

Title	How did periphrastic modal verb + infinitive constructions develop semantically and syntactically in OE? : comparing the versions of Gregory's dialogues
Sub Title	OEにおいて迂言的な法動詞+不定詞構文は意味論的及び統語論的にどのように発達したか? : グレゴリウスの『対話篇』のヴァージョン間比較研究
Author	山本, 伍紀(Yamamoto, Tomonori)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	2009
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.96, (2009. 6) ,p.256(21)- 276(1)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00960001-0276

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the Keio Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

How Did Periphrastic Modal Verb + Infinitive Constructions Develop Semantically and Syntactically in OE?: Comparing the Versions of Gregory's *Dialogues*¹

Tomonori YAMAMOTO

1. Introduction

One of the most important topics in the field of English historical linguistics and philology is the historical development of the modal verb + infinitive constructions as periphrases.² According to Ogura (1991: 37–38), this development was triggered by “a loss of morphological identity” and “an influence of Latin constructions on OE counterparts,” and these factors were interacting with the modal verb + infinitive constructions and consequently in OE the constructions were used as periphrases, or alternatives for: (1) negative imperative,³ (2) expressing futurity,⁴ and (3) replacing the inflexional subjunctives and indicating the subjunctive mood. Particularly, the third type, periphrastic subjunctive, has attracted notice of a great number of scholars working in this field, and they are still looking for the answer to the question of when and how the historical change took place, that is, when and how the modal verbs began to be gradually auxiliarized and periphrastically replace the inflexional subjunctives by means of the modal verb + infinitive constructions. The precise causal relationship between the decline of the subjunctive and the development of the modal verbs is of particular interest.

The aim of this paper is to consider how the modal verb + infinitive constructions as periphrases developed semantically and syntactically in OE. To this end, this paper makes a comparative study between the two versions of Wærferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* (abbreviated *GD* hereafter). First of all, periphrastic subjunctive in OE needs an explanation to avoid any misunderstanding.

2. Periphrastic Subjunctive

As regards the path of the development of the modal verb + infinitive constructions as linguistic means of replacing the inflexional subjunctives in medieval English, Mustanoja (1960: 453) states that "in the course of the OE period the subjunctive mood begins to be indicated periphrastically by means of modal auxiliaries," and "the use of these auxiliaries, originally verbs with full meaning, as subjunctive equivalents becomes increasingly common towards the end of the OE period and in ME, no doubt because periphrastic expressions, being clearer in meaning and more emphatic than the old inflectional forms, provide more effective means for indicating modality." This arises because "in general decay of the inflectional endings which begins in OE the formal differences between the indicative and subjunctive are gradually lost or reduced to a minimum," as mentioned by Mustanoja (1960: 452). In relation to this, it should be noted that Kellner (1957: 232) considers the periphrastic construction formed with modal verbs to be used "to make up for the loss of perceptible forms of the subjunctive mood." Mustanoja (1960: 453) is, however, still cautious about identifying the semantic status of modal verbs in this periphrastic construction:

It must be borne in mind, however, that in the majority of cases the original meanings of these modal auxiliaries are more or less clearly felt in ME.

Ogawa (1989) also seems to be one of the most cautious among the syntactic studies of the problem in OE. With special reference to the conclusion of his study in 1989, Ogawa (1994: 403–404) again makes a case that the ‘substitution theory’, that the modal verb constructions started to be used as mere ‘analytic’ substitutes in function and meaning for the ‘synthetic’ subjunctive in OE, is invalid and such a development postdates OE,⁵ emphasizing that “original meanings or lexical meanings derived therefrom are clearly contained in these verbs.”⁶ In summary, Mustanoja (1960) and Ogawa (1989; 1994) consider that wherever the periphrastic subjunctive occurs, it denotes semantically and syntactically more than the inflexional subjunctive, because the original meanings of the modal verbs occurring in this construction are felt to be at work in OE and ME.

It should be borne in mind that this periphrastic subjunctive construction formed with modal verb + infinitive, which can occur in OE, set the starting point of the later history of the modal verbs leading to complete auxiliation,⁷ even though “original meanings or lexical meanings derived therefrom are clearly contained in these verbs” (see the quotation above), and as Denison (1993: 338, note 18) mentions, “to what extent modal + infinitive was interchangeable with subjunctive in Old English is a vexed question.”⁸ However, the comparison between the two versions of Wærferth’s translation of *GD* can give a clue to the development of the modal verb + infinitive constructions.

3. The Two Versions of Wærferth’s Translation of *GD*

Since Yerkes (1979: xvi–xxvi; 1982: 9–12) and Waite (2000: 46–48) give introductions to manuscripts, text, editions, authorship, and language of Wærferth’s translation of *GD*, there is no need to repeat them except for fundamental information relevant to the reason why the two versions of Wærferth’s translation of *GD* are worth comparing, and promising for the

study of linguistic matters such as the one dealt with in this paper.

