The Early English '*his* Genitives' from a Germanic Perspective[1]

CYNTHIA L. ALLEN
Australian National University
cindy.allen@anu.edu.au

1. Introduction

In this paper, I present some findings from an on-going investigation into the development of possessives in English and other Germanic languages. These findings concern the so-called *his* genitive which is found in some earlier periods of English. Examples are given in (1)-(6):

(1) *...to be enfformyd that Margere ys dowghter ys past to Godd*
  '...to be informed that Margery's daughter has died'   W. Cely 188.3 (1482)

(2) *...to your hurt and othtyr men ys grete avaylle*
  'to your great hurt and other men's great avail' J. Paston I 53.8 (1458)

(3) *...not borrowed of other men his lippes*
  'not borrowed from other men's lips'   Ascham Tox.A 5.23   (1545)

(4) *...but in his absence one Curio a gentleman of Naples of lyttle wealth and lesse witte haunted Lucilla hir company*
  'But in his absence a certain Curio, a gentleman from Naples of little wealth and less wit, haunted Lucilla's company'   Lyly, *Euphues*, 1578 (Bond ed. 237.8)

(5) *and then is there good vse of Pallas her Glasse*
  'and then is there good use (made) of Pallas' mirror'   Wisdome 44 (1619)

(6) *Beauty & agilitie their fame, hath their delyte*
  'The fame of beauty and agility have their delight'   QE Bo. Pr. III.ii.32 (1593)

The reason people have used the label '*his* genitive' is of course because most of the examples appear to use a form of the possessive pronoun *his*, which was variably spelled with an <i> or a <y> in earlier periods. The initial <h> often does not appear, as in examples (1) and (2). These possessives look similar to possessives involving a 'pleonastic' possessive determiner in other Germanic varieties, including modern colloquial German and Dutch, and in Norwegian varieties:[2]

(7) *Dem Chinesen seine   Puppe   ist schön*   (Ruhrdeutsch)[3]
   the Chinese his(FN) doll   is   pretty
   'The Chinaman's doll is pretty'

---

[2] I use the following abbreviations in the examples: D=dative, FN=feminine nominative, G=genitive, REFL=reflexive.
[3] Thanks to Karl Rensch for the information on this dialect.

(8) *de man met die gekke bril   z'n caravan*
    the man with those funny glasses his caravan
    'the many with those funny glasses's caravan'
    (Dutch, Weerman and de Wit (1999) ex. (39c), p. 1171)
(9) *mannen sit   hus*
    man-the his(REFL)   house
    'the man's house   (Norwegian, Delsing 1998 example (13a), p. 90)

There are of course some differences, but in the generative literature it is widely accepted that these sorts of constructions, which I will refer to as 'prenominal periphrastic genitives', have essentially the same structure. It is generally assumed that whatever analysis is given to these possessives in these languages, a similar analysis is applicable to the *his* genitives of earlier English. A commonly assumed[4] sort of structure is given in (10):

(10) $_{DP}[_{Spec}[Margery]\ _{Ď}[_{D}[ys]\ _{NP}[dowghter]]]$

Instead of the traditional NP, we have a DP (Determiner Phrase), with the possessor noun phrase in the specifier position, and the possessive form in the determiner position. Since Abney (1987), this is also the usual structure given for the clitic *s* of the Present Day English prenominal genitive.

However, it has also been argued[5] that in at least the earlier stages of Middle English, it is better to regard most of the examples as mere orthographical variants of the more common genitive ending in *–es*, which developed from the most frequently occurring form of the Old English genitive. I will therefore refer to the 'separated' genitive as opposed to the 'attached' genitive as a neutral term when I wish to avoid supporting any particular analysis, and will reserve 'prenominal periphrastic possessive' for examples in which the status of the possessive as an independent word is clear.

In this paper, I will not be addressing the question of how these genitives first arose in English, which is an issue which has been much debated in the literature,[6] and will focus instead on two basic questions concerning later Middle English and Early Modern English. The first is 'can we recognise more than one type of separated genitive in the history of English?' The second is 'why did the separated genitives die out in English?'

