earliest uses according to OED: *bell-ringing* (c. 1315), *child-bearing* (1388), *bear-baiting* (c. 1475), *house-keeping* (1550), *haymaking* (1588), *fox-hunting* (1674), *glass-blowing* (c. 1829), etc.

<sup>47</sup> Mossé, *F. P.* II. § 172.

<sup>48</sup> Curme, "History of the English Gerund." *Englische Studien* XLV.

About the same time we find another type *boces ræding*, which is composed of an objective genitive and a gerund. This has already been exemplified by example (1) under § 35. The following is noticeable, for it is quoted from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, just as example (1) above.

(2) Ne be heold hit nan þing seo scip fyrðing buton folces ge swinc and feos spilling and heora feonda forðbylding.—*Ibid.* 999. (The naval expedition saw nothing but the people's toil, wasting money and emboldening their enemy.)

It is true that *scip fyrðing* should be interpreted as a close compound, where *scip* (=ship) is rather attributively attached to *fyrðing* (=expedition), so that the definite article *seo* agrees in the feminine case with the whole compound *scip-fyrðing*. But *feos spilling* and *heora feonda forðbylding* are evidently free combinations that consist of the objective genitives and the verbal substantives. Now that we compare this with example (1), we can see the remarkable parallelism of the two types: *feoh spillinge* and *feos spilling*. Of these the former enjoyed a longer life, though finally, we might say, they both come to be supplanted by the newer one.

Now, at that transitional period the morphological distinction was generally becoming obliterated, and at the end of the twelfth century the noun or nominal group preceding the gerund appeared in the accusative case. The following may be cited as one of the earliest examples of the type "accusative object and gerund."

(3) Ich bide þe...bi his side openunge, bi his blodi Rune þet ron inne monie studen...erest in his one hond and seoððen in his oðer, olast in his side *ƿurlunge*.—*Lofsong of ure Lefdi* ((c. 1200)) [Van der Gaaf; Mossé]. (I pray you...by opening his side, by the issue of his blood that ran in many places ...in piercing first his one hand and then his other, at last his side.)

Here the gerunds *openunge* (=opening) and *ƿurlunge* (=piercing) have displayed, to a certain extent, the syntactic force as verbs, though the prepositions *bi* (=by) and *in* would be more naturally understood as governing the whole following groups than as governing the gerunds alone. Especially we should observe the free use of *his one hond* (=hand), *his oðer* (=other), and *his side* as object of *ƿurlunge*, as contrasted with the fixed nature of the component or genitive object as seen in examples (1) and (2).

Though the last type, in turn, began to be superseded by the newer one of *ræding boc* about the same period,<sup>49</sup> the general character of the construction was still in the substantival stage. We see that in example (2) above the two "genitive and gerund" phrases *feos spilling* and *heora feonda forðbylding* are co-ordinated by the "genitive and noun" *folces ge-swinc* (=people's toil). Though the functional relation denoted by the genitive in the latter is subjective, as opposed to

<sup>49</sup> The old type, however, kept remaining through the ME period. The following example, illustrating a modern remnant as late as the sixteenth century, is noteworthy in containing another synonymous construction with an *of*-phrase, which will be remarked in § 38.

Ther was brybes (=bribes) walking, *money makynge*, makynge of handes (=hands).—Latimer, *Seven Sermons before Edward VI* ((1549)) [Mossé].



the objective relation in the former, yet the exact parallelism shows that the *-ing* forms were felt as syntactically genuine nouns. In example (3), again, the "accusative and gerund" phrase (*bi*) *his side openunge* is followed almost appositionally by the group with a noun as its head-word; but the adjective *blodi* here is in the subjective relation to the verbal idea expressed by the noun *rune*, just as in *his side openunge* the noun *side* is in the objective relation to the verbal idea of *openunge*. The gerund *openunge* remarkably corresponds to the noun *rune* in the syntactic status.

§ 38. The substantival nature of the gerund in its early stage can be observed in another construction. Besides that the old objective genitive was supplanted by the accusative object in consequence of the inflectional decay, the function of the genitive was sometimes handed down to a periphrastic expression with the preposition *of*. This analytic way of expression also made its appearance at the beginning of the thirteenth century and became considerably usual in ME, but presently it was predominated by the more verbal construction with the simple object following the gerund. The following example is of particular interest, since it manifests a transitional phenomenon where we have both an *of*-phrase and an accusative pronoun as objects of the successive gerunds.

(1) Afterward, in *getinge of your riches* and in *usinge hem* (=them), ye shul (=shall) alwey have three thinges in your herte (=heart).—Chaucer, *C. T.*, "The Tale of Melibeus" § 52.

It was in the fourteenth century that the verbal force of the gerund was conspicuously developed. This was illustrated by the new use of adverbs as modifiers of gerunds, as well as the use of objects after them. We shall here cite from Mossé (*F. P.* II. § 174) the interesting remark that Dan Michel of Northgate, whose *Azenbite of Inwyt* was completed in 1340, was just in the transitional stage in the use of adverbs with gerunds<sup>50</sup> and that we find there *ate uerste guoinge in* (= at first going in ) and *uallyng down* (=falling down) by the side of *inguoynge* (= *ingoing*), and *at his down commyng* (at his down coming) as well as *his first commyng down*. As to his remarkably frequent use of gerunds, we may assume that it was in many cases due to the use of the *gérondifs* in *-ant*<sup>51</sup> that had appeared in the Old French originals. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Dan Michel made a considerable contribution to the syntactic development of the English gerund.

Another contributor in the fourteenth century is Wyclif. In his version of the Bible published in 1382, according to OED (s. v. *-ING*<sup>1</sup> 2), he regularly uses the gerund with verbal force in translating the Latin *gerundium*, while

<sup>50</sup> The use of an adverb with a gerund, however, did not start at that time in the fourteenth century, as is often alleged, but much earlier—indeed, in the twelfth century (cf. Mossé, *Op. cit.* § 174).

<sup>51</sup> The Old French form in *-ant*, in turn, was due to the convergency of the Vulgar Latin present participle in *-antem* and "gerundium" in *-ando*. In Vulgar Latin the ablative "gerundium" in *-ando* performed the same function as the present participle. This functional confusion was kept on in Old French, and, what is worse, facilitated by the morphological identity. The source of the modern indistinctness is very far to seek.

he retains the original substantival construction where an abstract noun has been used in the Latin text. Thus we find "the thridde moneth of the *goyng* of Yrael out (*egressionis*) of the loond of Egipte" (*Exod.* xix. 1) (the third month when Israel went out of the land of Egypt); but "power of *heelynge* (*curandi*) sicknesis, and of *castynge* out (*ejiciendi*) fendis" (*Mark* iii. 15) (power of healing sicknesses, and of casting out fiends). In the former *goyng*, together with *out*, corresponds to the Latin noun *egressionis*, genitive of *egressio*. It is therefore used like a noun, preceded by the definite article and followed by the *of*-phrase that is in the relation of subject to its verbal sense. In the latter, on the other hand, (*of*) *heelynge* and (*of*) *castynge out*, which correspond to the Latin genitive gerundiums *curandi* and *ejiciendi*, immediately precede their objects just as genuine verbs do.

From these instances we may judge that the Latin influence, as well as the Old French, was a factor in helping the English gerund to be developed in verbal constructions. The new gerundial construction was also favoured by some other writers such as Maundeville and Chaucer. It is upon the current of this development in the fourteenth century that we see the "subject and gerund" construction starting to make a steady advance.

### 3. *to-janes þo sunne risindde*

§ 39. As has been observed above, the transposition of the object after the gerund represents a marked step in the verbalization of the gerund whose nature is originally substantival. The gerund has now developed as much verbal capability as an ordinary transitive verb in freely preceding its object according to the common word-order in English syntax. At the same time it may be concluded that the older order "(pro)noun+gerund" has become reserved for another important purpose, that is, to express the relation of the subject to the gerund. Morphologically, too, a correspondent phenomenon has taken place. As the means of expressing the objective relation to the gerund the genitive case began to be supplanted by the accusative at the end of the twelfth century. In the same way, the old genitive that had denoted the relation of subject to the verbal idea of the gerund came to be replaced by the new accusative about two centuries later. This has undoubtedly enhanced the flexibility of the gerundial expression, marking a further step in its development.

Now we must remark a special phenomenon that had appeared much earlier than the general transition to the new "subject and gerund" construction. The following might be recognized as the earliest example where the gerund is preceded by a subjective common case, instead of a genitive case.

(1) Si sterre...apierede te þo þrie kinges of heþenesse *to-janes þo sunne risindde*.—Kentish Sermons ((a. 1250)) [Morris & Skeat]. (The star... appeared to the three kings of heathendom towards the sun rising.)