As regards Wærferth's translation of *GD*, Yerkes (1982: 9) states that "Bishop Wærferth of Worcester translated the *Dialogues* into English at King Alfred's command sometime between the early 870s and early 890s, and the revising of the translation took place roughly a century or century and a half later between 950 and 1050, probably at Worcester." And the introduction of Yerkes (1982: 9–10) is summarized by Waite (2000: 366) as follows: "The anonymous scribe who revised Wærferth's version of *GD* between 950 and 1050 not only changed the spelling but systematically altered vocabulary and syntax. The two versions, separated by only 60–175 years (the earlier preserved in MSS C O, the later in H), differ far more than today's prose differs from that of Emerson or Arnold."⁹ Yerkes (1982: 9) therefore suggests that "the translation thus offers a perhaps unique chance to see developments in the Old English language, or at least many of the stylistic choices available to its writers." After his analyses of the revisions of syntax, Yerkes (1982: 82) concludes that "most of the Reviser's changes make the translation more like present-day English. In fact, often the revision has the very idiom of present-day English, rather than the presumably more archaic phrasing of the original translation. It would seem, then, that many of current features of English took shape a thousand years ago, during the tenth and early eleventh centuries." Accordingly, it is worth checking whether the revision or the modernization of syntax can occur between inflected simple subjunctive and the periphrastic subjunctive construction formed with modal verb + infinitive in the OE period.¹⁰

This choice of text has another advantage: having the Latin available for syntactic and semantic comparison is particularly useful, considering that a major problem in this topic is detecting slight weakenings in the semantic force of the modal verbs. Such weakening is of course crucial in grammaticalization, of which this development is a clear example. Therefore, it should

be borne in mind that “the Reviser consulted the Latin throughout” (Yerkes 1982: 9) although “the second version, or ‘revision’ of *GD* was derived from Wærferth’s translation, and not independently from the Latin source” (Waite 2000: 48). In addition, Yerkes (1982: 82) states that “the original translation does not follow the Latin any more slavishly than the revision does, and all of Wærferth’s constructions find parallels in other contemporary writings.” In other words, these OE texts are semantically but not syntactically dependent on the Latin. These points will be taken up in the next section.

4. The Comparative Study of *GD*

Through the comparison between the two versions of *GD*,¹¹ this paper examines all the instances where the modal verb + infinitive constructions in one OE version differ from what occurs (e.g. simple imperative or indicative or subjunctive) in the other.¹² The instances where no lexical choices among the modal verbs are observed in comparing the modal verb + infinitive constructions to themselves are excluded from the corpus.

4.1 Negative Imperative Equivalents

There are three instances in which C shows *ne* + the modal verb + infinitive constructions while H shows *ne* + the simple imperative. Two out of these instances follow the Latin *noli* + infinitive by means of the *nylle* or *nelle* + infinitive construction in C.¹³ One example of the two is given below:

(1) 80.32 (80.31) [noli me contristare]

(C) ac nylle þu me ma unrotsian,

(H) ac ne geunrodsa þu me,

The following one uses the *ne þurfe ge* + infinitive construction:¹⁴

(2) 29.22 (29.18) [nolite esse solliciti]

(C) ne þurfe ge na sorgian,

(H) ȝ ne beo ge na carfulle

Ogura (1988: 87) states that “one of the constructions based on Latin usage is ‘*nelle/nellað þulge* + Infinitive,’ whereas “the alternative rendering is ‘*ne* + imperative (+ pronoun subject),’ an ordinary Old English structure,” and “other auxiliaries used in this construction are *þurfan* ... and *sculan* ...”; therefore, it can be concluded that H chooses an ordinary negative imperative as the more natural structure in OE, though C can choose both of the OE and Latin constructions equivalent to the negative imperative. Although structures with and without the modal verb of this type are given as equivalent to the same Latin, the one with the modal verb occurs in the earlier version. This shows semantic equivalence, but not the historical direction of the grammatical change.

4.2 Periphrastic Subjunctive

There is one instance in which the inflexional subjunctive in C is replaced by the modal verb + infinitive construction in H.¹⁵ This instance is illustrated below:

(3) 131.16 (131.15) [ut tam ex eisdem obsequiis quam ex purpureis uestibus rex esse putarentur]

(C) to þon þæt hit wære geþuht, þæt he se sylfa cyngc wære, ge for þam þegnungum ge for þam godwebbenum hræglum, þe he mid gegered wæs.

(H) to þam þæt sceolde beon wened, þæt he wære se cyning, ægðer ge for þam healicum þenungum, ge for þam pællenum reafum, þe he wæs mid gescrydd.