2. Types of separated genitives in English

One might expect that given all the discussion that has taken place concerning these possessives, it would be easy to answer our first question. But in fact there is no consensus in the literature on one crucial empirical question concerning the form of the separated genitive. Note that in (1)-(3), the *ys* or *his* fails to show agreement with the possessor,

---

[4] E.g. by Janda (2001: 303). Delsing (1998) assumes this as a surface structure for the Germanic languages in general, with the possessive determiner and the possessor having been moved from their initial position.
[5] For example, by Furnivall (1865), Carstairs (1987), and Allen (1997).
[6] See for example Allen (1997), Carstairs (1987), Janda (1980, 1981) Jespersen (1894: §249, 1942: §17.9) and Mustanoja (1960) to name only a few.

which makes these examples different from (4)-(6), where we have clear agreement, and also different from colloquial German and Dutch where agreement is obligatory. Some reputable scholars indicate that the two types belong to two periods, for example Wyld (1953: 316). But other very respectable sources indicate that the agreeing type is ancient, going back to OE, for example Mustanoja (1960: 180), along with Altenberg's (1982) study of the genitive in the seventeenth century and also the *Oxford English Dictionary* in its entries for HER and THEIR as possessive pronouns.

The problem here is simply that a handful of dubious examples have been repeated over and over again as examples of the agreeing type at an early period, for example (11):

(11) *Nilus   seo ea   hire æwielme   is neh _æm clife _ære readan saes*
       Nile   the river her   source   is near the   cliff the(G) red(G) sea(G)
       'The source of the River Nile is near the promontory of the Red Sea'
       Oros. (Bately 1986 ed. 11.3)

The problem with an example like (11) is that it is amenable to an analysis as left dislocation, or 'anacoluthia', as Jespersen (1894: §249, 1942: §17.9) discusses for the same example. All the putative examples of early separated genitives are discussed in Allen (1997), where it is shown that are all either amenable to another analysis or simply mistakes. The first convincing examples of any sort of separated genitive do not show up until the mid-thirteenth century, and it is not until the late sixteenth century that we find examples of agreement. Table 1 presents some results of my investigation for the period from 1300 on. This table indicates whether the separated genitive is found in a particular text which I read, and whether it is always in a form which looks like *his*, and if so, whether this possessive marker shows clear agreement or failure of agreement with the possessor. As the table indicates, the first convincing agreeing examples I found are from the late sixteenth century.

It can therefore be concluded that those who consider the agreeing type to be a late development are correct, and we can discern two periods: the period before the late sixteenth century, where we never find clear agreement, and the later period, where we do find it. This raises the question of whether agreement was obligatory in the later period, or whether non-agreement was still found. This is not a question which the literature has specifically addressed.

My own investigation leads to the conclusion that there was no period when we find both agreeing and clearly non-agreeing separated genitives. That is, from the late sixteenth century on, we do not find any convincing examples of non-agreement in the separated genitives. It is notable also that the initial <h> is never missing after this period.

This does not mean, however, that we suddenly find a lot of examples in which there is clear agreement. The separated genitive was not used at any period in all texts, or even in the majority of texts. It has frequently been noted that the *his* genitive was used most frequently with proper nouns, especially those ending in a sibilant. This makes it quite different from the prenominal periphrastic genitives found in the other Germanic languages. It also turns out that most English examples, particularly in the later period, are in fact

ambiguous between an agreeing and a non-agreeing interpretation, since the separated genitive was always used more often with masculine singular possessors than with any other type of possessor, such as (12):

(12) to fall…into Socrates his irronicall doubting of all things
      Bacon Adv. 26a

In such examples, the separated genitive could be taken as either agreeing with the masculine head or simply indeclinable. Most of the writers of the period after the agreeing type came in in fact only use the type with a masculine singular possessor. This suggests the possibility that we are dealing with a third type here, a genitive which is a *his* genitive in every sense. And in fact there is some evidence from grammarians that some speakers had a *his* genitive which was restricted in just this way. Maittaire's grammar of 1712 comments:

> The –s, if it stands for *his,* may be marked by an Apostrophus; E. G. *for Christ's sake*:
> and sometimes his is spoken and written at length; E.G. *for Christ his sake.*
> Maittaire (1712: 28)

Maittaire apparently believed that the *'s* genitive sometimes was a reduction of *his* and sometimes was not. Maittaire was unusual as a grammarian in accepting the *his* genitive at all. Most of these grammarians condemned the construction. In fact, some of the grammarians even condemned the attached genitive because they believed that it was a reduction of *his,* which offended against syntax and logic, especially when the possessor was feminine or plural; see e.g. Harris (1752) and Baker (1770), who argued that the only proper genitive in English was the *of* genitive. Ignorant of the history of English, they did not know that the attached genitive was a continuation of the old –(*e*)*s* genitive, which had long been extended to all nouns. But Maittaire is like most other grammarians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in not mentioning the existence of an agreeing prenominal periphrastic genitive. It therefore appears that the clearly agreeing type, which is found only in a few texts of the late sixteenth century and the seventeenth century, never really took hold in English. On the other hand, the third type, used only with a masculine possessor, is found with some frequency in the texts,[7] and comments by Maittaire and others indicate that it really did have some currency. For some authors of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, I have only found examples with trisyllabic masculine nouns ending in *s,* as in (12). It would appear that there was a good deal of individual variation. The nature of the variation makes the prenominal periphrastic genitive seem more like a peripheral stylistic device than a central part of the grammar.

How do these types fit into the general Germanic picture? The formal treatment we give to the switch from non-agreement to agreement will depend on such considerations as whether we assume a variant of (10) for both periods or assume that the attached genitive has a different structure from the separated genitive in the earlier period, etc. But one point which I will make here is that we will have a rather odd system in the later period by any analysis. Suppose, for example, that we adopt structure (10) for all genitives of both

---

[7] However, it is generally agreed that Hume's complaint of c. 1617 (in Wheatley 1865: 29) that 'therfoer now almost al wrytes his for it, as if it wer a corruption' is a gross exaggeration, and my own investigation confirms this opinion.

periods. Then the attached genitive would just be a variant of the separated genitive in the earlier, non-agreeing period. This variant would have a possessive determiner *es* or *s* which was cliticised to the specifier containing the possessor. Then when agreement appeared, we would have two variants of (10). We would need two because we would still need the old, non-agreeing attached type, given the evidence that this was still the most usual type for everyone, apart perhaps from a couple of prescriptive grammarians ignorant of the history of the language. We would have a second variant which had gender and number features in the determiner and had Specifier-Head agreement.

With two variants like this, the attached genitive would have had a split personality in Early Modern English, On the one hand, it could be a reduced form of the agreeing type, with the –*s* identified with the possessive determiner *his*. On the other, it could be an indeclinable possessive determiner, as in Present Day English. This is in line with Maittaire's comments. His comments also indicate that he thought that agreement was limited to masculine singular possessors. Given the lack of any agreeing examples with other than masculine singular possessors after about 1700, his comments seem consistent with actual usage.

This seems a rather strange and artificial-looking system. It is not like what we find in the other Germanic languages. Space does not permit us to address the question of how such a system could have arisen, but the point here is that such a system is not likely to remain for very long. This leads us to our other major question, the demise of the prenominal periphrastic genitive.

3. The demise of the prenominal periphrastic genitive

Why did this genitive die out? This question is tied up with another one: what was the sociolinguistic status of these genitives? It is frequently suggested that the hostility of the traditional grammarians towards the *his* genitive may have played an important role in its disappearance in English (see e.g. Traugott (1972: 81).

It is also frequently assumed that the prenominal periphrastic genitive was a colloquial construction in English, just as it is in Dutch and German.[8] For example, Lehmann (1995: 19) says that 'dialects and lower sociolects of Middle English had the alternative construction 'NP *his* N' (e.g. *the king* (*of England*) *his daughter*) available' and Janda (2001: 303) asserts that 'the construction shows hypercorrective hallmarks suggesting an origin among a much more numerous body of barely, nearly, or even non-literate speakers.'

We have no real way of knowing whether the construction originated among the poorly educated, but by the late fourteenth century, when the separated genitives first start appearing with some frequency (in their non-agreeing form, of course) the evidence indicates that this construction was a feature of the highest styles. By the time when the agreeing type appears, this evidence is overwhelming. It is particularly frequent in

---

[8] But apparently not in Norwegian. Lars-Olaf Delsing (p.c.) informs me that this construction is used in even the most conservative Bokmål newspapers..

translations from Latin and in particularly ornate styles, such as Lyly's. And in 1711, we also have the comment of Joseph Addison in issue 135 of the *Spectator*[9] that *his* (which he believed to be the origin of the attached genitive) was still retained 'in writing and in all the solemn offices of our religion.'

One important grammarian who gives an indication that the *his* genitive did have a low sociolinguistic status is Jespersen (1894: 327), who comments that he is presenting examples 'from Chaucer down to the vulgar speech or burlesque style of our days.' Jespersen in fact only gives two post-Shakespearian examples. One of these two examples is the only one in his whole list that we might consider 'vulgar'. It is from Thackeray's novel *Pendennis*:

 (13) *…in King George the First his time*
     'in King George the First's time'
     Thackeray (1849) *Pendennis* Vol. 1, Chap. 23(22) (Cited by Jespersen as II.6)

The reason why this example might be considered vulgar is that it is uttered by a housekeeper, although it is hard to be certain exactly how 'vulgar' is to be interpreted here; possibly Jespersen was making a reference to a dialect peculiarity or perhaps he considered the usage a hypercorrection. At any rate, the example is hardly convincing, since it reflects a novelist's idea of how a rustic housekeeper might talk.[10]

It should also be noted that in his discussion of the *his* genitive in Volume VI of his *Modern English Grammar,* published in 1942, Jespersen produces this same list of examples, but omits the prefatory remarks. I conclude that this single example, in the absence of more convincing ones, cannot be taken as evidence of the vulgar status of the construction in any period. None of the grammarians from the early seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century gives any indication that the separated genitives are 'vulgar'. It is true enough that we find many grammarians condemning the construction, but they do not comment that it is 'vulgar'. Rather, they just say that it is a mistake, and grammarians such as Bishop Lowth (1775) and others present examples of the 'best writers' being caught making this mistake and others. And in fact it should be noted that when grammarians of this period attacked constructions, they were typically attacking ones which were found in the speech and writing of the reasonably well-educated; they ignored the truly 'vulgar' usages which are listed in Savage's (1833) book *The Vulgarisms and Improprieties of the English Language*. It is surely significant that Savage himself makes no mention of the *his* genitive in his book, since he does mention other 'vulgar' types of genitives. We can assume that if people were using the *his* genitive in Savage's time and this was a 'vulgar' construction, he would have mentioned it.

---

[9] Edited by Bond (1965).
[10] Concerning this example, Phillipps (1978: 119) comments, 'To suggest bucolic overtones when a rustic guide conducts a party over a stately home, the novelist revives that Tudor phenomenon, which Jespersen… calls the quasi-genitive, as in John Smith his mark.' Phillipps does not mention any other examples of Thackeray using this construction.

Finally, we have the evidence of two studies of English dialects in the early twentieth century. The construction is not mentioned in Wright's (1905) *English Dialect Grammar,* or in Wakelin's (1977) introduction to English dialects, although both these works do mention other non-standard possessives. It seems reasonable to assume that if the prescriptive grammarians had managed to stamp out a thriving construction in Standard English, it would still be found in some dialects of English, just as forms such as *hisn* are still found in some places, so the non-mention of the *his* genitive in these two studies seems significant. Also, prescriptive Dutch and German grammarians have not succeeded in stamping out their own prenominal periphrastic genitives, although they have certainly tried. It would be a surprise, therefore, if the English grammarians would have had success had the *his* genitive truly been a colloquial construction at the time when they were condemning it. But it would not be surprising if their condemnation had an effect on the well-educated people who read their grammars and were concerned not to use 'irrational' constructions.