In interpreting the phrase *to-janes þo sunne risindde* in this quotation written in the Kentish dialect in the thirteenth century, there are two points to be con-

sidered. The first is the question whether *risindde* may not be a present participle, instead of a gerund. It is true that the form ending in *-inde* is that of a present participle as distinguished from a gerund which ends in *-inge*, and that in Kentish the distinction between the two categories was well preserved in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But the morphological confusion of the two forms was a fairly common phenomenon in those times. The participial form was sometimes meant for a gerund, and *vice versa*. From this fact it can be judged that *risindde* in the example above is used as a gerund in spite of its form.<sup>52</sup>

Secondly there is a question of how to interpret this compact expression *to-janes þo sunne risindde*. We can see that the context allows it to be interpreted in the two different ways. (1) If the preposition *to-janes*, whose original sense is "against," is here understood to imply a temporal relation, meaning "against the time of, near," the whole phrase will come to mean "near or at the time when the sun rose, *i. e.* near or at sunrise." (2) If, on the other hand, we take *to-janes* here as denoting the relation of local direction with the sense of "towards", then the whole phrase will be interpreted as meaning "towards the point where the sun rises, *i. e.* towards the east." The second interpretation has been adopted by, among others, Morris<sup>53</sup> and Einkenel,<sup>54</sup> but we should like to resort to the first one with OED and others, on the grounds that will be described in the following section.

§ 40. If we admit that *to-janes þo sunne risindde* implies the idea of direction and means "towards the east," *risindde* may as well be regarded as a present participle which is adjunctively subjoined to *þo sunne*. Then the whole expression will appear to form a concrete style, very characteristic of the early syntax. Even so, the combination has too much connotation for us to justify this construing. The fact is that *risindde* is a gerund as has been verified in the previous section, and moreover there is an important piece of corroboration. The *Kentish Sermons* are English translations from the French originals. According to OED (s.v. SUN-RISING), the French corresponding to the part "*to-janes þo sunne risindde*" is "*vers le solail (=soleil) levant*." It is inferred, therefore, that the French *gérondif levant* was the prototype of the English *risindde*. Though the French *gérondif* itself had already been indistinguishable from the present participle from the morphological point of view, we should now be reminded that modern French has fairly established idioms of a similar construction, *au soleil levant* and *au soleil couchant*. These correspond in English to "at sunrise" and "at sunset" respectively; and it would be difficult for us to perceive in these French phrases the dynamic expressiveness that can be displayed by the absolute participial phrase. In the same way, *vers le solail levant* and its translation *to-janes þo sunne risindde* are such fixedly constructed expressions that we may even feel *solail levant* and *sunne risindde* as compounds. We may say that the elements here

<sup>52</sup> Mossé, *F. P.* II. § 154; Bøgholm, *English Speech from an Historical Point of View* p. 217.

<sup>53</sup> *Specimens of Early English* I. p. 332.

<sup>54</sup> *Historische Syntax*, Nachtrage (§ 3 κ).

are so closely combined to each other that the groups have come to imply the fused meaning of a temporal noun "sunrise" (G "Sonnenaufgang").

It seems to be significant from the standpoint of syntactic history that the earliest type of the "subject and gerund" construction, even if it was the imitation of the Old French expression, was in the nature of a compound. The stage of compounds represents that of close and static structure, which later proceeds to the stage of open and dynamic structure. In §§ 36, 37 we have described how the primitive type of compound *boc(-)ræding* has grown into the free syntactic type *ræding boc* in respect of the development of the "gerund and object" construction. Now, as to the "subject and gerund" construction, we see a parallel tendency. The compound-like *(the) sun rising* represents the primitive type of the construction. It makes us anticipate the later development of freer and more general types, where any kind of noun or pronoun can be used before a gerund as sense-subject of the latter.

§41. The type "the sun rising," "the sun going down," or suchlike, especially preceded by a preposition, began to be found more than half a century later than the instance in the *Kentish Sermons* dealt with in the previous sections. The type of expression was pretty common in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In every instance it had the function of temporal determination, and there should be observed the static substantival nature which is alien to the participle-construction. The following are some of the examples.<sup>55</sup>

(1) Mury hit is *in sonne rising*.—*King Alisaunder* ((c. 1300)). (It is merry about sunrise.)

(2) At morn *yn the sonne rysyng* Brutus led Pandras...Until his castel.—Robert of Brunne, *Chronicle* ((1338)). (At sunrise in the morning Brutus led Pandras...to his castle.)

(3) And þat sal last *fra þe son rysyng* Till þe tyme of *þe son doungangyng*.—Rolle of Hampole, *The Pricke of Conscience* ((c. 1340)). (And that shall last from sunrise till sunset.)

(4) He wolde rest in it *after the sunne goyng down*.—Wyclif, *Gen.* xxvii. 11 ((c. 1382)). (He would rest in it after sunset.)

It is now interesting to see that this type of "common case and gerund" was liable to be superseded by the more usual one that contains a genitive noun or its equivalent *of*-phrase. Example (1), for instance, appears in the other text (Laud MS.) as: "Mury hit is in *sonnes risyng*." By the side of "fra þe son rysyng," as in example (3), Richard Rolle uses in another place (*The Psalter* ((a. 1340))), "fra the rysyng *of the sun*." Again "after the sunne goyng down" in the biblical passage quoted in example (4) has been altered in Purvey's revision ((a. 1388)) into "aftir the goyng down *of the sunne*." This may indicate that the type "(the) sun rising" was not altogether felt as a close compound but was likely to be

<sup>55</sup> The examples mentioned in this section have been quoted chiefly from Van der Gaaf, "The Gerund Preceded by the Common Case" §§27-29; Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* §148; and Brunner, *Die englische Sprache* II. p. 324.

understood as a free combination as if "the sun" were equivalent to the subjective genitive "the sun's" or the genitive-phrase "of the sun". But the fact is that the type has failed to be established as a permanent one<sup>56</sup>; it is rather a special or limited expression which implies the abstract idea in its concrete outer form. *Ʒe sunne rysynge* does not mean "that the sun rises (rose) or is (was) rising" but "the time when the sun rises (rose)." Such a condensed and connotative expression was too special to be felt as a typical construction of "subject and gerund." There is good reason for OED (s. v. SUN n. 13) to have recorded this kind of "special compounds," *sun-arising*, *sun-going-down* and *sun-sitting*, all marked *obsolete* and first exemplified from c. 1440. The dictionary also treats *sunrising* and *sunsetting* under independent headings, and marking them both as "now *rare* or *archaic*," notes that they have been superseded by *sunrise* and *sunset* respectively. As to their origin, it explains that they have been formed "partly after F *soleil levant*" and "F *soleil couchant*." In conclusion, we may say that the type "sun rising" appeared chiefly from the fourteenth to the fifteenth century on the analogy of F *soleil levant*, that it assumed the nature of a fixed compound where the first component *sun* was juxtaposed with the gerund *rising*, as it were, in the caseless status, and that it was destined to be displaced by the new noun *sunrise*. In view of the general trend of the gerund-construction, it was surely a transitory phenomenon; and yet it is significant in representing the earliest stage in the development of the "genitive and gerund" construction.

#### 4. "Subjective Genitive+Gerund" in ME

§ 42. In the ME period, apart from the special phenomenon "sun(-)rising," the usual way of expressing the subject of the gerund, or more strictly, what would be the subject of the corresponding verb, was to place the genitive case of a noun or pronoun before the gerund. This is nothing but a traditional way kept on since the OE period,<sup>57</sup> but it was only in the course of ME that the freedom and flexibility of the verbal construction was being gradually developed. Below some examples will be quoted from the works in ME.

(1) *Sannt Johaness fullhtninng* was Halsumm and god to fanngegn.—*The Ormulum* ((c. 1200)) [OED]. (Saint John's baptizing was wholesome and and good to receive.)

(2) Of *Ʒe kynges crounyng* in four and twentyƷe gere...—Robert of Gloucester, *Chronicle* ((c. 1298)) [Koch]. (Of the king's crowning in the twenty-fourth year...)

(3) Her pardoun is ful petit at *her partyng* hennes.—Langland, *Piers Plowman* (B) vii. 57 ((c.1377)). (Her pardon is very small at her parting

<sup>56</sup> In the following ME instance, *kockis crowynge* is of a similar type, composed of the genitive and the gerund. It also connotes a temporal idea, though it seems a still more isolated phenomenon than *Ʒe sunne rysynge* (cf. OED, s.v. COCK-CROWING).