H uses *sceolde beon wened* for the Latin *putarentur*, whose imperfect subjunctive seems to be rendered more faithfully in C. Here the structure with the modal verb **sculan*, which differs from the simple subjunctive that the final clause structure, the OE original and the Latin original all lead us to expect, was evidently felt by the reviser to be semantically necessary, to express futu-

rity.

In contrast, there are twelve instances in which the modal verb + infinitive constructions in C are replaced by inflexional subjunctives in H.¹⁶ These are examined one by one because the OE modal verb + infinitive constructions and inflexional subjunctives are used for rendering a variety of Latin verbs and constructions.

The instances from (4) to (8) show that the Latin has a subjunctive, and the OE significantly introduces a modal verb, which the reviser rejects. The instance in (4) shows different structures in the clauses between the two texts. C uses *we magan ongytan* for the Latin *agnoscat*, while H follows the Latin and uses the simple subjunctive *oncnawe*:

(4) 35.10 (35.12) [ut quis sit ecclesiasticus uigor agnoscat]

(C) þæt we magan ongytan, hwilc his seo circlice strengþ sy.

(H) þæt seo rihtwise strengð þære cyrclican gesettynsse oncnawe, hwilc he sy.

In (5), *magan* in C seems to express possibility.

(5) 163.13 (163.11) [ut, dum hoc a torquente creditur, suspensa interim crudelitate, ad uitam horae raperentur]

(C) to þon þæt he gelyfde, þæt fram þam tintregiendan sume þrage wolde seo wællgrimnes gebidan 7 geyldan, þæt he on þære hwile eft mihte beon gehyrtd.

(H) to þam þæt se his cwylmend his gelyfde, 7 he wurde sume hwile fram þære wællgrimmysse to life generated.

In (6), C uses **sculan* + infinitive to express futurity, as Yerkes (1982: 36–37) states:

(6) 54.23 (54.24) [quatenus postulando mereantur accipere]

(C) þæt hi sculon biddende gearnian, þæt hi onfon,

(H) þæt hi biddende gearnian, þæt hi onfon þæt,

In (7), C uses **sculan* + infinitive, and this modal verb seems to imply obliga-

tion or futurity.

(7) 147.26 (147.23) [et quis eis secundus esset ordinavit]

(C) ȝ eac geændebyrde, hwylc æfter þam beon sceolde.

(H) ȝ geendebyrde, hwylc wære æfter oðrum.

In (8), *willan* + infinitive seem to imply futurity. Yerkes (1982: 37) sees *adilgian* in H as indicative, but it is subjunctive in fact, although *willað* in C is indicative.

(8) 76.25 (76.25) [ut gratiam alienae operationis obnubilent]

(C) þe hi willað gedwellan þa gife oðera manna weorces.

(H) þæt hi adilgian þa gife oðra manna weorces.

The instances from (9) to (14) show that the Latin has some kind of non-finite clause, which the OE renders with a *þæt*-clause with a modal verb, which reviser again replaces with a subjunctive, though this time without the Latin subjunctive as a possible stimulus. In (9), the Latin simple sentence is expanded into the OE complex one. Here **sculan* + infinitive in C might imply futurity.

(9) 46.27 (46.25) [ego grandem hominem credidi]

(C) ic wende, þæt þes sceolde beon mycel ȝ fæger.

(H) ic gelyfde, þæt þes wære micel man ȝ fæger.

In (10), **sculan* in C seems to come from the sense of obligation given by *bebead* (the Latin *praecepit*) governing the subordinate clause.

(10) 57.23 (57.22) [eamque sollerti uigilantia seruari praecepit]

(C) ȝ bebead, þæt hine man scolde healdan mid geornlicre wacunge.

(H) ȝ bebead, þæt hine man heolde mid carfullre wæccan.

In (11), the Latin *ad reddendum* is rendered with the *þæt*-clause in C and H. In C, *agyfan wolde* may imply futurity.

(11) 81.11 (81.10) [Cumque ad reddendum nullo modo consentire uoluisset]

(C) ȝ þa þa he nolde nænigra þinga geþafa beon, þæt he hi agyfan wolde,

(H) ða þa he þurh nan þing nolde geþwærian, þæt he hi ageafe,

In (12), *willan* + infinitive in C seem to imply futurity, but the reviser rejects this structure and replaces it with the simple subjunctive.

(12) 148.27 (148.24) [uirum Dei, sicut se uenire promiserat, expectabant]

(C) ac forð abidon þone Godes wer, swa swa he ær gehet, þæt he cuman wolde.

(H) ac forð abidon, þæt se Godes wer come,

In (13), the Latin *sanandum monasterio illius* is rendered as the subordinate clause in C and H. It seems that **motan* in this instance does not have any sense of permission, but perhaps that of possibility, which is my tentative suggestion.

