

Lucía Loureiro Porto 2009: *The Semantic Predecessors of Need in the History of English*. Publications of the Philological Society, 43. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. xiv + 273 pp. ISBN 978-1-4051-9085-5

Alejandro Alcaraz Sintes
Universidad de Jaén
aalcaraz@ujaen.es

English modal verbs have been the object of extensive research because of their well-known special morphosyntactic and semantic features. However, while studies on necessity verbs in English have concentrated on synchronic descriptions of Present-Day English (PDE) *need*, Lucía Loureiro Porto's monograph is a study of the semantic and syntactic evolution (from 750 to 1710) not only of *need*, but also of the verbs that have also meant 'need' at some stage in their history. These verbs are the Old English preterite-present verbs *þurfan* and *bepurfan*, the weak verb *behoþian* (PDE *behave*), and the Middle English (ME) French loan *misteren*.

The study is grounded upon five solid theoretical, descriptive and methodological pillars. First, the author follows Sweetser's (1990) classification of modality and Talmy's (1988, 2000) cognitive notion of *force dynamics*. Second, she resorts to current ideas on grammaticalization, which she sees as a "comprehensive mechanism" (38) to describe grammatical changes. Third, she adopts Allen's (1995) taxonomy of 'experiencer verb constructions' (which includes the traditionally termed *impersonal constructions*). Fourth, a wealth of references is provided throughout, relative not only to the previous *pillars*, but to practically every issue that is raised in the book. Finally, her analysis of all the examples found in a purpose-built corpus of some four million words, covering the OE, ME and early Modern English (eModE) periods, has allowed her to weave a finely-grained interpretive account of the story of necessity verbs and to make some interesting findings about meanings and patterns unrecognized or unrecorded in literature.¹

Apart from the chapters themselves, the book contains a Table of Contents, the author's acknowledgements, a Foreword by Prof. M. Krug, Lists of tables, figures and abbreviations (i–xvii), four appendices (219–49) with all the word forms scrutinized, the References section (250–63) and, finally, a highly-laboured Index of authors, works and linguistic and grammatical terms (264–73).

In the Introduction (1–14), the author presents the scope and aims of the research, the perspectives from which it has been conducted, a comprehensive and well-documented review of traditional and modern studies of PDE *need* and *need to* and a description of her corpus.

Chapter two 'Theoretical Foundations' (15–54) describes the three-fold approach used to explain and interpret the semantic and syntactic evolution of the verbs of necessity. The first one, naturally enough, concerns the semantic category of modality, since necessity, together with possibility, is one of the basic modal meanings (Lyons 1977; Palmer 1979;

¹ The author's corpus is the sum of the *Helsinki Corpus* and a random selection of texts from the *DOEC*, the *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*, the *CEECs* and the *Lampeter Corpus*. Each major period is further split into shorter sub-periods: O1 (before 950), O2 (950–1150), M1 (1150–1250), M2 (1250–1350), M3 (1350–1420), M4 (1420–1500), E1 (1500–1570), E2 (1570–1640) and E3 (1640–1710).

1986, 2003; van der Auwera and Plungian 1998). Out of the many classifications of modality found in the literature, Loureiro Porto adopts the two-fold system, stemming from these notions of necessity and possibility, propounded by Coates (1983) and Sweetser (1990): *root* or *deontic* modality (obligation and permission, belonging in the socio-physical world) vs. *epistemic* modality (deduction and possibility, belonging in the mental world), to which she applies Talmy's (1988, 2000) cognitive notion of *force dynamics*. This combination proves fruitful insofar as it permits Loureiro Porto to study the various shades of meaning of necessity verbs with great subtlety, in terms of *barriers* (circumstances conditioning the realization of the event) and *forces*, namely an *antagonist*, the force that imposes a course of action (obligation, prohibition) on an *agonist* (the experiencer of the force) or exempts him/her from it. She explains how some of the meanings expressed by root modals involve gradience: degree of subjectivity, origin of the force (agonist-originated or *internal* vs. antagonist-originated or *external*, and *general*) and degree of the force (strong vs. weak, depending on the severity of the consequences for the agonist in case of unfulfillment). The second approach taken by the author is to study how the necessity verbs have been subject to grammaticalization, a series of linguistic changes that may be viewed as a unitary process and which has received ample attention in the past two decades, within and outside Spain (Hopper and Thompson 1984; Heine 1990, 1993; Hopper 1991; Lehmann 1995; Traugott and Dasher 2002; Hopper and Traugott 2003, among others).² This process affects different levels of language (semantics, morphology, syntax, phonology and pragmatics) and leads to the eventual conversion of a lexical form to a grammatical one or to the development of further grammatical meanings in a grammatical form, to put it briefly. The author summarizes the main views on the notion of *grammaticalization* and surveys its different mechanisms. She illustrates some of these mechanisms with PDE modals, since they are the end-results of a series of grammaticalizing changes undergone by a group of OE verbs, widely studied in the literature (Lightfoot 1979; Plank 1984; Heine 1993; Warner 1993), such as *desemantization*, *metaphorical extensions*, *subjectification* (the encoding of the speaker's subjective stance with respect to what is being said), *deategorialization* (loss of morphosyntactic properties), *paradigmaticization* (tightening and reduction of the paradigm that a form belongs to) and *coalescence* (reduction of phonological independence and erosion), among others.

The third approach is the inclusion of impersonal constructions in the account of necessity verbs, given their frequent occurrence in this type of construction (McCawley 1976; Fischer 1992; Warner 1993; Pocheptsov 1997). The author reviews the terminological debates and numerous historical studies on this construction (Van der Gaaf 1904; Wahlén 1925; Elmer 1981; Fischer and van der Leek 1983; von See Franz-Montag 1984; Denison 1993; Allen 1995, 1997) and adopts Allen's (1995) model of 'experiencer verb constructions', which is based on the inflection and realization of the two participants involved, namely, experiencers (oblique or nominative NP) and themes (genitive or nominative NPs and sentential), and on the presence or absence of a formal subject *hit/it*.

Chapter 3, *Tharf* and *Betharf* (55–108), is a description of the semantic and syntactic features of these verbs and of the potentially grammaticalizing processes that they went through before dying out in the ME period (M4 and M1, respectively). As regards their semantics, by applying Talmy's (1998, 2000) notions of *barriers* and *forces* and taking into

² The author herself, though working at the University of the Balearic Islands, belongs to the University of Santiago de Compostela-based research unit 'Variation, Linguistic Change and Grammaticalization', created in 1990 by Prof. T. Fanego.

account the polarity of the clauses, the author finds that *tharf* and *betharf* stand in complementary distribution. Throughout their lives, *tharf* normally expressed external (religious, hierarchical or legal forces) lack of necessity or obligation, in non-affirmative contexts (practically the only meanings after 1250), as in *Ne þarfjan we us ondrædan* ‘We need not be afraid’ (81), while *betharf* tended to express internal (agonist-generated) necessity or obligation, in affirmative contexts (in both OE and M1), as in *ymbe ... ælce neode þe man bedearf* ‘about each necessity that one needs’ (89). The author establishes that *tharf*, but not *betharf*, was clearly on the path towards becoming a modal auxiliary, since it complied with some of the criteria for grammaticalization seen above, and could express a variety of modal necessity meanings, including impossibility.³ This tendency is also found in syntax. As Loureiro Porto points out, not only is *tharf* inclined to sentential themes, particularly bare infinitives (including passive ones), unlike *betharf*, for which NPs are the preferred theme, but also to nominative experiencers, two clear signs of auxiliarization.⁴ Even when found in impersonal constructions with an oblique experiencer, as in *Ne þearf nanne man tveoġian* ‘No man need doubt’ (97), grammaticalization may be posited, since *tharf* has undergone decategorialization by losing its capacity to select the subject. As for *betharf*, although it too tends to be used with a nominative experiencer, its preference for nominal themes (in OE and ME) is evidence of its non-auxiliary nature. For the author, this proves that Visser’s (1963–1973) claim that the choice of nouns or infinitives was inconsequential in OE is not tenable, since it is this choice that leads or not towards grammaticalization and that permits *tharf*, but not *betharf*, to be considered as a premodal.⁵

In chapter 4, ‘*Behove* and *Mister*’ (109–40), the author analyses the semantics, syntax and grammaticalization processes of the verbs *behove* (109–36) and *mister* (136–40), which, given its ephemeral presence in English, I will not summarize here. *Behove* changed its basic meaning of necessity to that of appropriateness (‘need’ > ‘be obligatory/highly advisable’ > ‘be fitting’) in the course of time and thus evolved from a personal to an impersonal verb. Again, the adoption of a dual *root* vs. *epistemic* modality system and the cognitive dynamics perspective allows her to explain the semantic evolution of *behove*. In OE the verb tended to express weak internal necessity and was mainly found in affirmative contexts (overlapping with *betharf*), as in *Ic ... myltse behofige þas beofonlican dryhtnes* ‘I need the mercy of the heavenly Lord’ (117–18), but after 1250 it began to convey external and general forces (a meaning also expressed by *need* in M3), gradually moving away from the basic meaning of ‘need’, as in *hit ne behouep nazt to rebervi* ‘it is not necessary to repeat it’ (119).⁶ From here it is but a short step to conveying appropriateness, found in affirmative

³ The few examples of impossibility, that is, of lack of barriers, seem to prove that possibility derives from necessity, not the other way round, as Traugott and Dasher (2002) claim.

⁴ It should be noted that Loureiro Porto has detected an unrecorded construction where *tharf* is used with an inflected infinitive, which contradicts Visser’s (1963–1973) and Warner’s (1993) claim that only bare infinitives were used with this verb.

⁵ The author has, nevertheless, detected a few examples of *betharf* with sentential themes, as in *hym beþorften þæt hi his mare wiston* ‘it was necessary for them to know more about him’ (103), a hitherto unrecorded construction. However, since these sentential themes are *that*-clauses (an indication of non-auxiliarhood), her finding further adds to the view of *betharf* and *tharf* as standing in complementary distribution. This example also comes to enrich the controversy over whether dative-inflected subjects exist. The author adds one more reason to Elmer’s (1981) and Allen’s (1995) arguments in favour of the subjecthood of experiencers, namely, number agreement of the verb with the experiencer.

⁶ *Behove* is the most frequently attested necessity verb in sub-period M2 in Loureiro Porto’s corpus. The reasons for this are explained on page 119.

contexts, as in *Chastysment behoveþ þarto* ‘punishment is appropriate thereto’ (122). General forces develop and will become the most common meanings in eModE, a tendency that runs parallel to the specialization of *behave* as a verb meaning appropriateness rather than necessity. Finally, in M3 *behave* actually came very near to expressing the epistemic meaning of deduction (‘must’), a result of subjectification and of metaphorical extension of root external obligation, as in *he that makyth us meke and mylde, it behovyth neds to ben that he be ever on in love* ‘he who makes us meek and mild, it must necessarily be the case that he is ever in love’ (125).⁷ As far as syntax is concerned and in accordance to this semantic evolution, OE *behoþian* (‘need’) favoured nominative experiencers (like *þarf* and *beþarf*) and nominal themes, while its ME reflex, *behoven* (‘is appropriate’), preferred non-nominative experiencers and sentential themes, with or without a formal subject *it*, as in *It byhoveth the to ben obeisaunt* ‘It behoves you to be obedient’ (112).⁸ For Loureiro Porto, it is in this type of ME experiencer verb constructions that potentially grammaticalizing mechanisms may materialize, such as the use of bare infinitives. Indeed, she finds that bare infinitives are clearly favoured in M2, which, in her opinion, could be a sign of auxiliarization. Although this usage decreases, in M3 *behoven* starts accepting passive infinitival themes, another feature of auxiliarization, as we saw above. The fact remains, however, that in M3 and M4, the verb stepped out of this grammaticalization trail: it lost frequency, reduced its meaning to appropriateness, required a formal *it* subject and accepted only *to*-infinitives and, by eModE, could co-occur with other auxiliaries (cf. Rissanen 1999).

Chapter 5, ‘Need’ (141–208), is longer and more complex than the preceding ones, since actually two verbs are involved (*need 1* ‘compel’ and *need 2* ‘need’) and because a greater number of variables are considered.⁹ The author first conducts a thorough semantic analysis of the two verbs in terms of modality meaning, cognitive forces and polarity, and describes the syntactic evolution of each verb, taking into account the various types of constructions involved, the presence and inflection of the experiencer, and voice. It is a lengthy account supported by copious examples, to which any short summary here would not do justice. However, her most important findings, to my mind, clearly deserve to be singled out. As regards meaning and semantic evolution, Loureiro Porto first proves that the loss of *need 1* or, rather, the coalescence of *need 1* and *need 2* in M3, was facilitated by the use of *need 1* in passive constructions, as in *he is nedede to deye for the firste synne* ‘he is compelled to die for the first sin’ (153), because in the passive the agonist takes the same syntagmatic subject position that is found in active counterparts with *need 2*, as in *us nedyth to do our neybor* ‘so we must do our neighbours [love them]’ (153), which, in her opinion, suggests the following evolution: ‘to compel’ > ‘to be compelled’ > ‘to need’. Second, she confirms that the epistemic meaning of possibility emerged out of prohibition and she

⁷ Loureiro Porto has also detected a few 16th-century examples with epistemic modality, thereby establishing the existence of the construction in eModE, unrecorded in the literature. In her view, this supports van der Auwera and Plungian’s (1998) model for the semantic development of modals and Nordlinger and Traugott’s (1997) notion of *wide scope*, where the obligation or necessity affects not so much the experiencer, as the whole proposition, a process that precedes the rise of epistemic meanings.

⁸ The few attested forms of non-nominative experiencers in OE are “interlinear glosses of the 12th century copies of OE manuscripts, [and] hence are not original OE examples but rather the marks of ME scribes”, according to Loureiro Porto’s (110) summary of Allen’s (1997: 5) findings.

⁹ They are two different (though related) verbs, whose time-spans are O1&2–M3 for *need 1* and O4–E3 for *need 2*. The author’s joint treatment of the two verbs in terms of force dynamics allows her to explain when and in what respect their original meanings overlapped and how *need 2* syntactically and semantically replaced *need 1* in the course of the ME 3 sub-period.

locates it in M4, as in *a better knyght than he neded no man behold* ‘no man could behold a better man than him’ (148).¹⁰ Third, she also confirms that the expression of general forces, being a metaphorical development from the referential meaning ‘press, push’, is clear evidence of grammaticalization (desemanticization). Fourth, she states that out of these general forces emerged the expression of epistemic modal meanings (deduction), with examples attested for E1 and E3, thus antedating by two centuries Nykiel’s (2002) claim.¹¹ Finally, she shows how the E3 period is crucial for the semantic development of *need*, since it is at this period that we find it with all meanings it has in PDE.

As regards syntax and morphology, the only surviving construction in eModE, out of the very many recorded for ME, is that with a nominative experiencer and a sentential theme, and it is here that the author has looked for morphosyntactic signs of grammaticalization or auxiliarihood. She finds that a confluence of factors allowed the verb to enter the group of eModE auxiliary verbs and gave rise to PDE modal *need*. More particularly, she studies how and to what extent *need 2* complies with five potentially applicable criteria (cf. Warner 1993; Barber 1997; Rissanen 1999). First, she notes that, unlike the prevailing tendency in ME and E1, by E3 the bare infinitive is five times as frequent as the *to*-infinitive. This is clear characterization of *need* as an auxiliary. Second, the growing ability of *need* to be used with passive infinitival clauses and to have an inanimate referent (20% of times in E3) testifies to decategorialization and desemanticization (cf. Heine, Claudi and Hünemeyer 1991; Krug 2000). These two criteria converge in M3, when only bare passive infinitives are used. Third, indisputable cases of elision of the infinitive are an E3 development and substantiate the auxiliary status of *need*.¹² Fourth, the author finds that the overall percentage of instances without auxiliaries in eModE is about 80% and that the tendency from E1 to E3 is one of progressive reduction. The figures and the tendency are even more striking if only personal constructions with a bare infinitive are reckoned: 86%. Finally, though only about 40% of her examples exhibit lack of the third person singular present inflection, the figure for E3 when the constructions contain a sentential theme rises to 75%. As the author puts it, “there is an overlap of auxiliary features which seem to attract each other if the theme is sentential, if the experiencer is present and if the verb” has a nominative experiencer (207).

The conclusions given by the author in chapter 6 are presented next, together with my own general evaluation.

Loureiro Porto’s monograph convincingly shows how applying a force dynamics framework to modality effectively contributes to plotting the semantic development and gradual grammaticalization (auxiliarization) over time of a specific group of verbs, those expressing ‘necessity’, which have not been studied in the literature on diachronic grammaticalization as frequently as other verbs (*can, may, must, will...*). One particular strength of the study is the incorporation of other relevant variables, particularly impersonal constructions, which shed light on the varying degrees of grammaticalization of the verbs at different periods. In addition, the author’s findings are borne out by the empirical evidence of a huge number of examples for each historical period (and

¹⁰ In fact, according to the author, only those verbs that reached a considerable degree of grammaticalization (*need 2* and *tharf*) ever expressed this meaning.

¹¹ The only other verb that developed epistemic meaning before *need* is *behove*, though only in affirmative contexts.

¹² All previous instances of elision were triggered by other factors and cannot be considered; cf. Warner (1993).

subperiod). To my mind, the monograph's most relevant contributions to the field are the following. First, it confirms that *need* has gone through the familiar steps in the semantic development of modal verbs (Sweetser 1990): physical tangible force > external (through metaphorical extension: social obligation or lack thereof) > internal (through further metaphorical extension: internal necessity and obligation) > generalization (as a result of desemanticization).¹³ Second, force dynamics has enabled the author to prove that, although *tharf* and *need* are not completely alike semantically, *tharf* is clearly a semantic predecessor of *need* with many common features. Both developed morphosyntactic auxiliary features and, more importantly perhaps, the range of meanings expressed by both verbs is large: obligation, necessity (less frequently than *betharf* and *behoove*, however), lack of obligation and necessity (their most frequent meanings), prohibition and impossibility, which for the author is "a line of development ... restricted to auxiliary verbs or verbs which are likely to undergo auxiliarization" (211). Third, force dynamics can also help explain how a minor necessity verb such as *betharf* competed with a major verb such as *tharf* in the expression of necessity, both eventually becoming syntactic and semantic counterparts. Fourth, force dynamics allows treating the semantic development of the two ancestors of *need* (*need 1* and *need 2*) as a single development and explains their coalescence in M3. Finally, the empirical corpus-based approach has permitted the author to confirm that grammaticalization and frequency of usage run parallel (Heine, Claudi and Hünemeyer 1991; Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994; Hopper and Traugott 2003) and that the eModE period is crucial to the location of changes in the history of English necessity verbs.

Works Cited

- Allen, Cynthia 1995: *Case Marking and Reanalysis. Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English*. Oxford: Clarendon P.
- 1997. "The Development of an "Impersonal" verb in Middle English: The Case of *Behoove*". Jacek Fisiak ed. *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1–21.
- Barber, Charles 1997 (1976): *Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Dale Perkins and William Pagliuca 1994: *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago and London: The U of Chicago P.
- CEECs: Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, comp. 1999: *Corpus of Early English Correspondence Sampler*. Helsinki: Department of English, U of Helsinki.
- Coates, Jennifer 1993: *The Semantics of Modal Auxiliaries*. London and Canberra: Croom Helm.
- Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*. F. McSparran and P. Schaffner, eds. 2006: *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*. The Middle English Compendium. U of Michigan <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme>> (Accessed 8 August, 2011)
- Denison David 1993: *English Historical Syntax: Verbal Constructions*. London and New York: Longman.
- DOEC: Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al.* 2000: *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus*. Toronto: DOE project on CD-ROM.

¹³ In this respect, her findings are different from van der Auwera's and Plungian's (1998) hypothesis that external meanings developed out of internal ones. However, this was the path along which the author suggests *behoove* developed historically, but it is a path that did not lead to grammaticalization of the verb.

- Elmer, Willy 1981. *Diachronic Grammar. The History of Old and Middle English Subjectless Constructions*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Fischer, Olga 1992: 'Syntax'. Norman Blake ed. *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume II: 1066–1476*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 207–408.
- and Frederike van der Leek 1983: 'The Demise of the Old English Impersonal Construction'. *Journal of Linguistics* 19: 337–68.
- Heine, Bernd 1990: 'Grammaticalization Chains'. *Studies in Language* 16.2: 335–68.
- 1993: *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünemeyer 1991: *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991: 'On some Principles of Grammaticalization'. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. 2 vols. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- and Elizabeth Closs Traugott 2003: *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- and Sandra A. Thomson 1984: 'The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar'. *Language* 60: 703–52.
- Krug, Manfred G. 2000: *Emerging English Modals: A Corpus-Based Study of Grammaticalization*. Topics in English Linguistics, 32. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lampeter Corpus*: Josef Schiemd, comp. 1999: *Lampeter Corpus of Early Modern English Tracts*. Chemnitz: U of Technology.
- Lehmann, Christian 1995 (1982): *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Lightfoot, David 1979: *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Lyons, John 1977: *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- McCawley, Noriko A. 1976: 'From OE/ME "Impersonal" to "Personal" Constructions: What is a "Subjectless" S?'. Sandfor B. Steever et al. eds. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 192–204.
- Nordlinger, Rachel and Elizabeth Closs Traugott 1997. 'Scope and the Development of Epistemic Modality: Evidence from *ought to*'. *English Language and Linguistics* 1: 195–317.
- Nykiel, Jerzy 2002: *Crossing the Border between the Modal and the Lexical: The Developmental Paths of Two English Verbs: dare and need*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Silesia, Poland.
- Palmer, Frank Robert 1979: *Modality and the English Modals*. London: Longman.
- 1986: *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- 2003: 'Modality in English: Theoretical, Descriptive and Typological Issues'. Roberta Fachinetti et al., eds. *Modality in Contemporary English*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1–17.
- Plank, Frans 1984: 'The Modals Story Retold'. *Studies in Language* 8: 305–66.
- Pochepstov, George G. 1997: 'Quasi-impersonal Verbs in Old and Middle English'. Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 469–88.
- Rissanen, Matti 1999: 'Syntax'. Roger Lass ed. *The Cambridge History of the English Language Volume III 1476–1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 187–331.
- Sweetser, Eve 1990: *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 54. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Talmy, Leonard 1988: 'Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition'. *Cognitive Science* 1: 49–100.
- 2000: *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume I: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: The MIT P.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher 2002: *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- van der Auwera, Johan and Vladimir A. Plungian 1998: 'Modality's Semantic Map'. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79–124.
- van der Gaaf, Willem 1904: *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English*. Anglistische Forschungen 14. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Visser, Fredericus T. 1963–1973: *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

- von Seeffranz-Montag, Ariane 1984: "'Subjectless' Constructions and Syntactic Change'. Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Historical Syntax: Trends in Linguistics / Studies and Monographs* 23. Paris and The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter. 521–53.
- Wahlén, Nils 1925: *The Old English Impersonalia*. Part I. Götteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Actiebolag.
- Warner, Anthony R. 1993: *English Auxiliaries. Structure and History*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 66. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Received 1 September 2011

Revised version accepted 10 October 2011

Alejandro Alcaraz Sintes, PhD, is Lecturer in the Department of English Studies, Universidad of Jaén, where he has taught a variety of linguistics courses, including History of the English Language. His main field of research is English Historical Linguistics. He has several publications on semantic and syntactic complementation of Old English adjectives.

Address: Departamento de Filología Inglesa. Edificio D2, Despacho 214. Universidad de Jaén. Campus Las Lagunillas s/n. 23071 Jaén, Spain. Tel.: +34 953 211856. Fax: +34 953 211824.