Whanne the lord of the hous cometh...in the mydnyzt, or *kockis crowynge*....—Wyclif, *Mark* xiii. 35. (When the lord of the house comes...at midnight, or cockcrowing...)

<sup>57</sup> For an OE instance, see example (1) under §35.

hence, *i. e.* death.)

(4) Who coude telle yow...Swich subtil loking and dissimulinges For drede of *jalouse mennes aperceyvinges*?—Chaucer, *C. T.*, "The Squieres Tale" 283-6 ((c. 1386)). (Who could tell you... such subtle looking and dissimulations for fear of jealous men's perceivings?)

(5) Thus Achillis achevit his awne choyse frendes, Thurgh *his prokuryng* prestly all the pure Troiens.—*The Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy* ((c. 1400)) [Koziol]. (Thus Achilles gained his own choice friends through readily instigating all the simple Trojans.)

(6) At *his* againe *comyng* he semed blewe.—Malory, *Morte D'Arthure* ((1470-85)) [Visser]. (At his coming again he looked blue.)

These examples, except the last two, show that the gerunds still remain in the status of nouns and their combinations with the preceding genitives are structurally substantival rather than verbal, though in example (3) the gerund is accompanied by the adverb *hennes* (=hence). Especially in example (4) the *-ing* form appears in the plural *aperceyvinges* (=perceivings), which is placed so as to form an antithesis with *dissimulinges* (=dissimulating) in the preceding line. The substantival nature of the *-ing* forms is apparent both morphologically and semantically. In example (5), on the other hand, the prepositional phrase introduced by *thurgh* (=though) reveals fairly verbal features, though the genitive pronoun *his* would be superfluous here if the passage were to be expressed in PE. Example (6) has much of the modern pithy gerundial expression. It should be observed that the gerund *comyng* is immediately determined by the adverb *again* (=again).

At any rate the supple and forceful gerund-construction that is commonly found today had not been fully developed till the beginning of the ModE period, while the original substantival nature had been, more or less, preserved all the time.

§ 43. In ME a genitive personal pronoun was in more general use than a genitive noun as sense-subject of a gerund. Such a pronoun is expressed rather subsidiarily with a gerund which conveys the primary idea in the context. In this respect this kind of construction may be contrasted with the participle-construction, where an accusative noun or pronoun is primarily expressed and a participle is added only complementally.

The prominent type with the genitive pronoun preceding the gerund is "*in+my* (*thy, his*, etc.)+gerund." It first appeared about the end of the thirteenth century, probably through the imitation of the Old French "*en+mon* (*ton, son*, etc.)+gérondif."<sup>58</sup>

(1) Guo in-to helle *ine þine bibbende* þet þou ne guo *ine þine steruinge*.  
—Dan Michel, *Azenbite of Inweyt* ((1340)) [Mossé]. (Go into hell while you are alive that you may not go when you die.)

<sup>58</sup> Eienkel, *Historische Syntax* § 3. ζ.

(2) Me thought a nyght *in my sleping*, that...—Chaucer, *The Romaunt of the Rose* ((a. 1366)) [Einenkel]. (It seemed to me one night while sleeping that...)

The original French for example (1) is “*Va en enfer en ton vivant, que tu n'i voises en ton morant.*” For the morphological confusion seen in *libbende* and *steruinge*, §§ 12, 13, 39 should be referred to. The French that corresponds to example (2) is “*Ce m'iert avis en mon dormant...*” Since the type “in my sleeping” began to be found in English about the same time as the type “in sleeping”<sup>59</sup>, whose prototype was, in turn, the Old French “en dormant,” we can safely conjecture that both the types were felt parallel so that, in the writer’s linguistic consciousness, the genitive pronoun in the former was merely secondary in the process of expression.

This type of expression also failed to be naturalized into the general usage of English syntax, for it hardly survived till after the ME period<sup>60</sup>. After all it only serves to indicate that the Romanic influence should be subsidiarily taken into account in the present survey.

##### 5. “Common or Accusative Case+Gerund” in ME

§ 44. When the sense-subject of the gerund was a noun, its form as genitive case was often obscured so that the noun came to appear in the form suitably called “common case.” This phenomenon first became apparent about the end of the thirteenth century in works written in the Northern dialect, so far as this construction is concerned. It usually occurred after a preposition.

(1) *At þe appestell biding* sone þai went. —*The North-English Legendary* ((1275)) [Van der Gaaf; Poutsma]. (At the apostles’ bidding they soon went.)

(2) Bot son quen he had seised þe land, Pat in þan fel a hunger strang *Thoru corn wanting* or *thoru were...*—*Cursor Mundi* ((c. 1300)) [Van der Gaaf; Curme]. (But soon when he had seized the land upon which a great famine had fallen through corn wanting or through war...)

(3) *For the quene comynge* he was fol glad.—Robert of Brunne, *Chronicle* ((1338)) [Van der Gaaf]. (For the queen’s coming he was very glad.)

(4) And what es mare uncertayn thyng, þan es þe tyme *of the dede comynge*.—Rolle of Hampole, *The Pricke of Conscience* ((c. 1340)) [Van der Gaaf; Mossé] (And what is a more uncertain thing than is the time of death coming?)

(5) And Pat was showet apertly *by temples and images falling* down in Rome.—*The Stanzaic Life of Christ* ((a. 1400)) [Van der Gaaf]. (And that was shown partly by temples and images falling down in Rome.)

<sup>59</sup> Einenkel, *Op. cit.* § 3.ε; Mätsner, *Englisch Grammatik* III. p. 85 f.

<sup>60</sup> As one ModE instance Einenkel (*Ibid.*) mentions the following, which evidently reflects the author’s syntactic Latinism.

He rose, and *in his rising* seemed A pillar of state.—Milton, *Paradise Lost*.

(6) Sone *uppon the chef baron comyng* I schall send you a lettre.—*The Paston Letters* ((1461)) [Van der Gaaf]. (Soon upon the chief baron coming I shall send you a letter.)

First it should be observed that the *-ing* forms in these example are gerunds, not present participles. Apart from the morphological consideration of the preceding nouns, it was usual in the Northern or East Midland dialects, as illustrated by these examples, that the *-ing* forms as gerunds were fairly distinguished from the *-and(e)* forms as participles (cf. § 12). In example (1) *apostell* is an uninflected form for the genitive plural, as is often the case with Northern Middle English. *Corn*, in example (2), is another uninflected genitive; it would have been *cornes* in older or Southern English.

In example (3) it would be possible to regard *quene* as accusative and *comynge* as a participle.<sup>61</sup> Indeed in this East-Midland work the forms *-ande* and *-ynge* were sometimes used indiscriminately as present participles<sup>62</sup>. But the meaning of *the quene comynge* here seems to express the idea of an action or occurrence rather than a concrete description of the person. Morphologically, besides, the genitive singular of the feminine noun *quene* (<OE *cwene*) originally had the same form as the nominative singular, and the old usage was still occasionally found as elsewhere in ME. For these reasons we judge *comynge* as a gerund preceded by the outwardly common case *quene*.

Hampole shows a good deal of hesitation in using *dede* (=death) as in example (4), for in similar contexts in the same work he uses "*þe dedes commyng*" and "*þe commyng of þe dede*". Such hesitation, probably due to the fact that the sense of the noun is abstract and inanimate, is the proof that *dede* in the quotation is meant for the genitive.

Example (4) has been quoted so that we may illustrate that the plural noun as sense-subject naturally fails to be formally distinct whether it is genitive or accusative (cf. § 49 c). The common cases *temples* and *images* here are of course meant for the genitives. By the way, let us note that this example presents a good deal of verbal character that is seen in instances of the same construction in the later periods.

The last example includes as sense-subject of the gerund the use of the common case *the chef* (=chief) *baron*, where it is not so easy to explain the disappearance of the genitive ending, for the text *Paston Letters* was written in Norfolk, East Midland, and *baron*, which denotes a person, would have been readily inflected as *barones*. Here the temporal phrase "*uppon the chef baron comyng*," though such is a quite common kind of expression in ModE, may probably be interpreted as an explicit expression for the absolute participial phrase "*the chef baron comyng*", the preposition *uppon* having been added to express more clearly the relation of temporal determination implied by the absolute construction. We may assume, therefore, that such an expression, apparently in imitation of the Latin usage, was first limited to literary style in that early period.

<sup>61</sup> Curme, *Syntax* p. 489.

<sup>62</sup> Mossé, *F. P.* II. §134.