(13) 27.27 (27.25) [ac sanandum monasterio illius commendaret]

(C) ȝ he hine to ðam befæste, þæt he moste beon læce þæs nunmynstres.

(H) þæt he hine Æquitio þam abbode befæste to þam, þæt he wære læce on þam nunmynstre.

In (14), what *magan* denotes seems unclear. Perhaps it might imply the sense of ability, possibility or permission, but none of the senses seem to fit the context of compulsion. This might be seen as a rare piece of evidence that *magan* + infinitive had begun to be grammaticalized and replace the inflexional subjunctive, although this usage was rejected by the reviser.

(14) 73.5 (73.5) [compulsus est cognoscere in sua uexatione quid esset]

(C) he wæs genyded, þæt he mihte on his agenre geswæncednyse ongytan, hwæt he sylf wæs.

(H) þa wearð he geneadod, þæt he on his agenre geswencednyse

oncneowe, hwæt he sylf wæs.

In (15), the OE modal verb may well be a lexical verb corresponding to the Latin verb (*scylen = debeat*), but again the reviser sees the simple subjunctive as semantically closer.

(15) 39.16 (39.16) [ne fatigari debeat]

(C) þæt ge ne scylen eow swencan on þone siþ.

(H) þæt ge eow on þone weg ne geswencean.

In summary, the inflexional subjunctive is replaced by the modal verb + infinitive construction in only one instance, while these constructions are replaced by the subjunctives in twelve instances. This does not show any historical tendency for the modal verb + infinitive construction to replace the subjunctive, but it should be noted that the reviser (H) seems to follow the Latin by using the simplex verbs in five of these examples, and the original translation (C) might show the more modern usages of the modal verb + infinitive constructions. The modal verb + infinitive construction does seem to be a possible equivalent of the OE subjunctive as well as of the Latin subjunctive. The original meanings of the modal verbs could be contained in all the instances except for (14). The instance in (14) might show that the historical change, the grammaticalization of the modal verb + infinitive constructions and their replacing the inflexional subjunctive had taken place to some extent, although it was not the reviser's preferred usage.

4.3 Other Modal Correspondences

There are numerous other cases in which a modal verb + infinitive construction in one version of *GD* corresponds to something else in the other version.

There are two instances in which modal verb + infinitive constructions correspond to semantically specific periphrases:¹⁷ in 37.27 (37.28) *him mihte his tunge genihtsumian* in C and *he ... hæfde his tungan gewæld* in H for the Latin *sufficere lingua potuisset*; in 132.13 (132.12) *he næs naht beald him*

to *to ganne* in C and *ne dorste he him to genealæcean* in H for the Latin *non ausus accedere*. It should be noted that they are very much in the minority.

We can find various types of structure with a modal verb + infinitive construction in one version corresponding to structure without the modal verb in the other version.

There are six instances that show inflexional indicatives in C corresponding to modal verb + infinitive constructions in H.¹⁸ Four out of them have Latin verbal elements that might have prompted the modal verbs: in 34.29 (34.28) *willan* of *gehyran wyle* in H (*gehieran lystep* in C) might be stimulated by the Latin *amplectendo*; in 81.5 (81.5) *faran wolde* in H (*eode* in C) by the Latin future active participle *digressurus*; in 145.16 (145.19) *willan* of *wolde ... gehyrta*n in H (*ongan ... hyrtan* in C) by the Latin verb *studuit*; in 73.20 (73.20) *willan* of *woldon ... helpan* in H (*ongunnon ... helpan* in C) by the Latin subjunctive *conarentur*. Then the following two should be noted: in 136.23 (136.21) *ungerisenlic me byncep* in C and *unpæsllic mæg beon gepuht* in H for the Latin *esse inconueniens uidetur*;¹⁹ in 75.13 (75.13) *ic ... ne fand* in C and *ic ... findan ne mæg* in H for the Latin *non inuenio*. Here *magan* seems to imply ability.

There are thirteen instances that show modal verb + infinitive constructions in C corresponding to inflexional indicatives in H.²⁰ In five of these instances the Latin has a subjunctive, and the OE significantly introduces a modal verb, which the reviser rejects: in 43.3 (43.4) *nylt no scyldan* in C (*na ne bewerast* in H) might be prompted by the Latin *non ... defendas*; in 69.2 (69.3) *onfon nolde* in C (*ne undernam* in H) by the Latin *nihil ... admitteret*; in 118.12 (118.9) *tihhode, þæt ... bedeoglod beon sceolde* in C (*digollice wæs gemynt* in H) by the Latin *lateret*; 155.31 (155.30) *hyran nolde* in C (*ne gepwærode* in H) by the Latin *nullo modo consentiret*; in 157.18 (157.18) *ne mæg ... swigian* in C (*ne forsuwie* in H) by the Latin *neque ... taceam*. Then it seems that the following instance illustrates **sculan* + infinitive expressing

futurity in C, as Ogura (1991: 40-41) mentions:

(16) 62.19 (62.17) [Heu, heu, mortuus est miser iste]

(C) wala wa! dead sceall beon þes erming!