4. Conclusions

The first conclusion from this investigation is that the use of the agreeing or non-agreeing form of the separated genitive is not sporadic, but is associated with different periods. After the late sixteenth century, we have a clearly periphrastic prenominal genitive which apparently never fails to agree with the possessor. As far as we can tell, once the separated genitive became clearly identified with the possessive pronouns we had two basic types of writers who used it. The first type restricted this prenominal periphrastic genitive to masculine possessors, where *his* made some sort of sense, while others reacted by having a prenominal periphrastic genitive but making it more apparently logical by making it agree with the possessor generally. Both reactions were in keeping with the spirit of the times, which put a high premium on rationality in grammar. What does seem clear enough is that the same writer did not variably use agreeing and non-agreeing forms.

The second conclusion is that the prenominal periphrastic genitive in English never had the same sort of sociolinguistic status that it has in Modern Dutch or German. It is not unlikely that the hostility of the grammarians towards it played a role in its demise, but this was only possible because the construction did not have real roots in the language. It was easy to kill off because there was another prenominal possessive available, namely the attached genitive, which did have real roots in the language and which made the periphrastic prenominal possessive an unnecessary adornment. This fact made English different from Dutch or German, where the prenominal periphrastic possessive is very useful because the old Germanic attached genitive has become limited essentially to proper nouns and kinship terms.

This leads us to the final point, which is that we cannot assume without further investigation that we are dealing with essentially the same construction when we have strings that look superficially the same in two languages. Indeed, we cannot even make this assumption for two stages of the same language; an example of a *his* genitive in late Middle English should not necessarily be given the same analysis as a similar-looking example in Early Modern English. Previous investigations have taken examples from different periods

without a systematic examination of the syntax of those periods. But the examples cannot
be analysed in isolation; we must put them in the context of the grammatical system of the
variety of the particular time and place.

Appendix: Details of the Investigation

Table 1: Separated Genitives in ME and EModE

Text	Date	Sep.	*(h)is* only	non-agr *(h)is*
SEL(L)	c.1300	NO	-	-
Havelok	c.1300,1295-1310	NO	-	-
Rob.Glo.	1325, 1300	NO	-	-
Aẏenbite	1340	NO	-	-
Early PS	1st half 14thC	NO	-	-
CrsorM (Vsp)	c.1350	NO	-	-
PiersP	c.1400, c.1377-81	NO	-	-
Chaucer	b. 1368, c.1400-10	rare	YES	NO
Lon. Eng.	1385-1425	NO	-	-
Trevisa	1387	YES	YES	1 ex
Vernon	c.1390	NO	-	-
Text	Date	Sep.	*(h)is* only	non-agr *(h)is*
BBrut	c.1400	NO	-	-
Sig.HV	1417-1422	NO	-	-
Chancery I	1384-1429	NO	-	-
ChanceryII	1430-1462	2 ex	YES	2 ex
JulNor	c.1435, c. 1374	YES	YES	NO
Mirror (Th)	MS 1430-1440	NO	-	-
Kempe	before 1450	NO	-	-
Shillingford	1447-50	YES	YES	NO
Gregory	c.1452	YES	YES	YES
Stonor	1430-1483	YES	YES	2ex
Capgrave	b.1398, 1451	YES	YES	NO
Malory	fl.1475	YES	YES	NO
J. Paston II	b.1442, 1461-79	YES	YES	YES
Cely	1472-88	YES	YES	YES
Caxton	b.1422(?), 1473-1490	NO	-	-
Ricart	1479-1506	YES	YES	NO
Elyot	b.?1490, 1531	NO	-	-
Ascham	b. 1515, 1552	YES	YES	YES
Machyn	1550-1555	YES	YES	NO
Lyly	b.1554(?), 1579	YES	NO	NO
QEI	b.1533, 1593	1 ex	NO	NO
Shpre	b.564, 1603-23	NO	-	-
Bacon	b.1561, 1605	1 ex.	YES	NO
Wisdome	1619	YES	NO	YES

Barrington	1629-30	YES	YES	NO
Harley	1626-43	2 ex	YES	NO
Nicholas	1641-60	YES	NO (1 fem)	NO
Haddock	1657-1718	NO	-	-
Welwood	b.1652,1700	1 ex	NO	NO
Addison	b1672, 1699-1711	1 ex	YES	NO

Note: These results refer only to the portions of the works which I read, as specified below; e.g. no claim is being made that Shakespeare never used the group genitive, but only that it is not found in the two plays read for this investigation. 'Yes' for a category means that more than one example was found. I have sometimes specified the number of examples when it is low. Examples of categories:

Sep**.**= *the king* (*h*)*ys daughter/son* (with what looks like a possessive pronoun written separately as a possessive marker).

(h)is only: Yes=*her* and *their* (or variants) are never used as a possessive marker.

non-agr *(h)is* (non-agreeing *his*): Yes= *Margery* (*h*)*is daughter, men* (*h*)*is lips* etc.

Texts Used

When more than one date for a text is indicated, separated by commas, the first date is the presumed date of the manuscript while the second is the presumed date of composition of the text. I have sometimes given an author's birth date instead of/followed by the date of the work. EETS=Early English Text Society. Where page/line numbers are not noted, I have read the entire work. I have supplemented my reading with searches executed on the first edition of the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (*PPCME*) where a portion of a text is included in that corpus. This corpus is an annotated and somewhat extended version of the ME part of the Helsinki Corpus of English texts created under the supervision of Matti Rissanen at the University of Helsinki. The annotations were carried out under the directions of Anthony Kroch at the University of Pennsylvania.

SEL(L)=Horstmann C (ed.) 1887 *The Early South-English Legendary; or, Lives of Saints* EETS 87. 1-150.

Havelok=Smithers GV (ed.) 1987 *Havelok* Clarendon Press Oxford.

Rob.Glo.=Vol. I of the 'A' MS (Cotton MS Caligula A. xi) version of Wright WA (1965) [1887]. *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester* Rolls Series 86 Kraus Reprint London.

Aẏenbite=Gradon P (ed.) 1975 *Dan Michel's Aẏenbite of Inwyt or Remorse of Conscience Volume I: Text* Oxford University Press Oxford.

EarlPs**=**Pp. 1-150 of Bülbring KD (ed.) 1891 *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter* EETS 97.

Cursor M (Vsp)=The first two volumes of the Vespasian Aiii version Morris R (ed.) 1874, 1876 *Cursor Mundi* EETS 57, 59.

PiersP=The 'B' version of Schmidt AVC (ed.) 1978 *The Vision of Piers Plowman.* Dent London.

Chaucer=various works in Benson LD (ed.) 1987 *The Riverside Chaucer.* Third Edition Houghton Mifflin Boston:. The pieces read were *The Book of the Duchess, House of Fame,* and books I and II of *Troilus and Cressida.*

Lon.Eng.=Daunt M. & RW Chambers (eds.) 1967[1931] *A Book of London English 1384-*

1425 Clarendon Press Oxford.

Trevisa=John Trevisa's translation of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* in Lumby JR(ed.) 1876 *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, Monachi Cestrensis: English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*. Rolls Series 41. 1-201 of vol. 1 and 1-201 of vol. 2 (English is every other page) and *PPCME* selections were read.

Vernon=Pp. 219-240.the version of the *Mirror of St. Edmund* in the Vernon MS. Horstmann C (ed.) 1895 *Early Yorkshire Writers Vol* Swan Sonnenschein London.

BBrut=Brie F (ed.) 1906 *The Brut, or the Chronicle of England* EETS 131. Pp. 1-16.17, 28.9-217.5 and the *PPCME* selections were read.

Sig.HV=The signet letters of Henry V in JH Fisher, M Richardson & JL Fisher (eds.) 1984 *An Anthology of Chancery English* University of Tennessee Press Knoxville.

Chancery I=The later Signet letters and other Privy Seal letters and Indentures through 1429 found in Fisher et al. (see Sig.HV).

Chancery II=the later Privy Seal letters and Indentures from 1430 found in Fisher et al. (see Sig.HV).

JulNor=Beer F (ed.) 1978 *Julian of Norwich's Revelations of Divine Love. The Shorter Version* Carl Winter Universitätsverlag Heidelberg.

Mirror (Th)=The Thornton MS version of the *Mirror of St. Edmund* in Perry GG (ed.) 1921 [1866] *English Prose Treatises of Richard Rolle de Hampole* EETS 20.

Kempe=Meech S & HE. Allen (eds.) 1940 *The Book of Margery Kempe* EETS 212. Pp. 100-160 and *PPCME* selections were read.

Shillingford=Moore SA (ed.) 1965 [1871]. *Letters and Papers of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter 1447-50.* Camden Society N.S. 2 New York. Pp. 1-32, 35-40, 43-60 and 66-68 plus *PPCME* selections were read.

Gregory=Gairdner J (ed.) 1876 *Gregory's Chronicle: The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century* Camden Society NS 17 Officers of the Society Westminster.

Stonor=Kingsford CL (ed.) 1919 *The Stonor Letters and Papers, 1290-1483* Camden Society Third Series 29, 30 Officers of the Society London: I have excluded items which are not letters.

Capgrave=Munro JJ (ed.) 1910 *Lives of St. Augustine and St. Gilbert of Sempringham and a Sermon* EETS 140.

Malory=Pp. 7-152 of Field PJC (ed.) 1990 *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* 3rd Edition Clarendon Press London.

J Paston II=Davis N (ed.) 1971 *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century.* Clarendon Press Oxford. I have confined my investigation to the letters of John II.

Cely=Hanham A (ed.) 1975 *The Cely Letters, 1472-1488* EETS 273.

Caxton=Crotch WJB (ed.) 1956 *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* EETS 176. Blake NF (ed.) 1970 *The History of Reynard the Fox. Translated from the Dutch Original by William Caxton* EETS 263.

Ricart=Smith LT (ed.) 1872 *Ricart's Kalendar: The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar* Camden NS 5. I read only the parts which were by Ricart himself.

Elyot=Pp. 1-60 of Elyot T 1970 [1531] *The Book Named the Governor, 1531* Scolar Press Menston, England.

Ascham=The Scholemaster and A Discourse on the Affaires of the State of Germanie in

Wright W (ed.) 1904 *Roger Ascham: English Works* Cambridge University Press Cambridge.

Machyn=The entries for 1550-1563 in Nichols J.G (ed.) 1848 *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London. From A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563* Camden Society NS 42 J.B. Nichols & Son London.

Lyly=Bond RW (ed.) 1902 *The Complete Works of John Lyly* Vol. 1 Clarendon Press Oxford.

QEI=the prose parts of Queen Elizabeth I's *Boethius* in Pemberton C (ed.) 1899 *Queen Elizabeth's Englishings* EETS 113.

Bacon=Book I of Frances Bacon 1605 *The Twoo Bookes of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning* (1970 facsimile of original ed) Da Capo Press Amsterdam and New York.

Shpre=Two plays by William Shakespeare. Pafford, JHP (ed.) 1963 *The Winter's Tale* Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks Methuen London. Fraser R (ed.) 1963 *The Tragedy of King Lear* Signet Classics New York.

Wisdome=Gorges A 1619 *The Wisedome of the Ancients, Written in Latine by the Right Honourable Sir Francis Bacon Knight, Baron of Verulam, and Lord Chancellor of England. Done into English by Sir Arthur Gorges, Knight.* John Bill London. [Reprinted in Da Capo Press facsimile 1968].

Barrington=PP. 1-160 of Searle, A. (ed.) 1983 *Barrington Family Letters, 1628-1632* Offices of the Royal Historical Society University College London.

Harley=Pp. 1-110 of Lewis TT (ed.) 1854 *The Letters of Lady Brilliana Harley* Camden Society NS 58 J. B. Nichols & Sons London.

Nicholas=Warner GF (ed.) 1920 *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas Volume IV: 1657-1660* Camden Third Series 31 Officers of the Society London. I excluded letters which are extracts made nearly a century later in a modernized spelling..

Haddock=Thompson EM (ed.) 1881 *Correspondence of the Family of Haddock* Camden Society NS 31 Camden Society London. The tables concerning naval battles on pp. 31-5 were not included in the investigation.

Addison=Letters 1699-1705 and pieces from the *Spectator* in 1711. Graham W (ed.) 1941 *The Letters of Joseph Addison* Clarendon Press Oxford. I read the letters designated 'TLB'. Bond, D F (ed.) 1965 *The Spectator* Clarendon Press Oxford. I read the first 30 pieces by Addison in each of volumes I and II.

Welwood= Pp. 1-75 of Welwood J 1700 Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England, for the Last Hundred Years, Preceding the Revolution in 1688, by James Welwood Second edition T. Goodwin London.

References

Abney S 1987 'The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect' Unpublished PhD thesis MIT.

Allen CL 1997 'The origins of the 'group genitive' in English' *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95: 111-131.

Altenberg B 1982 *The Genitive v. the Of Construction: A Study of Syntactic Variation in 17th Century English* (Lund Series in English 62) Gleerup Lund.

Baker R 1770 [1968] *Reflections on the English Language* (English linguistics, 1500-1800 87) Scolar Press Menston.

Bately J (ed.) 1986 *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition Volume 3: MS A* D. S. Brewer Cambridge.

Bond DF (ed.) 1965 *The Spectator* Clarendon Press Oxford.

Carstairs A 1987 'Diachronic evidence and the affix-clitic distinction' in AG Ramat, O Carruba & G Bernini (eds) *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics* Benjamins Amsterdam and Philadelphia 151-162.

Delsing L-O 1998 'Possession in Germanic' in A Alexiadou & C Wilder (eds) *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase* John Benjamins Amsterdam and Philadelphia: 87-108.

Furnivall FJ 1865 'Some fresh evidence from the second text of Layamon of the possessives in *es* and *his*' *Transactions of the Philological Society* No volume no.: 75-94.

Harris G 1752 [1970] *Observations upon the English Language. In a Letter to a Friend* Garland New York.

Janda R 1980 'On the decline of declensional systems: the loss of OE nominal case and the ME reanalysis of *-es* as his' in EC Traugott, R. Labrum & S Shepard (eds) *Papers From the Fourth International Conference on Historical Linguistics* Benjamins Amsterdam: 243-252.

Janda RD 1981 'A case of liberation from morphology into syntax: the fate of the English genitive-marker *-(e)s*'. In BB Johns & DR Strong (eds) *Syntactic Change* Department of Linguistics, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan: 60-114.

Janda RD 2001 'Beyond "pathways" and "unidirectionality": on the discontinuity of language transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization' *Language Sciences* 23: 265-340.

Jespersen O 1894 *Progress in Language. With Special Reference to English* Swan Sonnenschein & Co. London.

Jespersen O 1942 *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Volume 6: Morphology* Allen and Unwin London.

Lehmann C 1995 *Thoughts on Grammaticalization* (LINCOM studies in theoretical linguistics LINCOM Europa München.

Lowth R 1775 [1979] *A Short Introduction to English Grammar. A Facsimile Reproduction with an Introduction by Charlotte Downey, R.S.M.* Scholar's Facsimilies & Reprints Delmar, New York.

Maittaire M 1712 [1967] *The English Grammar* (English Linguistics 1500-1800 6) Scolar Press Limited Menston, England.

Mustanoja T 1960 *A Middle English Syntax* Société Néophilologique Helsinki.

Phillipps KC 1978 *The Language of Thackeray* Andre Deutsch London.

Savage, WH 1833 *The Vulgarisms and Improprieties of the English Language; Containing also Grammatical Errors, Orthoepical Readings, Tautological Phrases, Aspiration of H. Together with a Critical Preface on Stage Pronunciation* T.S. Porter London.

Simpson J & E Weiner (eds.) 1989 *Oxford English Dictionary* Clarendon Press Oxford.

Traugott EC 1972 *A History of English Syntax* Holt, Rinehart and Winston New York and London.

Wakelin MF 1977 *English Dialects: An Introduction* Athlone Press London.
Weerman F & P de Wit 1999 'The decline of the genitive in Dutch' *Linguistics* 37: 1155-1192.
Wheatley H B (ed.) 1865 *Of the Orthographie and Congruities of the Britan Tongue: A Treates, noe Shorter then Necessarie, for the Schooles, By Alexander Hume* EETS 5.
Wright J 1905 *The English Dialect Grammar* Henry Frowde Oxford and London.
Wyld H C 1953 *A History of Modern Colloquial English* Fischer Unwin London.