Later on, especially after the end of the seventeenth century, it became popularized and came into colloquial use as well. With this transition we may conclude that a parallel change took place in the nature of the construction. The original participial construction gradually came to be felt as gerundial. Here we can see an aspect where the participle-construction has contributed to the modern extension of the gerund-construction.

§ 45. The failure in the case-distinction was also observable when the personal pronoun *her* was used as sense-subject of the gerund.

(1) I am ful gladde *of here comynge*.—*The Sowdone of Babylone* ((c. 1400))  
[Van der Gaaf]. (I am very glad of her coming.)

(2) *Of here Fedyrgoyng* þis was the entent.—Bokenam, *Legends* ((1446))  
[Van der Gaaf]. (This was the intention of her going there.)

That *here* (=her) in either of these examples is genitive, not accusative, is clear from the strikingly substantival nature of the collocation. For the construction in example (1), example (3) under the previous section should be compared. In example (2) *Fedyrgoyng*, which literally means "thither-going," remained in the early stage of the compound-construction, where the adverb is prefixed to the gerund so that the components may form one noun (cf. § 38).

#### 6. "Preposition+Genitive+Gerund" in ModE

§ 46. In the greatest number of the ME examples quoted in the preceding sections 39—45, the "subject and gerund" construction is introduced by some preposition. This is only natural, because the gerundial construction can most effectively display its syntactic utility with the stylistic value of supple compactness, when it is freely used as object of a preposition. In this way the idea of various relations can be explicitly denoted by the prepositions; while if we were to use a subordinate clause instead, it would be awkward or, from the ModE point of view, impossible to express any preposition at all. For instance, the German "*dadurch dass er komt*" cannot be translated into "through that he comes" in ModE, but instead, briefly and yet expressively, into "*through his coming*." It would be unnecessary here to mention that this syntactic facility of the construction has been greatly enhanced since the perfect and passive forms of the gerund (e.g. *by his having come, for my being taken*, etc.) were developed about the end of the sixteenth century.

In the ModE period, the more the verbal force of the gerund came to be developed, the more popular the construction became in use. Of the innumerable examples in ModE that illustrate the "preposition+genitive+gerund" construction, we shall first quote those with personal pronouns as gerundial subjects. Also compare §§ 55, 56, 57.

(1) *At their risinge* in the dawning of the day, thei sent about priuily to their servantes.—T. More, *The History of Kyng Richard the Third* [Visser].

(2) (She) Had made provision *for her following* me And soon and safe

arrived where I was.—Shakespeare, *Com. Err.* I. i. 48–49.

(3) Whether this might not partly arise *from my opening* my Mouth much seldomer than other People...I am not at leisure to determine.—Steele, *The Spectator* No. 17.

(4) She made not the smallest objection *to his joining* in the society of the neighbourhood, nor *to his leaving* his parish occasionally for a week or two to visit his relations.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* xiv.

(5) Mrs. Driffield is very keen *on my doing* it.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xi.

It is no doubt that *her* in example (2) should be understood as genitive. Though the general tendency is that this sort of gerund-construction, as well as those dealt with in the following sections 47–50, became conspicuously more verbal from the eighteenth century onwards, it would not be irrelevant here to mention such a PE instance as follows, where the *-ing* form remains quite substantival though it appears in the same syntactic position.

(6) And he need not have been so much afraid *about his dancing*. Truly, it was not polished, but it could not spoil hers, so light, firm, buoyant!—Galsworthy, *The Dark Flower*, "Spring" viii.

*Dancing* here does not denote any person's dynamic act performed on a particular occasion, but a purely static and abstract idea meaning "mode or manner of dancing."<sup>63</sup> It thus remains in the old stage as a verbal substantive. This is, indeed, the intrinsic feature, more or less, perceivable in any gerund that characterizes its use as distinct from that of the participle.

§ 47. The use of a genitive noun as sense-subject of the gerund has also been fairly common, though not so frequent as that of a genitive personal pronoun. The first of the following examples shows a phenomenon where the genitive noun stands parallel with the genitive pronoun.

(1) They are all couched...with obscured lights; which, at the very instant *of Falstaff's* and *our meeting*, they will at once display to the night.—Shakespeare, *Merry W.* v. iii. 14ff.

(2) There is a very different story from that *of the earth's moving* round the axis.—Sterne, *Tristram Shandy* [Koch].

(3) I hear nothing *of Lord Mountjoy's coming* for Ireland.—Swift, *The Journal to Stella* [Jespersen].

(4) Winterbourne felt a superior indignation *at his own lovely fellow-country woman's* not *knowing* the difference between a spurious gentleman and a real one.—H. James, *Daisy Miller* ii.

(5) Is it not more reasonable to suppose that the whole thing may have been due to a young *gentleman's celebrating* his twenty-first birthday near Oxford...?—Lynd, "The Earthquake."

It is observable that the "genitive and gerund" construction is rarer when

<sup>63</sup> Poutsma, *Gram.* LVI § 37 h).

the sense-subject is a noun than when it is a personal pronoun. But when the gerundial subject is in the common or accusative case, the general proportion of the usage is reversed. The latter construction is more usual with a noun than with a personal pronoun, for the reasons that will be remarked in § 49. It would be of some interest here to notice that the use of the genitive noun is commoner in the eighteenth (or early nineteenth) century. For example, in (2) above, *earth's* would sound awkward and probably be replaced by *earth* in PE, since in modern prose style it is unusual to use the genitive form for a noun that denotes an impersonal thing.

Opposite to this general tendency, however, there is another which should be taken into account. Even in late ModE the genitive noun (as well as the genitive pronoun) is liable to be used when the semantic or syntactic nature of the gerund that follows it is decidedly substantival rather than verbal. We should like to add an example which illustrates such tendency.

(6) During the interval of the *cottager's going* and *coming*, she had said to her husband....—Hardy, *Tess* xxxv.

Here the use of the genitive *cottager's* is quite appropriate, since *going and coming* is almost synonymous with "departure and arrival or return." This is also an important point we should consider in contrasting the gerund-construction with the participle-construction.

The following PE example should now be observed, for it has revealed the substantival nature of the gerund more explicitly, though the sense-subject is expressed in a different outer form.

(7) He...resolved to curse them all in the morning and go off with Leora, but with *the coming of the three-o'clock depression* he perceived that with him she would probably starve....—S. Lewis, *Arrowsmith* IX. iii.

Such expression of the gerundial subject by a periphrastic phrase should be compared with the parallel expression of the gerundial object that is found in the older stage of the development (cf. § 38).

## 7. "Preposition+Common or Accusative Case+Gerund" in ModE

§ 48. It may be considered that such a modern construction as "...to a young gentleman's *celebrating* his twenty-first birthday..." (in example (5) under the previous section) reveals the double nature—the substantival nature on one hand and the verbal nature on the other. First it is substantival in that the gerund *celebrating* is defined by the genitive *gentleman's* and, together with the latter, governed by the preposition *to*. Secondly it is also verbal in that *celebrating* precedes its object *birthday*. The use of the genitive is, therefore, an old characteristic that has tenaciously remained in the verbal construction, which should be the ultimate goal of the development. According to the general trend, therefore, the gerundial subject is to be changed from the genitive case, the old substantival remnant, to the common case, which appears as the grammatical subject preceding the predicate verb, just as the genitive case as sense-object of the

gerund was formerly replaced by the accusative case. The result of the new transition is to appear in the ordinary word-order: the subject and the verb. We have seen in §44 that some sporadic instances of this transition were already found at the end of the fourteenth century when the case-endings of nouns had been levelled in certain positions. But we might agree with Jespersen (*M.E.G.* V. §9. 4<sub>1</sub>) in affirming that not till 1700, or somewhat earlier than that, was the intrinsic change universally observed.

It is not the main purpose of the present study to make elaborate inquiries into the various reasons why the common or accusative case has been substituted for the genitive as sense-subject of the gerund. Below we are going to remark only briefly the main circumstances that have brought about the change.<sup>64</sup>

§ 49. a. Sometimes it seems to be practically immaterial to the general meaning whether an *-ing* form is interpreted as a gerund or a participle. The use of an accusative before an apparent gerund can often be attributed to the psychological fact that it may also be considered a participle. This circumstance directly concerns the present study, and so will be observed more fully later, especially in §53.

b. There has for centuries been a strong disinclination in English to make the genitive form in *-s* of a noun that denotes an impersonal or lifeless thing. This accounts for the abundance of instances where the gerundial subjects in the common case do not denote persons or living creatures (cf. §44 and example (2) under §47).

(1) No man ever heard of *opium leading* into delirium tremens.—De Quincey, *Confessions of an Opium-Eater* [Jespersen].