(H) wala! wala! dead is þes yrming,

There is one instance in which the *þæt*-clause containing the modal verb + infinitive construction in C corresponds to the simple infinitive in H:²¹ in 125.17 (125.15) *het, þæt man sceolde bringcan ...* in C and *het ... bringan* in H for the Latin *deferri iubet*.

There is one instance in which the *þæt*-clause containing the modal verb + infinitive construction in C corresponds to the dative absolute in H:²²

(17) 88.12 (88.12) [acta de malis suis paenitentia]

(C) þæt he þa dæde be his agnum yflum mihte him geꝛdettan,

(H) geworhtre dædbote ȝ behreowsunge be his yfelum

There are two instances in which the modal verb + infinitive constructions in C correspond to *beon* + the dative infinitive in H:²³ in 63.6 (63.6) *hu mycelne ege we sceolon witan* in C and *hu micel ege si to hæbbenne* in H for the Latin *quantus sit ... timor exhibendus*; in 146.13 (146.12) *we magon witan* in C and *swa is eac to witenne* in H for the Latin *ita sciendum est*.

There are thirteen instances in which the *þæt*-clause containing the modal verb + infinitive constructions in C corresponds to the dative infinitive in H,²⁴ as in 44.32 (44.31): *þu hit secest, þæt þu wilt witan* in C and *þu secest to witanne* in H. Similarly, there is one instance in which the relative clause containing the modal verb + infinitive construction in C corresponds to the dative infinitive in H.²⁵ These instances agree with the tendency to replace finite clauses by infinitives, observed from late OE onwards. The fact that the versions with and without the modal verbs were in some way equivalent is further evidence of semantic weakening of the modal verbs.

We can find two instances in which C shows two modal verbs in modal verb + infinitive constructions while H chooses just one.²⁶ These instances are

illustrated below. In (18), C uses *moste* and *dorste* and H *dorste* only for the Latin *praeualuit*. In C, *moste* might imply the sense of ability or permission.

(18) 31.25 (31.23) [nec eam contingere ultra praeualuit]

(C) ȝ he na onufan þæt hire gehrinan ne *moste* ne ne *dorste*.

(H) ȝ na leng syððan hyre æthrinan ne *dorste*.

In (19), *mihte* in C and H corresponds to the Latin *potuisset*. It seems that C might derive *dorste* from the infinitive *gedyrstlæcan* perhaps because it could emphasize the meaning of this infinitive, which is synonymous with **durran*.²⁷

(19) 115.26 (115.24) [et quod praesumere non potuisset]

(C) þæt he ne *mihte* ne ne *dorste* to þon *gedyrstlæcan*,

(H) ȝ þæt he ne *mihte* *gedyrstlæcan*,

We can find three instances in which H chooses different modal verbs from those of C in the constructions:²⁸ in 35.19 (35.21) the Latin *deduci debuisset* is rendered into *moste beon gelæded* in C and *sceolde beon gelæded* in H. The instance in (20) shows that H rejects *sceolde* in C and chooses *wolde*, to which the Latin *studuit* (*pohte* in H) might be a possible stimulus for implying eagerness or intention.

(20) 80.16 (80.16) [eorum prius studuit asperitatem placare]

(C) ȝ tihhode, þæt he *sceolde* ærest geliðian heora reðnysse.

(H) þohte ærest, þæt he *wolde* hyra reðnysse gegladian

In (21), the OE expands the Latin infinitive *explorare* into the *þæt*-clause, in which *sceolde gecunnian ȝ arasian* in C corresponds to *wolde gecunnian ȝ arasian* in H. Ogura (1991: 39) points out that *sceolde* is more common in a *þæt*-clause, but H chooses *wolde*, probably as a substitution for the use of *ginnan* ‘to desire’ in C.

(21) 130.28 (130.27) [ipse, sicut perfidiae mentis fuit, an uir Domini prophetiae spiritum haberet, explorare conatus est]

(C) þa ongan he sona, swa swa he wæs þa git getreowleas

modes wer, girnan, þæt he sceolde gecunnian 7 arasian, hwæþer
se drihtnes wer hæfde witedomes gast.

(H) ða þohte he, swa swa he wæs getrywleases modes, þæt he
wolde gecunnian 7 arasian, hwæðer se Godes wer hæfde wite-
unge gast.

