Grammatical Change of Representation: Toward "Overt"

Kenji Ishihara

I

What has made us what we are now is doubtlessly language, which enables us not only to communicate with each other but also to be more imaginative and to create something imaginary. The greatest value of language lies, above all, in its generalizing or conceptualizing power, through which we grasp our surrounding world. This distinguishes humankind from other animals.

We have several theories concerning the origin of language. No matter how it emerged and developed, the most necessary condition for its appearance is the collectivity of man; man can never come together without communicating something, known or unknown, real or unreal. The increasing activity of communication naturally leads man to find it more effective and convenient to make a vocal expression than otherwise. And what is important is that, by speaking and hearing, thought is made clearer and deeper, which in turn influences the language itself. Thus the relation between thought and language is thought to be indivisible.

Nearly 500,000 words are listed in *OED*. Today the English language is the richest in its vocabulary because of its international aspect. No

doubt the richness of words shows the degree of culture or civilization of a society: the richer the higher. The vocabulary of OE is, on the other hand, 60,000, more or less.[1] That the small number of OE vocabulary reflects the low level of culture is proved by its rapid increase brought about by the more cultured French after the Norman Conquest in 1066. It is quite hard, though not impossible, for any society to keep on its maintaining the conventional vocabulary while being continually influenced by another higher culture.[2] As shown above, vocabulary reflects the degree of culture; in other words, language is a mirror of the world it is spoken in. As mentioned earlier, thought and language are so mutually related. So it follows that, as society becomes more complicated and heterogeneous, thought and language cannot fail to keep pace with it. In primitive society where everything keeps going within the framework of little concrete, empirical knowledge, man's way of expression or thought cannot be free from such a limitation. The way of expression therein would have such features as directness, concreteness, spontaneousness, etc.

The so-called Proto-Indo-European language is thought to be very synthetic on the ground of its eight cases—nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, ablative, locative, instrumental and vocative. Most of the present languages descending from this language have come to have less cases through syncretism. The noun whose function in a sentence is shown by the inflectional ending gives the impression that its own substantial meaning and grammatical meaning (realized by inflection) are so closely united as to be recognized directly or concretely. For example, in Latin (with five cases) "dominus," "dominum," "dominī" and "dominōs" are distinguished from one another in terms of number

and case: "dominus" shows itself as an actor or doer of some action, and "dominōs" as receivers or something like that of some action. Any word in such a language is given life so as to stand itself in a sentence, for it is impossible to think of a noun of a neutral meaning free from any context like "master" as in English; in other words, no noun can be spoken without a specific meaning represented by some case. It can be said, therefore, that the case-form is a necessary linguistical form deriving from such a mental attitude toward direct or concrete representation.

As touched upon above, it is impossible for language to be free from the changes of society; in the course of time such vocabulary increases as general, abstract or technical words.[3] As the social system becomes more and more complicated, it is necessary for language to reflect the nature of the change. This also happens with regard to language structure. The proto-language, quite inflectional, might be thought to have become insufficient for coping with surrounding changes, *i.e.*, for expressing more complicated ideas or thoughts by inflectional endings, producing a lot of ambiguities.[4] Such being the case, it is natural for language to adopt or develop another effective way which the language already has within it.

Since "no language of our family has at any time had a case-system based on a precise or consistent system of meanings,"[5] the following takes place: The function inflectionally performed comes to be realized analytically through phenomena such as word order, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, etc. They enable men to express themselves as briefly and economically as possible to a much greater extent:

The old men slew the young bears.
The old man slew the young bear.

are briefer than their OE equivalents:

Ða ealdan men slōgan þa geondan beran (The old men slew the young bears).
Sē ealda man slōh þone geondan beran (The old man slew the young bear).

That "I had sung" is briefer and more economical than the Latin "cantaveram" (I had sung) is recognized by comparing such as "I had sung and danced and played and laughed" with "cantaveram (I had sung) et saltaveram (I had danced) et luseram (I had played) et riseram (I had laughed)." As such analytical expressions show us, the linguistic change from synthesis to analysis is no doubt "an improvement in the efficiency of language as a medium of expression."[6] An improvement it is because the analytic expression saves mental effort without resulting in the lessening of the communicating value. Word order, above all, is the most typical of this:

The man slays the bear; The bear slays the man

versus

Sē man sliehþ þone beran (The man slays the bear); Sē bera sliehþ þone man (The bear slays the man).

The analytic feature of language, to be brief, can be regarded as showing the linguistic direction toward making grammatical functions "overt." The article, for example, which is thought not to have existed in Proto-Germanic or Italic, became an independent part of speech (deriving from the demonstrative pronoun) to mark out a definite or fa-

miliar object and so distinguish it from an indefinite or less familiar one, serving so much to reveal the grammatical function of nouns in a sentence. But, important and valuable as the article is, its case-forms have been reduced in number,[7] because of grammatical tendency to analysis. In general, the change from the full to leveled or lost inflection in nouns or articles can be explained not only from the phonological point of view but also from the potential importance of already existing prepositions or the way of arranging words in a sentence.

It is generally admitted that, if there are several elements whose grammatical function is similar, the more effective one comes to dominate the others. This is the matter of prepositions and word order for cases, periphrastic tense forms for conjugation, and so forth. Prepositions changed their nature from something adverbial:

> ond him þær *wiþ* gefeaht (and [he] them there with fought: and [he] fought with them there) (*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 871).
> þa gatu him *to* belocen hæfdon ([they] the gates them to locked had: [they] had locked the gates to them) (*ibid.*, 755).
> þæt bed þe sē lama *on* læg (the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay) (Mark. ii. 4).

to something like indicators of the relation of nouns (they govern) to the rest of a sentence. Such a word that functions like this is termed a "function word," which has "little or no meaning apart from the grammatical function it indicates."[8] This means that it functions not as a concrete but as a generic element. In

> Worhte Ælfrēd cyning lȳtle werede geweorc (The king Ælfred built a fortification with his small troop) (*The Anglo-Saxon*

Chronicle, 878).

the adjective "lȳtle" (little) is instrumental and the noun "werede" is dative, so that this noun phrase can be regarded as instrumental. This feature of instrumentality would be expressed more clearly and properly by the use of the function word—*mid* (with) as in

> Ceorl . . . feaht wiþ hǣþne menn mid Defena-scīre (Ceorl . . . with the men of Davon fought against the heathen army) (*ibid.*, 851).

Concerning this function of function words, E. P. Morris says:

> It is certainly not correct to say that . . . the expression of relation by a single word, e. g., a preposition, is clearer than the suggestion of the same relation by a case-form, but it is correct to say that the relation can become associated with a single word only when it is felt with a considerable degree of clearness. The relation between concepts must itself become a concept. To this extent the movement toward the expression of relation by single words is a movement toward precision.[9]

The linguistic phenomenon similar to the above is seen in the relation between inflection and word order. The subject and the object in a sentence are so different in their grammatical meanings that it is natural to think that they should be grammatically distinguished from each other. But this is not always the case in inflectional languages such as Old High German, Latin, Russian, etc. An explanation for this might be of a psychological nature: It is true that the more inflectional a language is, the freer its word order is, but, so long as it is a medium of communication, there appears the tendency to make the message

easily understood. Even Latin, quite inflectional as it is, has such a standard word order as Subject-Adjective (of the subject)-Indirect Object-Direct Object-Adverb-Predicate Verb.[10] As for the word-order pattern in OE, the prevailing ones are S-V-O/C, S-O/C-V and V-S-O/C, so the percentage of the order that S is followed, directly or not, by O is quite high.[11] This being the case, the function of inflectional endings (or articles) naturally begins to be felt redundant, the result being that the nominative and the accusative can become indistinct in forms without giving rise to any ambiguity. The fixed word order as well as prepositions has thus become a brief and easy way of representing the grammatical functions which inflection used to perform.[12]

The process from synthetic to analytic expression seen in some languages can be put forth this way; from directness, concreteness, obscurity to the opposite, in short, the realization of "overt" grammatical elements.

II

What has been touched upon so far will hold good with regard to the way one expresses one's ideas or thoughts, *i. e.*, the process toward more "overt" representations of them. The problem that confronts one in dealing with the representation is how to define the representation itself, or by what standard to regard it as one's proper expression of thoughts. Usually such a linguistic category is grasped as "sentence." This can be (and has been) discussed from a variety of angles. The important point as to how to define it is, above all, in its function of communicating something, not in its form, whether with a finite verb or without. This function can be said to be performed when something

is roused in the hearer, or in other words, when some expression rouses "meaning" in him.[13] This being admitted, any expression can be a "sentence," whether a word or words:

"Yes." "Fire!" "Nice day!"

For these are "complete" enough in themselves to assume a meaning.

The general trait recognized in the changing grammatical elements mentioned above can also be recognized in the way a sentence is uttered.[14] It cannot be denied that, when one wants to make oneself well understood, one tries to speak as clearly as possible by paying attention to grammatical points. The more attention one pays, the more elaborate one's expression becomes.[15] This elaboration is obtained by following morphological or syntactical rules as a result. As far as European logic is concerned, a sentence has been thought to be expressed most specifically in terms of subject and predicate. This is because, when a man is in any mental activity, he forms a double judgment (the predication of subject by predicate). Behind any expression such as "Nice!" or "John" subject and predicate are thought to underlie it. Herein lies the significance of the notional aspect of the sentence.

If only a double judgment underlies any sentence, it is natural to think that the more overtly any element in a sentence is expressed, the easier it is to understand. From lack of grammatical devices for revealing grammatical functions, the sentence becomes ambiguous:

> Sie ist das Mädchen, das die Tante liebt (She is the girl who loves the aunt; She is the girl whom the aunt loves). The women with the girl who could swim across the river are now in hospital (The women with the girl who was able to swim

> . . . are now in hospital; The women with the girl who were able to . . . are . . .).

The former would be avoided if the relative pronoun had different forms in the nominative and accusative like *der* (nominative) and *den* (accusative) in the masculine, or if word order were effectively fixed as in English. The latter would become clear if the verb or the auxiliary were made distinct in number, singular or plural.

As seen above, language is in general not always given effective grammatical devices. A possible reason might lie in man's mental characteristic that he cannot be as logical as he wishes to; it is frequent that what he thinks and says cannot always hold water. This is necessarily reflected in language; the ambiguous expression is a natural result. It is true that ambiguity is an unavoidable feature of language, but, as far as communication is concerned, it is necessary for any expression to be clearly made. As *logos* is "word," clear meaning is to be given by any linguistical form.

Regarding clear expressions of a series of thoughts, the same can be said as the foregoing—the process of making grammatical elements "overter." The description of the year 871 in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (British Museum, Cotton Ms., Tiberius B. IV) has nearly 400 words in it, but the so-called complex sentence is only one:

> . . . him Ælfred þas cynges broþor and ealdormen . . . radan on ridon, þe man na ne rimde (Ælfred the king's brother and aldermen . . . made a raid on them, which man did not count).

The others are all simple sentences, almost all of which begin with "and." This characteristic can be thought quite native not only to

OE,[16] but also to some other old languages, that is, a general one seen in early stages in language.[17] In expressing a series of thoughts, the easiest way is to mention one after another as

I came, I did not see, I went.

Such an expression reveals the chronological succession, but does not give a clear idea of logical relation among them.

Similarly,

Nothing ventured, nothing gained.
Ende gut, alles gut (End good, all good).
Summum ius summa iniuria (The highest law, the highest injustice).

These are called "parataxis" (*para* "beside" + *taxis* "arrangement, order"). As G. Brook says that it "reflects the succession of mental images as they occur,"[18] parataxis sounds direct, strong or emotional, therefore, good for something like proverbial expressions. One can express what occurs to one quite tersely, forcefully and simply. This way of expression can be said to have much to do with language structure, that is, the grammatical elements language has in order to reveal a variety of relations among words. In general in ancient times when specific or clear representation of ideas or thoughts was not so necessary, such paratactic expressions seem to have been prevalent.

As touched on above, when a sentence is uttered, a double judgment underlies it—the predication of subject by predicate. To predicate something is to relate one concept to another; in such a process, concepts are very likely to be ranked as principal or secondary. The process

is always made regardless of the means of expression a language has. From this it will follow that behind any expression (if a sentence) there is made a certain classification among concepts; therefore, in such paratactic expressions as

Go and see. Out of sight, out of mind. Better dead!

comprehension would be done as if they were:

Go to see. If something is out of sight, it soon passes out of mind. It would be better if he were dead!

About such a relation between the formal expression and the way of recognition, L. Kellner writes that "in short, what was formally a paratactic connection, is logically hypotaxis or subordination."[19]

Such subordination termed as "hypotaxis" (*hypo* "under, below" + *taxis*) is the dependent relation of a clause or construction on another, which is formally realized by the use of conjunctions or other elements. Its greatest feature is that it "imposes a discipline which makes clear the relation of one idea to the next."[20] Since one's thought is the process of predication, hypotactic expressions are necessary results of the direction of "overt" expressions. Thus, it follows, in paratactic expressions, though without formal signs, actual subordination was present at an early stage of language growth.

It has been recognized that function words have developed as the result of the linguistic demand for overt expressions. Of them the conjunction, as seen above, has come to play a great role in making parataxis to hypotaxis. It changes direct representation to abstract:

I know that (demonstrative pronoun): you are just → I know

that you are just.

The former expression is direct, whereas the latter is abstract in that "you are just" is made the object of the verb "know" with the indicator of "that." Like the preposition, the conjunction is a very grammatical element serving for the accuracy of the expression.[21]

III

The principal aim of the foregoing has been to show the linguistical direction of making grammatical functions "overt"; what can generally be said of it is that those elements functioning in such a direction are so common and indispensable now.[22] Hence it seems that such a direction is so natural that language never fails to proceed along this. And if language were like a mathematical formula, such would be the case. But, as it is, language is not so unitary.

The English language, the most heterogeneous, has experienced a great change in its vocabulary and structure. Structually, it has been influenced by Latin, Old Norse, Norman-French. What is interesting in terms of what has been discussed so far is the "absolute constr(uction)" because of its uniqueness of semi-hypotaxis. Its origin is often said to be of Latin ablative constr.[23] As mentioned above, the ablative is so overloaded that the ablative absolute constr. necessarily assumes various functions which can be plainly revealed by the use of conjunctions or prepositional phrases which have developed for clear representation. Most of paratactic expressions can be looked into from the hypotactic point of view. The absolute constr., formally parataxis because of the lack of any grammatical elements that connect it with

the rest of the sentence (this is why it is "absolute" [<*absolvere* "set free, release"]), assumes a strong feature of subordination because of its being ablative; nominals of other case than nominative usually cannot stand as the subject of a sentence, but often as something adverbial, which subordinates itself to other parts of a sentence.[24] In

> ...iunctis bobus... debeo arare integrum agrum (the oxen being yoked... I must plow a whole acre) (*Ælfric's Colloquy*, 26-27).

"Iunctis bobus" (yoked oxen [ablatives]) grasped as "nexus" is not as overtly subordinated to the clause "debeo..." as its equivalent "cum bōvēs iunctī sint" (when the oxen are yoked). In this respect the expression is not quite hypotactical, but, as far as its meaning is concerned, *i.e.*, its subordination, this can be said to be semi-hypotactic.

As for such constr. in English, it is often said that the constr., dative in OE, is entirely of foreign origin—Latin[25] as

> *Him* þa gyt sprecendum hī cōmon<Adhuc *eō* loquente, veniunt (While he yet spoke, they came) (Mark. v. 35).
> Ut-adryfenum *þam deofle* sē dumba spræc < Eiecto *daemone* locutus est mutus (When the demon was cast out, the dumb man spoke) (Matthew. ix. 33).

The reason the dative is used is in its historical character; in it were included such cases as ablative, instrumental, and locative, so that this case is naturally the most suitable for this constr. Above all, the adverbial use of the dative can be regarded as a great factor for the growth of this constr.:

lȳtle werede (with a small troop)
Ðone ilcan we hataþ *oþre naman* æfensteorra (We call the same by another name evening star).[26]

As seen so far, frequently nominal expressions in the dative can be substituted by prepositional phrases with *mid* or *be* (by, with, etc.):

. . . sē *be* Diocletiane lyfgendum Gallia rīce . . . rehte (who ruled the empire of Gaul . . . with Diocletian living) (*Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, I, 8).

This has in a great degree been inherited in Present English:

She is lonesome with her husband so much away.
With conditions in every way favorable, he might succeed.
By the noise increasing, I knew their numbers were greater.

If it is an attendant circumstance, similar phrases can be without prepositions:

She stood before him, her face terse with anger.
He sat at the table, collar off, head down, and pen in position.
Sword in hand, he faced his foe.

These phrases are very like the OE absolute constr., though without case-forms.

"Him . . . sprecendum" (when he spoke) is today rewritten as "He . . . speaking" as the result of the loss of inflection and the strong tendency to putting nominals (if notionally subject) in the nominative.[27] This change shows well the characteristic of the change of English: From morphological to syntactical, that is, nominals in the nominative can not be put in adverbial phrases in OE, whereas the nominative is

like a marker to show a notional subject in nexus today. C. T. Onions points out the oblique feature of this constr., saying that "this fact is disguised by its present form [nominative]."[28] As he says, this constr. of adverbial nature originally demands oblique cases, but, since inflection has become unimportant, there arises no problem with the nominative.

From the standpoint of "overt" representation, such nominative absolute constructions:

My task being completed, I went to bed.
The clock having struck, we had to go.
The man being ready to start, we decided to stay at home.

will be clearer if expressed with such conjunctions (*i.e.*, in the hypotactic form) as "after," "when," "because," and so on, similar to the case where prepositions reveal grammatical meanings more clearly than inflection. If language were only for clear, logical communication, it would be expressed by every available possible method for this purpose; and, in fact some language aspects seem to have changed in such a direction. However, language is not so mechanical as natural phenomena; it leaves much room for something easy, flexible, or redundant. The absolute constr. is an example of such a kind, giving movement, making flexible, compact and suggestive.

IV

To sum up, language, most human, cannot avoid changes of various kinds along with social changes. There are two different aspects in language: as a medium of communication and as one way to express

mental action. The former needs logic, consistency, rigidity; the latter reveals man's mental disposition somewhat opposite to the former. Historically some languages have changed from synthetic to analytic, the result being that some grammatical functions have been made "overt," seen in the increasing importance of function words for example. This is true of not only parts in a sentence, but also the sentence itself, or the representation of ideas or thoughts.

Such is, however, merely one side of a coin. As touched upon in the absolute constr. as an example, language does not always adopt, develop or reinforce blindly some effective elements for clear representation, but maintains something like "expression range." Hence it can be said that language changes within some framework. This is obvious in that any element becoming prevalent or dominant cannot be made up completely from where there is nothing to do with that element, but be put forth or developed from within the language. The absolute constr. is said by some to be alien, but, as I. A. Gordon says that "in order to be a candidate for retention . . . the foreign phrase must on its introduction be itself structured as if it were already English," [29] this constr. was not too foreign to be one of English usages; in other words, in the language there were already intrinsic elements, without which the development of such usage could not have been possible. And the same might be true of many aspects in language. H. Izui writes:

> While physical or constitutional circumstances in our life change, the affairs of "intra cutem" (the inside of skin) and "inter homines" (relations among men) hardly change. . . . What is changing is the world of "extra cutem" (the outside

> of skin).... Our language is a phenomenon of "intra cutem" and "inter homines."... The range of direction to be taken is mostly limited.... Simplicity and complexity—language can change in either direction [my translation].[30]

This is just because language is nothing but the very property of humankind.

NOTES

1. In OE there are quite a few synonymous words such as *beadu* (battle) having more than eleven synonyms, or *brim* (sea) with sixteen. Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (revised ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), p. 48.
2. Naturally language has the power of forming new words by existent words as remarkable in OE: *godcund* (God+likeness: "divine"), *godspræce* (God+speech: "oracle"), etc. (*ibid.*, p. 42), but this is not without limit as witnessed in any language.
3. "Civilization means ... increase of abstract terms and decrease of superfluous special words." (O. Jespersen, *Efficiency in Linguistic Change* [Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941], p. 45.) In OE "wascan" (wash) is used for clothes or animals; "þwean" for a man or his part. "Wash" is the descendant of the former via "waschen" in Middle English, becoming neuter for anything.
4. Each case (especially oblique) has various functions. This becomes more so through syncretism. Latin ablative, for example, stands for actor, instrument, means, accompaniment, measure, time, price, and so forth.
5. O. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924), p. 185. He says of case as "one of the most irrational part of language in general" (p. 186).
6. George L. Brook, *A History of the English Language* (London: Andre Deutsche, 1958), p. 20.
7. In German the number of the demonstratives (of different forms equivalent to "the") has decreased from 12 in Old High German to 7 in Middle High G. and to 6 in present G., whereas in English from 10 in OE to 1 in

Middle E.

8. Charles C. Fries, *American English Grammar* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940), p. 109.
9. Edward P. Morris, *On Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax* (1901), quoted *ibid.*, p. 110.
10. Hidenaka Tanaka, *Shin Raten Bunpo* (The New Latin Grammar) (Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1929), p. 63. F. Bodmer goes so far as to say that "there can be little doubt that it [the word order of Classical Latin] was as fixed as that of colloquial Italian." (Frederick Bodmer, *The Loom of Language* [London: George Allen & Unwin, 1944], p. 324.) "The movement towards a relatively fixed . . . word order . . . was well established in the earliest extant documents, and even in the still earlier Runic inscriptions." (Ian A. Gordon, *The Movement of English Prose* [London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1966], p. 24.)
11. In the ninth-century OE, the percentage that the subject and the object are not distinguished by inflection is 59, in which word order is S-O in 94%. F. G. Cassidy and R. N. Ringler (eds.), *Bright's Old English: Grammar and Reader* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1891), p. 92.
12. Effective functions of the fixed word order and prepositions are to be seen in this: "weil Hans Maria Peter Paul verzustellen bat"; "because Hans asked Maria to introduce Peter to Paul."
13. Anton Marty's psychological ground is to be supported: "Bedeutung ist dasjenige psychische Phänomen, welches der sprachliche Ausdruck im Hörer wachzurufen bestimmt ist" (Meaning is that psychological phenomenon which the linguistic expression is bound to rouse in the hearer). (Otto Funke, *Innere Sprachform* [Reichenberg i. B.: Sudetendeutscher Verlag Franz Kraus, 1924], pp. 20-21.)
14. Such sentences as "Yes." "John!" "Nice!" and the like are so context-oriented that they can be put aside for convenience' sake.
15. In the opposite case when a man is in mentally or physically bad condition, he stammers less-grammatical words hard for the hearer to comprehend with ease.
16. M. C. Bean says of this *Chronicle* that "it represents the most extended prose composition which might conceivably reflect the vernacular language

of the period to a considerable extent." (Marian C. Bean, *The Development of Word Order Patterns in English* [London: Croom Helm, 1983], p. 14.)

17. "In all languages of the Indo-European family, hypotaxis has developed from parataxis. There is no complex sentence in the oldest Indo-European language." (Sanki Ichikawa (ed.), *The Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Philology* [Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1940], p. 465.)
18. G. L. Brook, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
19. Leon Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, ed. with Notes and Glossary by Kikuo Miyabe (6th ed.; Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1968), p. 45.
20. G. L. Brook, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
21. As for the import of the preposition and the conjunction, L. Murray, who is said to have successfully compiled the 18th-century grammars into his book (which contributed a lot to the establishment of the present grammar), says that they are "essential to discourse . . . . , without which there could be no language [, and join] words together into intelligible and significant propositions." (R. C. Alston [ed.], *English Grammar* [English Linguistics 1500-1800, No. 106] [Menston: The Scolar Press, 1968], p. 81.)
22. For example, in explication of the so-called asyndetic construction like "there is a man at the door wants to see you," one is inclined to think a relative pronoun is omitted. But, such a clause is "presumed to be the earliest type of relative clause known to the Germanic languages." (W. B. Lockwood, *Historical German Syntax* [London: Oxford University Press, 1968], p. 242.)
23. "*Caesare praesente* Cicerō rēgem Dēiotarum dēfendit" (With Caesar present Cicero defended the king Deiotarus). This ablative absolute constr. "is of uncertain and perhaps mixed origin. It seems to be a special type of ablative of accompaniment or attendant circumstance." (Mason Hammond, *Latin: A Historical and Linguistic Handbook* [London: Harvard University Press, 1976], p. 161.)
24. "*Sole* mundus illustratur" (The world is illuminated *by the sun*). "Germania *rivis fluminibus* que abundat" (Germany abounds *in brooks* and *rivers*).
25. "This construction oftenest occurs in those Old English translations from Latin in which the writers allow themselves to be influenced by the syntax of the original." (Frederikus T. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English*

Language II [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966], p. 1073.) Jespersen regards it as "imitation of the Latin construtions . . . chiefly in close translations from Latin." (O. Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 117.)

26. Some adverbs originate from nouns in the dative: "styccemælum" (<"styccemæl": piecemeal), "unwearnum" (<"unwearn": irresistibly), "whilom" (<"hwīlum"<"hwīl" [time]: formerly), etc.

27. The nominative use began to be seen in the following: "Benedicens nos *episcopus* profecti sumus" (*The bishop* blessing us, we went forward) (Peregrinatio Silviæ 16. 7, quoted in O. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 128.) C. H. Ross says of Wyclif's isolated example that this is "a proof of the fact that the absolute case had changed, or had begun to change, its form before Wyclif made his translation": "*We* overcumen, he go out" (Exodus. i. 10). (Charles H. Ross, "The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English," *PMLA*, VIII, 3 [1893], p. 285.)

28. Charles T. Onions, *An Advanced English Syntax* (London: W. Jolly and Son, 1904), p. 69.

29. I. A. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

30. Hisanosuke Izui, *Gengo no Sekai* (The World of Language) (Tokyo: Chikumashobô, 1970), pp. 50–51.