(2) Cornelius...re-read as he walked the curt note which had led to this *journey being* undertaken.—Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*, "A Tragedy of Two Ambitions" iv.

(3) There is no possibility of my *suspicious being* wrong.—Id., *Alicia's Diary* v.

(4) Even the mere senses...attest to this truth about *vivacity going* with differentiation.—Chesterton, *As I Was Saying*, "About Shamelessness."

To example (3) the circumstance remarked under c below may also be applied.

Next c down to e concerns the morphological restraints that are inherent in the English language.

c. The common case and the genitive are formally identical in most plural nouns, as well as in the personal pronoun *her* (cf. §45). Phonologically there is no distinction between the two categories in ModE. Even the modern orthographic device of writing *kings* for the common case plural and *kings'* for the genitive plural, as well as *king's* for the genitive singular, had not been estab-

<sup>64</sup> The observation made in the following section mainly depends on Jespersen, "On Ing" (*S. P. E. Tract XXV.* p. 155 ff.), Id., *M. E. G.* V. §§9.4–9.7, Curme, "History of the English Gerund" (*Englische Studien XLV.*), and Id., *Syntax* p. 485ff.

lished till the eighteenth century. This formal identity has certainly contributed to the feeling that a common case may be used as sense-subject of a gerund.

(5) Mrs. Bennet...had calculated on his *daughters remaining* at Netherfield till the following Tuesday...—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* vii.

(6) The objection to female juries never was an objection to *juries being* female.—Chesterton, *As I Was Saying*, "About Shamelessness."

The use in example (5) is especially remarkable, because it is seen in the work by Jane Austen, who is so conspicuous in favouring the "genitive and gerund" construction.

d. It is impossible to form genitives of some pronouns, such as *all, both, each, this, that, himself*, etc., or some adjectives used as nouns, such as *(the) rich, (the) English*, etc. So these words naturally precede gerunds in the caseless forms, though the phenomena are of rather rare occurrence.

(7) He wouldn't hear of *that being* possible.—Dickens, *Dombey and Son* [Jespersen].

(8) But, Mr. Morris, ain't you clear forgot about *this being* my day off?—Caldwell, *Georgia Boy*, "Handsome Brown's Day Off."

(9) I'm for *us English sticking* together when we're abroad.—Maugham, *Cosmopolitans*, "Mr. Know-All."

In the last example *English* can be interpreted as apposition to *us*, and so the instance might have to be dealt with under e below. Anyhow it is a striking case where the use of the genitive is unavailable.

We may be allowed to mention the following example of the special collocation under this heading.

(10) I remember a fine thing by the Poet Laureate, something about *there being* more faith in honest doubt...—A. Huxley, *Rotunda*, "The Tillotson Banquet" iii.

Of this expression "*there+gerund*" Jespersen (*M. E. G. V.* 9.7<sub>g</sub>) remarks that there are only two quotations to be cited before the nineteenth century, one from Defoe ((1722)) and the other from Joseph Butler ((1736)).

e. We have some difficulty in forming genitives of word-groups. As sense-subject of the gerund, such a word-group only naturally stands before it in the caseless form, though this is also rather a special phenomenon.

(11) He would not hear of *Mrs. Mackenzie and her daughter quitting* his house.—Thackeray, *The Newcomes* [Jespersen].

(12) A note posted by her in Budmouth Regis at daybreak has reached me this afternoon—thanks to the fortunate chance of *one of the servants calling* for letters in town to-day.—Hardy, *Alicia's Diary* vii.

§ 50. When the sense-subject of the gerund is a personal pronoun, the use of the accusative form as distinct from the genitive comes to be questioned. As has been mentioned in § 47, a personal pronoun has preserved the use of the old genitive better here than a noun. This is because the personal pronouns are more distinct and complete in their morphological system and, unlike nouns,

have the genitive singulars distinguished from the genitive plurals, except in the case of *your*.

Nevertheless, the accusative case of a personal pronoun came to be used before a gerund, generally in the latter half of the nineteenth century.<sup>65</sup> The new use is suited to colloquial, or sometimes vulgar or dialectal, style. The pronoun has occasionally acquired the capability of being emphasized according to the demand of the context. Before making further inquiries, we shall see some examples.

(1) There could be no harm in *them walking* together.—Hazlitt, *Liber Amoris* [Jespersen].

(2) What's the use o' *you lookin'* at it?—G. Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss* V. ii.

(3) Papa did not care about *them learning*.—Thackeray, *Henry Esmond* [Poutsma].

(4) Instead of *me talking* to you, you ought to be talking to me.—Bennett, *How to Live on 24 Hours* [Jespersen].

It may be admitted that such use is generally found in colloquial style. Indeed the accusative pronouns in these contexts are liable to be emphasized and pronounced with a simple, vivid tone. The sentence quoted as example (2) is spoken by an uneducated person and so has a vulgar and dialectal tone. The last example is of special interest, for *me* before *talking* is clearly contrasted with *you* and has been given a strong stress.

Now let us consider what psychological factor has induced the speaker or writer to use such expression. Suppose that the genitive *their*, instead of *them*, were to be used in example (1). In the sentence "There could be no harm in *their walking* together," we might feel the combination between *their* and *walking* so close as to produce the sense of fairly compact unity. On the contrary, the original combination "in *them walking*" is not so close. We can even read it putting a slight pause between *them* and *walking*. What is really meant by the sentence is inferred to be something like "There could be no harm if they were to walk together," though the resultant expression is more straightforward.<sup>66</sup> Generally speaking, the combination between the accusative pronoun and the *-ing* form is rather loose, and consequently has less of the synthetic sense which is usually felt in an ordinary gerundial phrase. We might proceed a step farther to conclude that the writer has expressed the *-ing* form after the pronoun with some vague sense that it is of the nature of a present participle. It seems possible to trace some influence of the participle in the subconsciousness of the speaker who has used the *-ing* form in such a concrete and colloquial way of expression.

<sup>65</sup> Jespersen (*M.E.G.* V. §9.7.) remarks that among the accusative pronouns *it* was isolatedly the first to be found before a gerund. This is probably due to the particular circumstance that the use of the form *us* was established much later than that of the other genitive pronouns. It can be exemplified from as early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, as follows:

I never had so much as one thought of *it being* the hand of God.—Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* [Jespersen].

<sup>66</sup> Poutsma, *Gram.* XIX. §6. I, VI; LVI. §36. II.

§ 51. The inference drawn in the previous section further leads us to consider the three examples that belong to much earlier periods. They have been quoted by Curme (*Syntax* p. 489) and Van der Gaaf ("The Gerund Preceded by the Common Case" § 17) as illustrating the earliest instances of the kind of gerund-construction which contains an accusative pronoun as sense-subject.

(1) Humbly requyryng...my sayd lord to take no displeasure (=displeasure) at *me* so *presumyng*.—Caxton, *The Epilogue to Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* ((14..)) [Kellner].

(2) I would have no mans honestye empayred (=impaired) by *me* *telling*.—Latimer, *Seven Sermons* ((1549)) [Van der Gaaf].

(3) I trust they will beare with *me* *writing* in the vulgar speach (=speech).—Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* ((1589)) [Van der Gaaf].

In each of these quotations it would be possible to perceive some pause between *me* and the following *-ing* form (in example (1), preceded by the adverb *so*), and so regard the latter as a present participle that is expressed cumulatively as predicative adjunct of the preceding pronoun. We can assume that this loose but concrete expression with the participle which had been found in the earlier period came to commingle with the "common case and gerund" construction which began to be popularized about the end of the seventeenth century. The result of this process we see revealed in such examples as have been mentioned in the preceding section. The reality of the expression must be inquired into from the psychologic or stylistic point of view.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Convergence of the Two Constructions

§ 52. In § 49 we have mentioned the influence of the participle-construction as the most important of the circumstances that have brought about the "common case and gerund" construction. Now we are in a position of investigating the individual cases where the sphere of the gerund-construction has been trespassed upon by that of the participle-construction or inversely the latter has been absorbed by the former. Hitherto we have endeavoured to trace some such phenomena diachronically. But so far as the modern usage is concerned, we cannot but recognize that the synchronic method has to be adopted. The process to the new construction did not take place till the modern gerund-construction had been universally established in the late ModE period.

We shall proceed with the observation, with special reference to the three types of syntactic combination. They are Type A: "preposition+(pro)noun+*~ing*," Type B: "verb+preposition+(pro)noun+*~ing*," and Type C: "verb+(pro)noun+*~ing*." By the "verb+preposition" in Type B we mean a somewhat closely fixed group where the verb requires a certain preposition so that the two elements may semantically correspond to one transitive verb.

§ 53. Type A: "preposition+(pro)noun+~ing" has already been exemplified in §§ 49—51. Here we shall only consider those examples which involve some questionable respects. First let us compare the following couple of examples.

(1) Do you know the Jupiter's silly words, *about the bug being* of solid gold, had a remarkable effect upon my fancy?—Poe, *The Gold-Bug*.

(2) The theologian used the old quip *about a philosopher being* like a blind man, in a dark room, looking for a black cat—which wasn't there.—J. Huxley, *Man Stands Alone*, "Life Can Be Worth Living."

In example (1) the prepositional phrase introduced by *about* is parenthetically separated with the commas from the other part of the sentence and so there is felt a more or less unity of its own. Accordingly the combination between *the bug* and *being* is considered comparatively close, forming a nexal relation where *being* is naturally interpreted as a gerund. In example (2), on the other hand, the preposition *about* is combined with the preceding "the old quip" nearly as closely as with the following "a philosopher." The next *being* is further combined to "a philosopher" with much the same closeness. The whole structure, therefore, is expressed in a cumulative style, and *being* is invested with some nature of a present participle. At least, we may suppose, the reason that the writer has not used "a philosopher's being" here is that he has not intended to have recourse to a synthetic expression by means of a gerund but to a looser but more concrete participial expression.<sup>67</sup> At the same time he has subconsciously preferred the construction composed of the concrete determined and the abstract determiner to the one composed of the concrete determiner and the abstract determined. Although the latter may be more logical than the former, it is the meaning of the former that the reader is more readily accustomed to adjusting.<sup>68</sup> It is thus upon a basis both stylistic and psychologic that *being* in example (2) had better be understood as a participle.

Another couple of examples should be compared.

(3) When the soprano soloist came in, Paul forgot even the nastiness of *his teacher's being* there.—Cather, *Youth and the Bright Medusa*, "Paul's Case."

(4) Winterbourne had now begun to think simply of the craziness, from a sanitary point of view, of *a delicate young girl lounging* away the evening in this nest of malaria.—H. James, *Daisy Miller* ii.

In example (3) we have the apparent gerundial construction with the genitive *teacher's* as sense-subject of the gerund *being*.<sup>69</sup> It is inferred that the writer

<sup>67</sup> Jespersen (*M.E.G.* V. §9.6.) attributes the use of the common case in such an instance to the vague idea of the combination which is unfit to be expressed by means of the genitive case whose character is definite. There is some truth in this observation, in so far as the functional feature of the case is concerned.

<sup>68</sup> Sandmann, *Subject and Predicate* p. 231.

<sup>69</sup> According to the research by Fries (*American English Grammar* p. 76f.) concerning modern American usage, there are recorded 20 instances, including both standard and vulgar ones, with nouns in the common case, while only one standard instance with a genitive noun. It seems, however, that the range of the materials adopted is too limited to convey the real state of the usage.



has used the genitive here to clearly express the meaning that what was nasty to Paul was the fact that his teacher was there, not his teacher herself. The distinct gerundial construction here serves to get rid of any ambiguity that would be felt in the expression with the common case "the nastiness of his *teacher* being there." In example (4), indeed, the reader feels such ambiguity in the meaning of "the craziness...of a...*girl* lounging," or rather we should say that the whole sentence itself has been expressed in a rather indefinite style. Amid the general indefiniteness, however, we see the descriptive force displayed intensively in both "a delicate young girl" and "lounging." It may be admitted that the writer has expressed *lounging* in this context with the sense that it is rather a present participle. This also shows that the modern frequency of the common case in this kind of construction is largely due to the writer's psychology of intending to invest the following *-ing* form with some of the participial nature.

§ 54. Of examples that illustrate Type B: "verb+preposition+(pro)noun+*-ing*," some contain constructions unquestionably clear in their nexal character as gerund-constructions. So in the well-quoted "I *insist upon* Miss Sharp *appearing*" (Thackeray, *Vanity Fair* xi),<sup>70</sup> "Miss Sharp *appearing*" is evidently equivalent to "that Miss Sharp will appear." But these are not all the cases. There are others where we feel more or less of the participial nature in the *-ing* forms used after the common cases.

(1) I must *object to* this witness *being* allowed to enter the box.—Haggard, *Mr. Meeson's Will* [Poutsma].

Cf. : (2) He had no objection to *your* expecting a little humility of him.—H. James, *Daisy Miller* ii.

(3) Have you ever *heard of* any important treasure *being* unearthed along the coast?—Poe, *The Gold-Bug*.

Cf. : (4) Do not be alarmed if you should hear of *his* having been to me.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* vii.

When we read example (1) or (3), we naturally put a slight pause between the noun and the *-ing* form. We can feel that "this witness" and "any important treasure" are considerably emphasized and are loosely supplemented with "*being* allowed" and "*being* unearthed." Either *being* is therefore tinged with some of the participial character.<sup>71</sup> By the way, the form *witness*, as against *witness's*, in example (1), may be explained phonologically to be due to the principle of euphony which has caused the speaker to avoid the double sibilant in [witnisis]. For the form *treasure*, as against *treasure's*, in example (3), compare § 49 b.

Now we may once again consider the pattern "*think of*+(pro)noun+*-ing*" that has been described in §§ 30, 31. It can be judged, indeed, that the *-ing* form here is genetically a participle. But the gerund-construction in analogous types has been universalized, so that the *-ing* form in that pattern has some-

<sup>70</sup> Cf. : And when we saw this he absolutely insisted on *my* having it.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xvii.

<sup>71</sup> For example (3), furthermore, compare example (3) under § 30.

times come to be felt as a gerund. This is a phenomenon especially seen in polite speech when the sense-subject is expressed by a personal pronoun.<sup>72</sup> The following are some of the instances.

(5) And to *think of your being* up all night and then not able to get a decent breakfast!—Cather, *Obscure Destinies*, "Neighbour Rosicky" i.

(6) She never *thought of his loving* her; that would be—unnatural!—Galsworthy, *The Dark Flower*, "Spring" iii.

We may also mention an example of the synonymous pattern.

(7) I can't bear *the thought of his staying* on in that odious house by himself.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xix.

In these examples the content of the thought has been expressed as a synthetic unity by means of the "genitive and gerund" construction. This is one of the cases where the sphere of the gerund-construction has, as it were, absorbed that of the participle-construction.

§ 55. As to Type C: "verb+(pro)noun+~ing," we must first observe instances where the use of the verbs is analogous to that of "think of" last mentioned in the previous section, that is, where we may see the same trace of transition from the participial to the gerundial construction. The use of the individual verbs in the following examples should be compared with the corresponding use exemplified in § 24.

(1) *Fancy their askin'* you to ride your bicycle with them.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* v.

(2) I do *remember his boasting* one day, at Netherfield, of the implacability of his resentments, of his having an unforgiving temper.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* xvi.

(3) I can hardly *understand* a young *Frenchman's* not *entering* the army.—Meredith, *Lord Ormont and his Aminta* [Poutsma].

(4) Mrs. Driffield didn't half *like his coming* here.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xxiii.

(5) Tess, why do you always *dislike my kissing* you?—Hardy, *Tess* xi.

The verb *fancy*, as in example (1), semantically requires the predication of some descriptive action or behaviour about a person that is the object of mental picturing, and so we may assume that its proper construction should be participial. The use of *their*, instead of *them*, in the example, has made *asking* appear as a gerund. At the same time it ought to be noticed that the general tone of the sentence has turned rather intellectual, as compared with the emotional tone of example (2) under § 24.<sup>73</sup> In the other examples, where the verbs denote more

<sup>72</sup> Poutsma, *Gram.* LVI § 37 b).

<sup>73</sup> It is especially remarkable that both of the two constructions are found in the same work by Maugham. The following should be compared with example (1) above.

I heard she'd gone to service at the vicarage. *Fancy her being* there still!—*Cakes and Ale* vii.

*Her* here might be interpreted either as genitive or as accusative; but judging from the general tone of the quotation, we should like to regard it as accusative.

intellectual state or activity, the nature of the construction is more likely to become gerundial. Indeed the use of the genitive noun in example (3) may be older than that of the corresponding common case, but it offers us a proof that such a verb as *understand* intrinsically requires the gerundial construction. Only as to the verb *like*, as in example (4), we may be able to judge upon the ground remarked in § 24 that the tendency is in favour of "like *him* coming" rather than "like *his* coming." The antonym *dislike*, as in example (5), is not so frequent in this construction. In the quotation it is distinctly shown that the object of *dislike* is the action "(my) kissing (you)," not the person that would be expressed by "me."

Like *dislike* the semantically analogous *hate* and *mind* are used with the same kind of construction. In the following examples it would be noticed that the *-ing* forms have been invested with some of the participial character.

(6) I *hate* anyone *listening* when I'm telephoning.—Christie in *My Best Detective Story* [Jespersen].

(7) I'm sure 'e wouldn't *mind* you 'avin' a look at them.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xii.

With the latter, moreover, compare the following.

(8) I should not *mind* *their* talking about me.—Black, *The Princes of Thule* [Jespersen].

§ 56. An interesting case is observed in the variants of the construction after *prevent*. It can now be used in the three types of structure: **a** "I *prevented* him *from going*," **b** "I *prevented his going*," and **c** "I *prevented him going*." Of them, OED (s.v. PREVENT *v.* 7b, 8b) explains that **c** appears to be short for **a**, perhaps influenced by **b**, as though to say that **c** has been developed through the blending of the two other types **a** and **b**.<sup>74</sup> The strange fact is that the quotations given by OED itself fail to justify this assumption, though we must admit that the exemplification in this dictionary is not always based upon syntactic principles. The earliest quotation of **c** is dated 1689, while that of **a** is dated 1711 and that of **b** 1841. What is more, Van der Gaaf ("The Gerund Preceded by the Common Case" § 16) gives an example of **c** dated still earlier than 1689. That is:

(1) If wisdome and princely authority be not by you used to *prevent perilles appearing*, we have cause to doubt of greater danger to follow.—Queen Elizabeth, *Letters* ((1592)).

In this quotation "prevent perilles" is understood to convey a complete sense, to which the sense of *appearing* is added only complementally. The combination between *perilles* and *appearing* is much as loose as that between "greater danger" and "to follow" in the same sentence. In spite of Van der Gaaf, therefore, *appearing* here should be regarded as a participle; and we can see that such a participle-construction after *prevent* made its appearance as early as the sixteenth century.

Now, in PE usage, the type "I prevented *him going*" is not so popular as the

<sup>74</sup> Also compare Poutsma, *Gram.* XIX § 6 III, LVI § 35 a) 2).

types "I prevented *him from going*" and "I prevented *him going*," and of the latter the type "I prevented *him from going*" seems the commoner.<sup>75</sup> It is presumable that "I prevented *him going*" is felt too vague for such a matter-of-fact statement, and has come to be superseded by the more definite expression "I prevented *him from going*," which is also more analytic than "I prevented *his going*."<sup>76</sup> The result is, we might say, that the analytic style of the old participial expression, that is **c**, has been turned into the more explicit form of the new gerundial expression, that is **a**. Below we shall exemplify each of the three types, arranging them in the developmental order of **c**, **b** and **a**.

**c.** (2) The tide *prevented me going* to the wreck.—Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe* [Jespersen].

(3) What can *prevent us getting* married?—G. Moore, *Esther Waters* [Poutsma].

(4) Mrs. Bennet was *prevented replying* by the entrance of the footman with a note for Miss Bennet.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* vii.

**b.** (5) You shall not know that, if I can *prevent your knowing* it.—Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* III. xiv.

(6) You must see how desirable a wife like Miss Halborough would be, to *prevent my becoming* a mere vegetable.—Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*, "A Tragedy of Two Ambitions" iv.

(7) Thrift in itself is always a thirst to make all things thrive,...to *prevent their being* wasted, or, in other words, destroyed.—Chesterton, *As I Was Saying*, "About Bad Comparisons."

**a.** (8) I wonder whether the memory of her compassion *prevented him from cutting* his throat.—Conrad, *Amy Foster*.

(9) I used all my determination to *prevent the bitter jibes from passing* my lips.—Maugham, *Cakes and Ale* xvii.

(10) Tramping, too, *prevents the grass from getting* coarse and rough.—J. Huxley, *Man Stands Alone*, "Climate and Human History."

Example (4) contains a passive construction, where the *-ing* form *replying* appears as predicative of the subject "Mrs. Bennet," and thus shows that it is evidently a participle. This structural potentiality offers us another proof that the construction in **c** is participial.<sup>77</sup> It is also perceivable that the use of **b** is most restricted, for the type is now only ready to be used when the sense-sub-

<sup>75</sup> Jespersen, *M.E.G.* V. § 9.9.

<sup>76</sup> This type **b** is fit to express a slightly different meaning from what is usually meant by the two other types. It should properly be used when the verb indicates the notion of providing beforehand against the occurrence of some trouble (cf. OED, s.v. PREVENT *v.* 8; Poutsma, *Gram.* xix § 32 *b*), not merely the general idea of stopping or hindrance. Practically, however, the difference seems too delicate to be observed. This is another reason that this type is less favoured in PE.

<sup>77</sup> It is a noteworthy fact that this participle-construction with the verb *prevent* is found in Jane Austen, who elsewhere uses the "genitive and gerund" construction so frequently. In the following quotation from the same work, therefore, we might judge the construction to be participial, interpreting *her* as accusative.

Her indifferent state of health unhappily *prevents her being* in town.—*Pride and Prejudice* xiv.

ject of the gerund is to be expressed by a personal pronoun.

§ 57. We must next observe the three verbs whose syntactic features are fairly parallel with those of *prevent*: that is, *excuse*, *forgive* and *pardon*. These verbs, too, are often found introducing the "(pro)noun+~ing" construction. Only it is now not so usual; the commoner pattern is "*excuse (forgive, pardon)* +object+for+gerund." They are also used with the construction where the sense-subject of the gerund is expressed by a genitive case. Neither is this use very usual now. Anyhow we have the three types: **a** "*excuse* etc.+accusative +~ing," **b** "*excuse* etc.+genitive+~ing," and **c** "*excuse* etc.+accusative+for +~ing." Below will be given some instances of the respective types.

**a.** (1) I will therefore first shew that they had no such ignorance that could *excuse them admitting* that he was a superior.—*The Archpriest Controversy* ((1601)) [Van der Gaaf].

(2) Would you *excuse me asking* for a cup more coffee?—Dickens, *David Copperfield* [Jespersen].

(3) I *forgive him sinking* my own poor truck?—Wycherley. *The Plain-Dealer* ((1616)) [Poutsma].

(4) Moost humblie beseking...the Kyng and also the Quene to *pardon me so presumyng*.—Caxton, *The History of Jason* ((c. 1477)) [Kellner].

(5) *Pardon me saying* it.—Tennyson, *The Princess* [Poutsma].

**b.** (6) He must *excuse my being* rather in a hurry.—Collins, *The Woman in White* [Jespersen].

(7) If you'll forgive my saying so, sir,...your proposal seems to me very rough-and-ready justice.—Galsworthy, *The White Monkey* [Poutsma].

**c.** (8) The people may be *excused for following* tradition only.—Jowett, *The Dialogues of Plato* [OED].

(9) *Forgive me for bringing* you here.—Dickens, *Martin Chuzzlewit* [Poutsma].

(10) *Pardon me for neglecting* to profit by your advice.—Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* xviii.

It would be proper to infer that the **a** type is of the oldest origin and that the *-ing* form there is a present participle which is appended to the accusative object as predicatival adjunct. The decisive point lies in the semantic and pronunciational division. For example, in "*excuse me asking...*" we feel it possible to divide "*asking...*" from "*excuse me*" and interpret the whole group as meaning "*excuse me if I ask...*". Such division is out of the question in the case of "*excuse my asking...*" of the **b** type, where *my* and *asking* have formed a synthetic unit. "*Excuse my asking...*" may be more logically constructed than "*excuse me asking...*", and so probably be preferred by correct speakers. But after all "*excuse me for asking...*" of the **c** type has come to stay in standard PE as the most favoured construction. We should notice that the **a** type is naturally as much suited to the genius of English syntax in being as analytic as the **c** type; only the difference is that in the latter the annalytic nature is explicitly displayed.

## CHAPTER V

## Conclusion

§ 58. It is needless to say that the range of words and word-groups hitherto taken up as materials for our study, not to speak of examples quoted, is far from exhaustive. Since it is our humble intention, however, to make an attempt to trace the most predominant tendencies in the development of the constructions, we shall be content for the present to make an end of the cursory observation.

Now, reviewing it in retrospect, we shall sum up the prominent features so as to clarify the main routes by which the constructions have attained to the modern stage. In OE the present participle had a distinct form of its own, ending in *-ende*, as against *-ung* or *-ing*, the form of the verbal substantive or gerund. The former had its syntactically verbal capacity developed much earlier than the latter. The participle was already able to function as predicative adjunct of the object after some verbs of perception, when the gerund still remained a genuine noun. With this verbal capacity the participle had a particular stylistic value that has helped to keep the "accusative and participle" construction growing steadily ever since the earliest period. It has made the construction fit for concrete and expressive description as an essential factor for the formation of cumulative style—the style so characteristic of English syntax.

The morphological transition in later periods, however, was against the participle, whose proper form came to be absorbed by that of the gerund in *-ing* in the course of the ME period. In this respect the participle, at the cost of its own form, contributed to have the gerund develop its verbal force. This new syntactic capacity of the gerund was gradually displayed from the end of the twelfth century onwards. About two centuries after that the common case began to take the place of the genitive as a result of the general decay of inflexional endings. This indeed strengthened the verbal nature of the gerund, but its later progress was rather sluggish. Parallel with the earliest type of expressing "object + gerund," such as OE *boc-ræding*, there arose a temporal type of "subject + gerund," such as *sun-rising*. This phenomenon, mainly perceived from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, represents the early stage of the compound. The modern supple and efficient construction was not fully developed till about the end of the seventeenth century. But once established, it has succeeded in becoming a favourite construction in both literary and colloquial speech.

§ 59. Yet it is worth noticing once more that we still sometimes see the original synthetic nature of the gerund-construction fairly preserved in its modern outer form.

(1) This corner of the globe was predestined to be the cradle of the modern world—by its climate, by its great rivers, by the fact of *its being* the original home of wheat, by *its being* a natural meeting-place for different

streams of culture brought by different migrations of men, east and west as well as north and south.—J. Huxley, *Man Stands Alone*, "Climate and Human History."

As contrasted with the abstract, synthetic compactness of such gerundial phrases, we can see distinctly the loose, concrete force of participial phrases, as in the following example.

(2) He was just about to go down when the sight of *the main-deck stirring, heaving up, and changing* into splinters before his eyes, petrified him on the top step.—Conrad, *Youth*.

We may consider it possible to trace both diachronically and synchronically these different kinds of stylistic value representing the two constructions.

§ 60. After the time of Shakespeare, the use of the "accusative and participle" construction, "whether introduced by a verb or a preposition, became suddenly more frequent than ever before. Somewhat later than that the gerund-construction began to make no less remarkable progress. It even grew so overwhelming that some earlier participial expressions have resulted in getting absorbed in the gerundial pattern. There are of course instances where the transition in the opposite direction has taken place. But we should like to add the two more examples, which show how naturally participles may come to appear gerundial in some particular contexts.

(1) The first thing I heard was *Preacher Hawshaw saying* that old Uncle Jeff Davis Fletcher...had gone over into the next country to visit some sick relations for a few days.—Caldwell, *Georgia Boy*, "The Day We Rang the Bell."

(2) The next thing he was conscious of was lying in Polly's bed, and *Polly bending* over him wringing out bath towels in hot water and putting them on his chest.—Cather, *Obscure Destiny*, "Neighbour Rosicky" vi.

The expression in example (1) suggests as its psychological prototype the construction "I *heard Preacher Hawshaw saying...*," and that in example (2) the construction "He was *conscious of Polly bending...*". We would rather say that even in the actual expressions the *-ing* forms are participles. But in example (2) there is an external proof against this assertion. *Polly bending* is structurally parallel with *lying*, whose function is evidently substantival, not adjectival. As in this case, an apparent gerund is sometimes a participle in disguise, and this is also a fact that can be observed through the history of English syntax.

§ 61. In the course of the history we have seen some occasional expressions whose origin should be ascribed to the influence of foreign usage. For instance, the ablative absolute construction in Latin gave rise to some analogous expressions in English which were to expand the scope of the participial, or sometimes gerundial, construction. The appearance of some new idioms with gerunds was due to the imitation of the French *gérondif* in *-ant*, which no doubt stimulated the verbal development of the English gerund. But these were no more than

subsidiary phenomena. Without any such foreign influence, we dare to assume, the two English verbals would have had the potentiality of launching themselves upon the main currents. On a broad survey we should be allowed to conclude that the two constructions have been developed spontaneously in the native syntax.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(It is with my most heartfelt thanks that I here mention the names of those who kindly lent me some of the books enumerated below: Dr. Sanki Ichikawa, Mr. Fumio Nakajima, Professor of Tokyo University, Miss Masako Isshiki, Professor of Tsuda College, and Mr. Kenzo Kihara, Assistant Professor of Ochanomizu University.

The abbreviations which appear in the thesis are shown in brackets after the respective items.)

### I. BOOKS AND PAPERS CONSULTED

- Bøgholm, N. *English Speech from an Historical Point of View*. Copenhagen. 1939.
- Brunner, K. *Die englische Sprache*. 2 Bde. Halle. 1950, '51.
- Callaway, M., JR. *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*. Washington. 1913.
- Curme, G. O. "History of the English Gerund." *Englische Studien* XLV. 1912.
- " " *Syntax*. Boston. 1931.
- Delcourt, J. *Initiation à l'étude historique de l'anglais*. Paris. 1944. [Initiation]
- Einckel, E. *Historische Syntax*. Strassbury. 1916.
- Ewert, A. *The French Language*. London.
- Fowler, H. W. *The King's English*. Oxford. 1930.<sup>3</sup>
- " " *Modern English Usage*. Oxford. 1937.
- Fries, C. C. *American English Grammar*. N. Y. 1940.
- Huchon, R. *Histoire de la langue anglaise*. Tome II. Paris. 1930.
- Jespersen, O. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part V. Copenhagen. 1940. [M.E.G.]
- " " "On Ing." *S.P.E. Tract XXV*. 1926.
- Kellner, L. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*. London. 1892.
- Koch, C. F. *Die Satzlehre der englische Sprache*. Cassel. 1878.<sup>2</sup> [Satzlehre]
- Koziol, H. *Grundzüge der Syntax der mittelenenglischen Stabreimdichtungen*. Wien & Leipzig. 1932.
- Kruisinga, E. *A Handbook of Present-day English*. Part II. 1. Groningen. 1932.<sup>5</sup>
- Kruisinga, E. & Edades P. A. *An English Grammar*. Vol. I. Part I. Groningen, 1947.<sup>7</sup>
- Langenhove, G. C. van. *On the Origin of the Gerund in English*. Gand. 1925. [The Original of the Gerund]
- Mätzner, E. *Englische Grammatik*. Theil III. Berlin. 1885.<sup>3</sup>



- Mossé, F. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue anglaise*. Lyon. 1947.  
 " " *Histoire de la forme périphrastique 'être+participe présent' en germanique*. Partie II. Paris. 1938. [F.P.]  
 Poutsma, H. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. Part I. 2. & Part II. Sec. II. Groningen. 1929,<sup>2</sup> '26. [Gram.]  
 Regula, M. *Grundlegung und Grundprobleme der Syntax*. Heidelberg. 1951.  
 Sandmann, M. *Subject and Predicate*. Edinburgh. 1954.  
 Sweet, H. *A New English Grammar*. 2 vols. Oxford. 1892, '98.  
 Trnka, B. *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden*. Prague. 1930.  
 van der Gaaf, W. "The Gerund Preceded by the Common Case." *English Studies* X. 1928.  
 Visser, F. T. *A Syntax of the English Language of St. Thomas More*. Part I. Louvain. 1946.  
 Zandvoort, R. W. *A Handbook of English Grammar*. Groningen. 1945.

## II. DICTIONARIES CONSULTED

- Bosworth, J. & Toller, T. N., ed. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford. 1908-21. [A.-S.D.]  
 Mathews, M.M., ed. *A Dictionary of Americanisms*. Chicago. 1951. [D.A.]  
 Murray, J., & others, ed. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford. 1888-1933. [OED]  
 Stratmann, F.H., ed. *A Middle-English Dictionary*. Oxford. 1891.

## III. EDITIONS OF OE & ME TEXTS QUOTED FROM

- Brown, E.W., ed. *The Gospel of Saint John in West-Saxon*. Boston & London. 1906.  
 Klaeber, F., ed. *Beowulf*. Boston. 1922.<sup>3</sup>  
 Miller, T., ed. *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. E.E.T.S. 1890. [Bede]  
 Morris, R. & Skeat, W.W., ed. *Specimens of Early English*. Part I. Oxford. 1926.  
 Mossé, F., ed. *Manuel de l'anglais du moyen âge*. I. Vieil-anglais. II. Moyen-anglais. Paris. 1945, '49.  
 Plummer, C., ed. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*. Oxford. 1892.  
 Skeat, W.W., ed. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford. 1921.  
 " " *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew in Anglo-Saxon, etc.* Cambridge. 1887.  
 " " *Piers the Plowman and Richard the Redress*. Oxford. 1924.