5. Summary

This paper has examined how the modal verb + infinitive constructions as periphrases developed semantically and syntactically in OE through the comparative study of *GD*. In sections 4.1 and 4.2, it can be observed that these constructions are used as equivalents of the negative imperative and the subjunctive. In contrast with the negative imperative equivalents in C, the reviser chooses an ordinary *ne* + imperative structure, although the Latin shows *noli* or *nolite* + infinitive. As regards periphrastic subjunctive, the reviser replaces the inflexional subjunctive in C with the modal verb + infinitive construction only once, while such constructions in C are replaced by subjunctives in H twelve times. From these statistics the modal verb + infinitive = subjunctive equivalences seem fairly common, but the direction of change is not yet evident. These statistics also seem to be somewhat affected by the reviser's attitude: by using the simple subjunctives, H sometimes follows the Latin more faithfully than C. Therefore, it is possible that C might keep the more natural OE phrasing. As discussed in section 2, the constructions seem to denote semantically and syntactically more than the inflexional subjunctive; however, the instance illustrated in (14) might be inexplicable from such a standpoint. This instance might be a rare piece of evidence marking the beginning of the grammaticalization of the constructions.

It can be also observed in section 4.3 that the modal verb + infinitive constructions correspond in a variety of ways to the other linguistic forms and constructions between C and H. (We cannot say that they were exactly

equivalent semantically, but we can say they were semantically close, since they are used in identical contexts as equivalents of the same Latin). This of course means that structures with the modal verb + infinitive constructions were open to reanalysis as semantically equivalent to structures without the modal verb + infinitive, and such semantic bleaching is a first stage in grammaticalization. The evidence found in this paper indicates that this was already true in EWS, and does not seem to show any further development in (written standard) LWS. It may be a possible hypothesis that semantically bleached uses of modal verbs were already widespread in OE, only awaiting further triggers — wholesale phonological/morphological merger, breakdown of written standard — to produce the rapid developments that are found in Early ME.

As regards the OE period, two points emerge from this comparison. Yerkes' view that H is more modern does not apply here, if the increased use of the modal verbs as auxiliaries is regarded as modernization: we find 43 instances in which only the earlier version uses a modal verb as an auxiliary (to which we might add the two instances in which C has two modal verbs, H only one), with only seven showing the reverse change. Secondly, correspondences between modal syntagms and subjunctives are not the dominant pattern: there are 13 of them, against 39 instances of a modal syntagm corresponding to some other kind of non-modal syntagm. What this suggests about the development of the modal verbs needs to be tested against further data.

Notes

- 1 I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor John D. Schill of Keio University for reading this paper and his invaluable comments and suggestions.
- 2 The two terms, “periphrasis” and “modal verbs”, must be defined here. This paper uses the term “periphrasis” as Ogura (1991: 37) defines: “an expression of two or more words, which should or could be originally

expressed in a word.” The definition of the term “modal verbs” needs to be considered: in OE, “modal verbs”, or what we call now modal auxiliaries in Present-Day English, are morphologically preterite-present verbs except for *willan* and semantically have nonmodal as well as modal uses, and syntactically *willan* or **sculan* + infinitive can be used for expressing futurity. It is noteworthy that Denison (1993: 292) mentions terminology introduced by various scholars for the same verbs in question. This paper uses the term “modal verbs”, without inverted commas hereafter, because (1) only some of all the preterite-present verbs have developed into modal auxiliaries in the history of English, and (2) they did not lose their uses as lexical verbs in OE, and were used nonmodally as well as modally: clearly they had not completed their grammaticalization yet in the course of the OE period. To keep their history in view and avoid giving rise to misunderstandings that they had completed their auxiliiation and that they were restricted to auxiliary use in OE as in Present-Day English, the present study likes to combine their verb-like characteristics and possibility of their modal uses into the term modal verb, which Ogawa (1989; 1994) uses, though with a different justification. See Ogawa (1989: 13–18).

- 3 As regards the equivalents to negative imperative in OE, see Ogura (1987: 58–66; 1988; 1998: 295–297).
- 4 Sundaram (2003: 20–66) discusses the futurity expressed by the modal verb + infinitive constructions.
- 5 Fulk (1991: 548) says in refutation, “Ogawa’s conclusion is all the weaker because the overall incidence of these verbs is only indirect evidence, the change itself consisting rather in their reduction to modal auxiliary status ... the strongest evidence is not the incidence of all these verbs but of those used in modal auxiliary function ... he will not compile statistics based on the subjective differentiation of modal and nonmodal uses.” It should be noted that Ogawa (1994: 410–412) replies to this refutation, stressing the objectivity of the statistics, with his methodology unaltered. For instance, Ogawa (1994: 408) counts in his statistics the following example of *willan* with a noun clause as object: *ic wylle þæt ðu underfo þas seofan lamb æt me*. In this citation, obviously *wylle* is not used as modal auxiliary, but as main verb used nonmodally, which seems to indicate why Fulk (1991) refutes Ogawa (1989) as cited above. Concerning this point, this study agrees with the review of Fulk (1991), because the modal verb + infinitive constructions can be a syntactically objective springboard for the differen-

tiation of modal and nonmodal uses.

- 6 As regards the use and the semantics of modal verbs in the periphrastic subjunctive, Standop (1957: 167–171) seems to agree with the conclusion of Ogawa (1989; 1994). The study of Krzyszpień (1980) seems to seek the sense of possibility denoted by *magan* in any cited instances where the periphrastic subjunctive construction occurs, citing some examples from early OE prose and poetry. Ichikawa (2006) does not think of the use of *magan* occurring in the text he examines as a mere grammatical substitute for the inflexional subjunctive, but both “as a translational technique” and “as a deliberate device for creating a didactic context.”
- 7 The question of when and how modal verbs are completely reduced and grammaticalized into what we call now modal auxiliaries in the history of English lies beyond the study of this paper, but see Denison (1993: 292–339), Nagle and Sanders (1998), Fischer, et al. (2000: 6–7), and Fischer (2007: 159–209).
- 8 Denison (1993: 338, note 18), referring to Mitchell (1985: §§1014, 1995–9, 2081, 2764, 2824, 2974–5a, 2980), states that Mitchell (1985) quotes sympathetically earlier studies which deny full equivalence. Mitchell (1985) seems to agree with the opinions cited in note 6 of this paper.
- 9 As regards the MSS of the translation of *GD*, Yerkes (1982: 11–12) states that “Wærferth’s original translation survives only in manuscripts copied a century or more after its time of composition. Two nearly complete ones of the eleventh century — Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 322 (C) and British Library, Cotton Otho C.i, vol. 2, fols. 1–137 (O) — contain all four books of the *Dialogues*; the late-tenth century fragment Canterbury Cathedral Add. 25 has parts of a few chapters from Book IV. The sole witness of the revision, fols. 1–54 in Bodleian, Hatton 76 (H) from the first half of the eleventh century, contains about three-quarters of Books I and II of the translation ... Thus manuscripts C and O share all the material found in H; H never coincides with the Canterbury fragment.” See also Ker (1957: nos. 60, 96, 182, and 328).
- 10 Yerkes (1982: §§21, 51–52) analyzes instances where auxiliaries occur and CO differ from H, but does not seem to tackle them on the level of the meaning of the sentence; therefore, all the instances where they occur are worth rechecking and reconsidering in the context of the sentence where they occur.
- 11 The editions used in this paper are Hecht (1900) and de Vogüé (1978–

1980) for OE and Latin respectively. The pages and line numbers given below for reference are based on those in which the finite verbs of the relevant instances occur in C and H.

- 12 Some of the inflexions of the simple subjunctive can be so easily confused with those of the simple indicative that definite criteria for the morphological distinction between indicative and subjunctive should be set in order to clearly identify any simple verbs that are indeterminate in their distinction between indicative and subjunctive. This paper follows what Quirk set as the principles (1954: 29): “clearly, we must avoid using the *distinction between unstressed vowels alone* as a criterion. Even in texts where there is some evidence that *-en* is confined to subjunctive endings and *-on* to indicative ones, I have declined to use this distinction, and *curen, curan, curon* (pret.pl.) have all been counted as indeterminate forms. The unstressed vowel alone is, however, used as evidence of the mood when the opposition is *unstressed vowel-zero*, as in the 1st and 3d pers.sg.pret. of strong verbs: *for-fore, heold-heolde, het-hete*. Elsewhere, the distinction rests on the stressed vowel (*bat-bite, sceal-scyle*), on consonant alternation (*wæs-wære, doð-do, bindað-binden, bundon-bunde*), or on distinct mood forms (*is-sie, sy*.” It should be noted, however, that *findan (fand-funde)* is the exception to the principle of the distinction by means of stressed vowel: in WS, *funde* can be either past indicative or past subjunctive for all the three persons in the singular (see Campbell 1959: §741). For safety, this paper regards *funde* as indeterminate, though the MSS of *GD* display a considerable non-WS element in their orthography and inflexions (Campbell 1959: §17). This paper does not count any indeterminate instances.
- 13 80.32 (80.31); 88.34 (88.32). The reference in the brackets is to the page and line number in H.
- 14 29.22 (29.18).
- 15 131.16 (131.15).
- 16 27.27 (27.25); 35.10 (35.12); 39.16 (39.16); 46.27 (46.25); 54.23 (54.24); 57.23 (57.22); 73.5 (73.5); 76.25 (76.25); 81.11 (81.10); 147.26 (147.23). 148.27 (148.24); 163.13 (163.11).
- 17 37.27 (37.28); 132.13 (132.12).
- 18 34.29 (34.28); 73.20 (73.20); 75.13 (75.13); 81.5 (81.5); 136.23 (136.21); 145.16 (145.19). The inflexional indicatives of *onginnan* + infinitive occur in 73.20 and 145.16.
- 19 Yerkes (1982: 92, note 40) states that “the earlier writer construes *esse*

- with *inconueniens*, the later writer construes it with *videtur*.”
- 20 8.5 (8.5); 8.7 (8.8); 43.3 (43.4); 46.13 (46.11); 56.27 (56.26); 57.16 (57.16); 62.19 (62.17); 69.2 (69.3); 117.16 (117.11); 118.12 (118.9); 128.21 (128.17); 155.31 (155.30); 157.18 (157.18). The inflexional indicatives of *onginnan* + infinitive occur in (46.11) and (117.11).
- 21 125.17 (125.15).
- 22 88.12 (88.12).
- 23 63.6 (63.6); 146.13 (146.12).
- 24 44.32 (44.31); 55.33 (55.33); 71.7 (71.4); 78.20 (78.18); 78.22 (78.19); 78.29 (78.27); 82.5 (82.5); 95.13 (95.13); 97.2 (97.2); 104.22 (104.22); 125.14 (125.13); 147.18 (147.18); 156.1 (155.30).
- 25 84.5 (84.4).
- 26 31.25 (31.23); 115.26 (115.24).
- 27 *Dictionary of Old English* (2003) interprets *durran gedyrstlæcan* as “to dare to presume” (s.v. *gedyrstlæcan*).
- 28 35.19 (35.21); 80.16 (80.16); 130.28 (130.27).

Bibliography

- Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. rpt. with corrections. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Denison, David. 1993. *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London/ New York: Longman.
- de Vogüé, Adalbert. (ed.) 1978–1980. *Grégoire le Grand, Dialogues*. 3 vols. Sources chrétiennes 251, 260, and 265. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Dictionary of Old English in Electronic Form A–F*. 2003. CD-ROM. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Fischer, Olga, et al. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. *Morphosyntactic Change: Functional and Formal Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fulk, R. D. 1991. Review of *Old English Modal Verbs: A Syntactical Study*, by Hiroshi Ogawa. *JEGP* 90: 546–549.
- Hecht, Hans. (ed.) 1900. *Bischofs Wærferth von Worcester Übersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 5. Leipzig: Georg H. Wigand.
- Ichikawa, Makoto. 2006. “Alfred’s Additon of Modal Verbs in his Prose Translation of the First Fifty Psalms — With Special Reference to *Magan* —.”

- Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 21: 97–120.
- Kellner, Leon. 1957. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*. ed. with Notes and Glossary by Kikuo Miyabe. 2nd ed. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Ker, N. R. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Krzyszpień, Jerzy. 1980. "The Periphrastic Subjunctive with *Magan* in Old English." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 11: 49–64.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*. Part 1. Memoires/Neuphilologischer Verein, Helsingfors 23. Helsinki: Société néophilologique.
- Nagle, Stephen J., and Sara L. Sanders. 1998. "Downsizing the Preterite-Presents in Middle English." *Advances in English Historical Linguistics (1996)*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Marcin Krygier. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 253–261.
- Ogawa, Hiroshi. 1989. *Old English Modal Verbs: A Syntactical Study*. Anglistica vol. 26. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.
- . 1994. "Old English Modal Verbs: Some Further Considerations." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 95: 403–413.
- Ogura, Michiko. 1987. "Latinisms? — Constructions Chiefly Found in the Gospels, the Psalter, and the Hexateuch." *Tsuru University Review* 27: 53–67.
- . 1988. "*Ne Ondræd Pu* and *Nelle Pu Ondrædan* for *Noli Timere*." *Studies in English Literature*, English Number 1988: 87–101.
- . 1991. "Periphrases with OE and ME Verbs." *Chiba Review* 13: 37–70.
- . 1998. "The Grammaticalization in Medieval English." *Advances in English Historical Linguistics (1996)*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Marcin Krygier. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 293–314.
- Quirk, Randolph. 1954. *The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*. Yale Studies in English 124. New Haven: Yale University Press; rpt. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1973.
- Standop, Ewald. 1957. *Syntax und Semantik der modalen Hilfsverben im Altenglischen: Magan, Motan, Sculan, Willan*. rpt. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968.
- Sundaram, M. S. 2003. *The Conceptualisation of Futurity in Old English*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Toronto.
- Waite, Greg. 2000. *Old English Prose Translations of King Alfred's Reign*. Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature, vol 6. Cam-

bridge: D.S. Brewer.

Yerkes, David. 1979. *The Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues: An Old English Thesaurus*. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press.

—. 1982. *Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of the Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues*. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies.