UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The position of the adjective in (old) English from an iconic perspective

Fischer, O.C.M.

Publication date

2001

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

The motivated Sign. Iconicity in Language and Literature 2

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Fischer, O. C. M. (2001). The position of the adjective in (old) English from an iconic perspective. In O. C. M. Fischer, & M. Nänny (Eds.), *The motivated Sign. Iconicity in Language and Literature 2* (pp. 249-276). Benjamins.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The position of the adjective in (Old) English from an iconic perspective

Olga Fischer
University of Amsterdam

1. Introduction

I have often wondered about the different positions adjectives can take in Old English. They can occur both before the noun and after it as in,

- (1) a. *þa forlet he þone læmnan ofn ðæs mænniscan lichoman*
then left he the clay oven of-the human body
(Mart1.101)¹
- b. ... *het heanric þam se fæder becwæð gersuman*
was-called Henry to-whom the father left treasures
unateallendlice
uncountable
(Chron2.1086.59)

whereby it is interesting to observe that the postnominal adjectives are almost invariably adjectives of the so-called strong declension, declined as in (2a), while the prenominal ones follow the weak declension (see 2b) when the noun phrase is definite, and they are strong when the noun phrase is indefinite.

(2)	a.	<i>declension of OE strong adjectives</i>			b.	<i>declension of OE weak adjectives</i>		
		masc	neuter	fem		masc	neuter	fem
	nom. sg.	—	—	—/—u		—a	—e	—e
	acc. sg.	—ne	—	—e		—an	—e	—an
	gen. sg.	—es	—es	—re		—an	—an	—an
	dat. sg.	—um	—um	—re		—an	—an	—an
	nom. pl.	—e	—/—u	—a/—e		—an	—an	—an
	acc. pl.	—e	—/—u	—a/—e		—an	—an	—an
	gen. pl.	—ra	—ra	—ra		—ra/—ena	—ra/—ena	—ra/—ena
	dat. pl.	—um	—um	—um		—um	—um	—um

It appears then that in Old English definiteness and the strong/weak distinction is also closely linked with position. In this study I would like to find out why this is so, what the link is between these three features, and how position is further linked to iconicity.

In the course of the Middle English period, the strong/weak-adjective distinction was gradually lost. There are still some vestiges of it in Chaucer but they do not play a distinct grammatical or semantic role. This loss was a result of the general phonetic attrition of most of the inflectional endings, but it was also due to the development of a determiner system, which already in Old English began to take over the function of the expression of (in)definiteness. In Old English, definiteness was already usually marked with the help of the demonstrative pronoun *se, seo, þæt*. Indefiniteness usually remained unmarked (the use of *ān* 'one' or *sum* 'a certain', as an indefinite article, was still rare), and here the strong/weak adjective distinction still played an important role. In how far adjective position in Middle English was also affected by these changes, is something that still needs to be looked into, but which I will keep for another occasion.

I became intrigued again by the question of the different positions adjectives can take when I was looking for an appropriate poem to adorn a speech I had to give on a particular occasion. The poem I selected was by the Dutch poet, Judith Herzberg, and began like this,

- (3) *Mijn vader had een lang uur zitten zwijgen bij mijn bed*
 my father had a long hour sit be-silent by my bed
 'My father had been sitting silently at my bedside for a long hour'
 ('Ziekenbezoek', Herzberg 1968: 52)

The first time I read it aloud to practise, I automatically read, "Mijn vader had *een uur lang* zitten zwijgen bij mijn bed". Only when I read it out wrongly in this way, did I realise that the order of adjective-noun in the phrase "een lang uur" was highly unusual, and I suddenly realised what a difference position can make to the meaning of a phrase. 'A long hour' is definitely not the same as 'an hour long'. In the usual order 'an hour long', we indicate simply that the length of a particular occurrence was an hour: 'an hour long' then means 'an hour in length'; in the other order we say something about the kind of hour that it was, it was a 'loooooong' hour (to put it iconically), intimating possibly the heaviness or tediousness of that hour. In other words, the hour itself is qualified and becomes a different kind of category of hour, not just a neutral sixty minutes.

Nowadays in Dutch (and also in English) adjectives normally precede their nouns, so this case is rather exceptional in that the syntactically natural order is the more striking one. But this is, of course, just what poets do, they change what is the rule (in Lecercle's [1990] words, they play with or violate the rules of grammar) but always according to some other rule system. One could say that there are two rule systems operating in language: conventional or grammar rules on the one hand, and expressive rules on the other. Plank (1979) refers in this respect to the symbolic and the iconic poles in language, and Fónagy (1999) distinguishes between the primary and the secondary code, whereby the first is conventional and usually language-specific, and the second motivated, and therefore much more universal. It is this latter code which is iconic in nature, reflecting in its form the shape of the world as we experience it. The difference in meaning in the Dutch phrase started me thinking whether the adjective position in Old English was ruled merely by the arbitrary conventions of grammar, or whether it could also have been iconically motivated in some way. The fact that Old English shows variation is in itself interesting and needs to be explained. When the adjective position is fixed (as it is more or less in both Modern Dutch and English), the likelihood that this position is purely grammatical or conventional becomes greater. However, like Dutch, English has its exceptions too, as the following examples show,

- (4) a. the responsible man
- b. the man responsible

Bolinger (1967: 4), who discusses more such pairs, remarks that (4a) means "almost unambiguously 'trustworthy'", whereas (4b) "is unambiguously 'to blame'". In what follows I will make use of Bolinger's very perceptive remarks as to what causes the difference between these two expressions.

2. Iconic motivation in the positioning of adjectives

When we are looking at the possibility of meaning differentiation of adjectives by means of difference in position, it is most fruitful to start with those languages where both pre- and postnominal position is used regularly, such as for instance the Romance languages (Spanish, Italian), Modern Greek, and also Old English. When we consult the handbooks of Old English grammar, however, we do not become very much wiser about what the 'meaning' of the adjectival position may have been. Grammars note the variety, but usually not more than that. Most often they explain the variety in position as follows, given here in the words of G. L. Brook (1955: 82): "[t]he order of words is less rigid in Old English than in Modern English because the Old English inflectional system, much fuller than that of Modern English, made it possible for a writer to make clear the relation of a word for the rest of the sentence without making use of word order for this purpose". Similarly, Sørensen (1956: 262–263) writes: "Anyhow it is tempting to assume that the widespread use of the construction adjective + substantive + adjective in OE. was supported by, if not a direct outcome of, [a] general tendency towards looseness in construction". Even Mitchell, the 'Bible' of Old English grammar, remains vague. He notes (1985: §172) that the reason for *postposition* may be Latin influence,² a desire for emphasis, rhythmic and stylistic variation, meter etc. In an earlier paragraph (§160), Mitchell remarks that it is not always clear whether with an "attributive adjective in postposition", "we have to do with an attributive, predicative or appositional, use". It seems that Mitchell himself believes that these adjectives are still attributive, witness his remark in §168 that adjectives after the noun "may seem predicative to *some* readers" (*italics added*). Although Quirk and Wrenn (1955) give more details about the kind and number of adjectives that appear postnominally, an explanation for the position itself in syntactic or semantic or in any other terms is not given in any of these grammars.

The difference between weak and strong adjectives, which is also of interest here because there is, as I said above, some relation with position, is usually explained in terms of a "principle of economy" operating in Old English. As Barbara Strang (1970: 301) put it: "so long as a preceding word carried the full differentiae the adjective could appear in a less highly differentiated form". In other words, when there is no other defining element, the strong adjective ending is useful because it is more distinctive of case and gender (unlike the weak adjective, see [2]), while such a distinctive ending in a weak adjective is less useful because case and gender are usually clear from the preceding demonstrative pronoun. This principle, based as it is on the functional interdependence of article and adjective ending, provides also an explanation for the rise of the

article system in Middle English, or, so one wishes, for the disappearance of the weak/strong distinction in Middle English. Because the two are interpreted as clearly linked, the increasing presence of the one (the article) obviates the need for the other (the strong/weak adjectival distinction).

However, some linguists, such as, for instance, Karl Brunner, already remarked that a deeper explanation must be sought for, i.e. that one must consider what the weak and strong forms of the adjectives in themselves stand for. In this he is inspired by the evidence coming from Old English poetry, where both types of adjectives could still be used without any determiners. And, as we will see shortly below, I have also found examples in Old English prose where a weak adjective is used after an indefinite article (*ān/sum*), and examples where the postponed adjective is weak rather than strong (the strong adjective, according to Mitchell [1985: §126], is the rule postnominally when the determiner is not repeated). In other words, it seems that the weak/strong distinction may well be independent to some extent of article use. Brunner (1962: 53–54) writes,

Die schwachen Formen sind daher individualisierend, gegenüber den allgemeinen starken. Sie werden zuerst wiederaufnehmend verwendet ... Die schwache Form steht daher attributiv wenn eine bestimmte Einzelperson beschrieben wird ... Als der bestimmte Artikel zur Kennzeichnung von Einzelpersonen oder Dingen in Aufnahme kam, wurde nach ihm die schwache Form des Adj. Verwendet. Daraus erklärt sich auch, daß die ebenfalls individualisierenden Komparative und Superlative meist schwach flektiert werden...

(The weak forms are therefore individuating, in contrast to the generalizing strong forms. They are at first used to refer back to an already mentioned entity ... The weak form is therefore used attributively when a certain individual is described ... When the definite article was on the increase to characterize individual persons or things, then the weak form of the adjective continued to be used after it. This also explains why the likewise individuating comparative and superlative forms usually carry a weak inflection). (My translation.)

It is clear that for Brunner, the prime distinction between weak and strong adjectives is that the weak adjective conveys 'given' information, and is individuating, and that the strong adjective is generalizing. I do not think that 'individuating' vs. 'generalizing' is the most useful distinction, but the idea that weak adjectives convey 'given' information (forming the 'theme' of the utterance) is something that seems supported by other studies, which I will discuss below. Weak adjectives would then contrast with strong ones in that the latter are 'rhematic', i.e. they provide 'new' information.

Before we move to the question of adjective position, I would like to make two general introductory remarks, which touch also on my theoretical position.

First of all, I believe with linguists like Haiman, Givón, Hopper, Thompson, Dressler and many others, that "questions of the relationship between language and the mind can be approached only by considering language *in its natural functional context*" (Hopper and Thompson 1984: 747–748, italics added), and that, more specifically, the cognitive strategies underlying language systems (or the theory of grammar) have a strong perceptual basis (cf. also Hopper and Thompson 1984: 747): i.e. diagrammatic iconicity plays a very important role in the way the rules of grammar are formed and maintained. Or, in the words of Dressler (1995: 22, see also Dressler 1990), in a study where he lists some tenets of the naturalness approach in language theory: "It does not assume an autonomous module of grammar, but attempts to find cognitive and other extralinguistic bases [...] for grammatical principles and preferences". I therefore believe that it would be worthwhile to find out whether the variation in the position of the adjective in Old English may be iconically or perceptually motivated.

Secondly, I think it is important to realize that the category of Adjective is not a universal category, unlike those of Noun and Verb (cf. Dixon 1977; Thompson 1988). In many languages, the property characteristics which are in English typically expressed by the category of Adjective are expressed by means of verbs or nouns or 'verbids' and 'nounids', i.e. items that share many characteristics with verbs and nouns. It is not surprising, too, in this respect that in a (binary) feature analysis of the category Adjective, the Adjective is characterized by the features [+N] and [+V]. Below I will show that the category Adjective in Old English has clearly nominal and verbal characteristics (much more so than in Present-day English), which can be linked up with the distinction between weak and strong respectively, and to some extent also with position.³

With these ideas in mind, let us now briefly look at what has been said in the literature about the position of adjectives. Bolinger has written two seminal articles on adjective position which touch both on the iconic (perceptual) as well as the categorial issues I referred to above, as is clear from their titles: "Linear Modification" (1952 [1972]) and "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication" (1967). Bolinger (1972: 31) writes: "[T]he linear geometry of the sentence imposes certain relationships upon the elements that compose it". The principle that he uncovers is perceptual in that whatever comes first in a linear sequence determines to some extent how the next element is to be interpreted (p. 32). Linear sequence is of course more likely to be meaningful when the elements concerned can occupy more than one position. This is the case with adjectives in Modern Greek (see below), and also in Spanish (Bolinger's examples are from Spanish), but much less so in Modern English because adjectives are on the whole fixed to prenominal position. Bolinger schematizes his idea as follows:

The diagram expresses that the element that comes *first* (A or N) modifies the rest of the phrase. Thus, in Spanish *un hermoso edificio* (A–N), refers to a building that has beauty as an inbuilt characteristic; in other words the topic of the sentence is a ‘beautiful building’. When the adjective follows — *un edificio hermoso* —, the adjective as it were splits up the noun, the topic: ‘building’ is now *contrasted* with other buildings that are not beautiful.

Stavrou (1996: 83–84), basing herself on Bolinger’s work, makes a similar distinction for Modern Greek. She writes, “the prehead AP [Adjective Phrase] denotes a pre-existing ... or defining property, whereas the post-head one asserts the (perhaps temporary) possession of a property”. She likewise, very interestingly, notes that the (in)definiteness of the noun phrase is also involved in this distinction. When the noun phrase is indefinite, both orders are encountered in Modern Greek:

- (6) a. *Katharise ena milo kokino*
he/she-peeled an apple red
(cf. Stavrou 1996: 80)
b. *Katharise ena kokino milo*
he/she-peeled a red apple

When the noun phrase is definite, only prenominal position is possible:

- (7) a. *Katharise to kokino milo*
he/she-peeled the red apple
b. **Katharise to milo kokino*
he/she-peeled the apple red
(cf. Stavrou 1996: 80)

She notes at the same time, however, that postnominal position with a definite noun phrase does occur when the postponed adjective functions as a small clause (what in traditional terms would be called an object complement),

- (8) *theli ti bira pagomeni*
he/she-wants the beer cold
(Stavrou 1996: 86)

She then relates the difference between (6a) and (b) to the difference between (7a) and (8) arguing that the postnominal adjective in the indefinite noun phrase

(6a) functions like a pseudo-small clause, i.e. like a secondary predicate, implying that it has predicative rather than attributive force. While the prenominal adjective is “‘an intrinsic part of the reference of the NP’, or the set of properties interpreting the NP, the posthead AP ‘asserts’ a property for some referent, which exists independently of this property; it gives a continuative description of the referent” (Stavrou 1996: 107–108). This means in effect that the postnominal adjective phrase receives a more restrictive interpretation, and as such it can be used to express a contrast. That this is so can be made clear with the help of Bolinger’s example quoted in (4). An utterance like ‘He is a responsible man’ cannot be followed by an utterance which generally denies his trustworthiness, because the adjective refers to an inherent characteristic of the man. Responsibility in ‘He is the man responsible’, however, can be contrasted with ‘non-responsibility’, because the man’s responsibility is only relevant for one particular case, not for all cases he is involved in. In other words, a contrast is possible in the latter but not in the former; this is also made clear by the difference in stress of the two adjectives. Hopper and Thompson (1984) refer to this difference as follows: they would say that in (4a) the adjective is incorporated into the noun phrase and therefore cannot be manipulated further in the discourse. In (4b), however, the adjective can be further manipulated because it has not been thematized. These differences, which in Modern Greek are expressed by position, are expressed in Modern English by differences in stress patterning, such that ‘a *réd* apple’ corresponds to the Greek example in (6a) and ‘a red *á*pple’ to the one in (6b). Similarly ‘give me the cold *béer*’, without any stress on ‘cold’, corresponds to (7) and ‘give me the beer *cóld*’ to (8). ‘The cold beer’ can also be uttered with double stress but that is not the usual pattern, and it always expresses contrast.

We have seen above that Bolinger claims that the position of the adjective when variable is iconic in that the meaning is determined by the linear order of the elements: what is perceived first, colours the interpretation of the rest of the utterance. Langacker (1997:22) notes that stress is iconic too but on a different level,

The focus is a conceptual constituent. It is not a classical constituent based on valence links, but rather one reflecting an abstract similarity, namely degree of interest or informativeness. The grouping formed on this basis cross-cuts classical constituency, symbolized by linear contiguity. The focus is however symbolized phonologically, namely by a phonological grouping based on unreduced stress. This symbolic relationship is clearly iconic, as stress level (salience in regard to amplitude) bears a natural relationship to degree of interest (discourse salience).

Similar differences, as far as position is concerned have been noted for Spanish (see Bolinger 1952 [1972] referred to above) and Italian. Writing on Italian, Vincent (1986: 192), who also provides a good overview of the studies that have appeared on this topic, shows that a common denominator can be found for each position in terms of theme/rheme (or 'given/new' information):

L'aggettivo preposto, essendo parte inseparabile della testa, non può avere un valore indipendente, mentre l'aggettivo postposto è sempre rematico rispetto al nome che modifica, anche se la sua posizione sintattica gli conferisce il ruolo di rema secondario.

(The preposed adjective, being an inseparable part of the head, cannot have an independent value, while the postposed adjective is always rhematic with respect to the noun that it modifies, even though its syntactic position confers upon it the role of a secondary rheme) (Vincent 1986: 192, my translation)

He further shows how the structure of the Adjective-Noun phrase resembles in linear terms the structure of existential clauses, which have only a rheme, while that of the Noun-Adjective phrase resembles a predicative clause, which has a theme as subject and a rheme as complement, suggesting the similar order theme/rheme for the noun and adjective respectively, and their independent 'value' with respect to one another.

3. Adjective position in Old English

It is now time to have a closer look at Old English. I believe that the differences noted above for Modern Greek and the Romance languages, can also be found in Old English. With a dead language it is of course more difficult to prove the meaningfulness of the variable position conclusively, but it seems to me that it can be shown that indeed the Old English postnominal strong adjectives act very much like secondary predicates; they are rhematic, and as such belong to an adjectival category that is very close to the Verb category. Their postnominal position, in other words, can be seen as iconic (because the meaning of the adjective is not incorporated into the noun, cf. [5b]). When strong adjectives occur in prenominal position, they tend to be rhematic too (which is not surprising because they only occur there in indefinite noun phrases, which tend not to be thematic).⁴ Here, however, phonological iconicity takes precedence over linear (syntactic) iconicity. When the adjective is rhematic in this position it is presumably stressed, when it is not, it is presumably unstressed. It would be nice if this difference was also expressed by means of the weak/strong distinction. This is

not so, the adjective is generally strong, but there are exceptions that may indicate that weak form and thematic function were allied even here (see below, Section 4.6).

As far as weak adjectives are concerned, they are placed, almost without exception, before the noun phrase, and are always part of a definite noun phrase, i.e. a noun phrase that tends to be thematic. These adjectives therefore function attributively, their position is iconic in that they modify the noun; they, as it were, change the noun into a new 'compound' noun, a new noun token (cf. 5a above). It is not surprising, therefore, that these weak adjectives, unlike the strong ones, are much closer to the noun category.

The strongly nominal and verbal (predicative) nature of the weak and strong adjectives respectively, also accounts for the fact that in Old English adjectives cannot really occur in a row as they do in Present-day English. In a previous study (2000) I have already suggested that weak adjectives function like adjuncts or denominal adjectives (the term used by Quirk and Greenbaum 1973) of the type, 'a stone wall', 'a Shakespearian critic'. Such adjectives cannot be modified. Thus, just as one cannot say in Modern English 'the very Shakespearian critic', in the same way one cannot modify an Old English weak adjective, neither by an adverb nor by another adjective, as is possible in Modern English: cf. 'this beautiful young girl'. In Old English two adjectives are either connected by *and* or draped around the noun. If strong adjectives are indeed predicative, it explains why they, too, cannot modify one another, just as one cannot say in Modern English, 'the road was long tedious'. When more than one strong adjective is used in Old English, they also need to be separated from each other, either by having one adjective in prenominal and the other in postnominal position, or by using the connector *and* (there are some exceptions to this rule, which I have discussed in Fischer 2000). In what follows I will concentrate on the verbal versus nominal characteristics of the two types of adjectives, hoping to give more evidence for their very different nature. This qualitative difference between the adjectives is, in turn, linked to position. By showing that prenominal weak adjectives are nominal or attributive (which entails that they change the meaning of the noun they modify), and that postnominal adjectives are verbal or predicative (thus, typically giving new information about the noun they modify), it follows that the position of the adjective in Old English obeys the perceptual linearity suggested by Bolinger, as sketched above in (5).

4. Evidence for the verbal nature of strong adjectives

In this section, we will have a look at the way adjectives are used in Old English (their position, but also the strong/weak inflections) in the following circumstances, which are all associated with strong 'verbalness':

1. modification with prepositional phrases
2. frequency of past participles in postnominal position
3. modification with adverbs such as *swiþe* and *swa*
4. their use as 'subject/object complement'
5. incorporation of negative element
6. discourse manipulability and distinctness in inflectional endings
7. use with empty or anaphoric head nouns (which makes them 'functionally' predicative. Cf. Thompson 1988: 174)

We will see that the strong postnominal adjectives score positively on all these points, whereas the weak adjectives score negatively on precisely the same points. Additional characteristics which may tell us more about the difference between the two types of adjectives are provided by the fact that

8. a number of adjectives, such as the *-weard* class, show differences in behaviour

It is also interesting to observe that postnominal adjectives in Present-day English are still strongly predicative. In Section 5 we will have a brief look at how postnominal adjectives are used in poetry.

4.1 Use of prepositional phrases

Whenever the adjective is modified by a prepositional phrase in Old English, the whole adjective phrase follows the noun, as shown in (9). In other words, Modern English constructions such as 'a suitable for nothing person' or 'a larger than life experience' simply do not occur. The most frequent adjective to occur postnominally with a prepositional phrase is the adjective *full*, and quantifiers like *eall*. In this respect there is clearly continuity with Present-day English:

- (9) a. *an man ... mihte faran ofer his rice mid his bosum full*
 a man could travel through his country with his body full
 goldes [GEN] *ungederad*
 of-gold unmolested
 (Chron2.1070.6)

- b. ... *and hæbbe hire ða syringe ealle butan ðæs*
 and [she] may-have for-her the buttermilk all except the
hyrdes dæle
 herdman's part
 (Lawr. 16)
- c. *seo sixte yld pissere worulde stynt fram criste astreht*
 the sixth age of-this-world runs from Christ stretched-out
op domes dæg eallum mannum ungewiss, ...
 [on the cross] until doomsday to-all men uncertain
 (Ælet4.1185)
- d. *God ða forð ateah of ðære moldan ælces cynnes*
 'God then forth pulled from the earth of-each kind
treow fæger on gesyhðe
 [a] tree beautiful in sight'
 (Æl. Old Test.1 1.2.9)
- e. *swiðe geleafull wer welig on æhtum*
 [a] very faithful man wealthy in goods
 (Ælet4, 1.737)

The use of the prepositional phrase makes clear that the adjective is not attributive; the usual position for attributive adjectives is awkward here too in Modern English cf. 'a wealthy in goods man' or 'a wealthy man in goods'.

I have found no examples of *full* (or any other adjective for that matter) with a genitive positioned before a noun in Old English even where the same phrase can have prenominal *full* in Present-day English,⁵

- (10) *gif hit ðonne festendæg sie selle mon wege cæsa and*
 if it then [a] fast-day be, let-give one 'wey' of-cheese and
 ... *fiscas and mittan fulne honiges*
 of-fish and [a] measure full of-honey
 (Doc12a.16) (Cf. PdE also 'a full measure of honey')

Examples such as these are nicely contrasted with instances like (11), where the same adjective used preminally and without a genitive, clearly conveys a different meaning, as still nowadays:

- (11) *and besætt þone castel abutan mid swiðe mycele here*
 and besieged the castle all-around with [a] very large army [for]
fulle six wucan
 full six weeks
 (Chron2.1087.54)

Also very frequent are participial adjectives with a prepositional phrase, which is not surprising since they are highly verbal,

- (12) *selle him þonne ... etan ... pisan ofþænda and gesodena on*
 give him then [to] eat peas overmoistened and boiled in
ecede ...
vinegar
 (Lch2.2.2.1)

4.2 Frequency of past participles in postnominal position

Quite a few of the postnominal adjectives in the above category and also in the other categories discussed below (cf. [12], [13], [15], [16a, b], [17], [20c]) are deverbal adjectives, such as participles. Thus, these adjectives are already more verbal by their very nature. Used postnominally, they indicate that the quality expressed is not inherent but that the noun as a separate entity is involved in a temporary activity or state expressed by the deverbal adjective. A very clear example of this is (15) below: the *swile* 'swelling' only bursts at the moment that it is *gewyrsmæd* 'festering'. An example with a present participle is given below in (16a). Also noteworthy is that, when there are two strong adjectives of which one is deverbal, there is a clear tendency for the deverbal one to follow the noun,

- (13) *ne scyle nan mon siocene monnan and gesargodne swencan ac*
 not must no man [a] sick man and wounded let-work but
hine mon scel lædan to þæm læce ...
 him one must take to the doctor
 (Bo4.38.123.32)

Other deverbal adjectives which show more of the trappings of adjectives, such as (un)gesewenlic in (14), also show a higher tendency to appear postnominally,⁶

- (14) *on þissum monðe gesceop god ælmihtig ealle gesceafta gesewenlice*
 in this month created God almighty all creatures visible
and ungesewenlice
and invisible
 (Byrm2 80.15)

4.3 Modification with adverbs

One of the more interesting observations is that the prenominal weak adjective does not occur with adverbs such as *swiþe* 'very' and *swa* 'so' (and other less

frequently occurring adverbs such as *niwan* in [15]), while they very commonly modify verbs and predicative adjectives (including strong pre- and postnominal adjectives), which are close to verbs. In Fischer (2000) I have shown that a phrase like 'a very old man', or 'the man is very old' is extremely common in Old English, but that a phrase like 'the very old man' does not occur at all in the complete body of material that we have of Old English. All this again shows that in Old English, the weak adjective is more nominal in nature, and like a noun cannot be modified by an adverb. There are also some interesting uses of *swa* with a postnominal adjective, which seem to emphasize the temporariness of the adjectival property concerned:

- (15) *þonne se swile gewyrsmed tobyrst nim gate meoluc swa wearme*
 when the swelling festering bursts take goat's milk thus warm
niwan amolcene sele drincan
 newly milked give [it] [to] drink
 (Lch2.20.1.1)

In (15) *swa wearme* clearly indicates that the milk must be given while it is *still* warm. When we compare this situation to Present-day English, we not only find 'very' used before an attributive adjective in a definite noun phrase ('the very old man', cf. Fischer 2000: note 9), but also more elaborate adverbials in this position as in these examples from Markus (1997): 'the normally timid soldier', 'this by no means irresponsible action' (slightly adapted).

4.4 Use as secondary predicate

An example like (15) also makes clear that the difference between an adjective that is linked to the noun phrase and an object complement in which the adjective functions as a secondary predicate separate from the noun phrase, is much more difficult to make in Old English. It is quite possible to interpret *swa wearme* in (15), for instance, as an object complement. In Present-day English the phrase in (15) would normally be translated as 'take warm, newly milked goat's milk', as if indeed the adjective is attributive, whereas the grammatical function of the adjective may well be more correctly translated by an object complement: 'take it (while still) warm'. Other such structurally ambiguous instances are given in (16),

- (16) a. *gif hwa his rihtæwe lifigende forlæte and on oðran wife*
 if anyone his lawful-wife living leaves and another woman
on unriht gewifige
 unlawfully marries
 (LawNorthu.64)
- b. *eft wið gefigon sceapes hohscancan unsodenne tobrec*
 then against cimosis (?) [a] sheep's leg uncooked break
gedo þæt mearh ...
 put the marrow
 (Lch1.2.23.6)
- c. *wiþ bryce fearres gor wearm lege on þone*
 against [a] fracture oxen dung warm place on the
bryce
 fractured-limb
 (Quad. 743)
- d. *gif mon twyhyndne mon unsynnigne mid*
 if one [a] two-hundred-shillingworth man innocent with [a]
hloðe ofslea
 troop-of-robbers kills
 (LawAf 1.29)

In an example like (16c), a translation into Present-day English with an object complement (i.e. with an adjective following the noun) seems still possible, but this is hardly the case in (16a, d); we can no longer say 'break a leg uncooked'. It is quite possible that the grammaticalization of adjective position to a fixed place in Present-day English, and the fact that the object complements themselves would normally follow the verb in an S[ubject] V[erb] O[bject] language, has also led to a more restricted use of these ambiguous object complements.

4.5 *Incorporation of a negative element*

The use of a negative element is very closely connected with the predicate, i.e. the verbal element of the clause. Adjectives used predicatively are close to verbs, as stated above, and therefore can also be easily negated. Nouns as entities are not normally negated, because even in a clause like 'there was no man left alive', it is not the category of man itself that is negated but the *existence* (expressed by the verb *to be*) of members of this category at a particular point in time. Note also the oddity of a negated attributive adjective as in 'the non-black sheep' vs. the normal, but predicative 'the sheep is not black'. It is striking in

my data that strong, negated adjectives occur much more frequently after the noun than adjectives without negation, and that, when there are two strong adjectives (when, in other words, one of the adjectives *must* follow), then it is usually the negative one that follows,⁷ possibly because the most predicative adjective is preserved for the most predicative position:

- (17) a. *þær mihton geseon winceastre leodan **rancne here***
 there could see [the] of-Winchester people [a] proud army
and unearhne
and dauntless
 (Chron1.1006.28)
- b. *se ilca dauid ... monigne forsende ðær he ymb*
 the same David many-a-man sent-to-destruction where he for
his getreowne ðegn unsynnigne sierede
his loyal thane innocent a-plot-laid (and see also 16d)
 (CP 3.37.7)
- c. *mid soðum geleafan untweogendum*
 with true faith staunch
 (Conf 3.2[Raith Y]23)

It is also interesting that deverbal adjectives with *un-* tend to occur relatively more often in postnominal position (see e.g. *un(a)tellendlic* in note 6). The same is true for adjectives, in which *un-* is somewhat unusual when used attributively, such as *unlyttel*. This adjective occurs twenty-six times in the *DOE*, one of which is prenominal, twenty postnominal and four are straightforwardly predicative. One example is,

- (18) *to miclan bryce sceal micel bot nyde and to*
 to [a] great breach must needs (go) [a] great remedy and to [a]
*miclan bryne **wæter unlytel** gif man þæt fyr sceal to ahte*
 big conflagration water not-little if one that fire shall at all
acwencan
 extinguish (WHom 4.17)

Here the predicative use of *unlytel* is further emphasized by the fact that it is modified by an adverbial clause (that the adverbial clause modifies the adjective rather than the whole clause is clear from the fact that the expression *to ahte* balances the litotes *unlytel*).

4.6 *Discourse manipulability and inflectional endings*

Hopper and Thompson (1984), when discussing degree of categoriality in nouns and verbs, show that nouns and verbs behave most prototypically (i.e. with the full range of nominal or verbal trappings) when they play a salient role in the discourse, that is, when they enter the discourse as full, new participants. When they are important to the subsequent discourse, they are seen to be highly manipulable. When nouns or verbs are not salient, they are also not manipulable; they lose their nominal and verbal trappings and are often incorporated into their dominating head in the form of a clitic or inflection or as part of a compound (cf. the suggestion about incorporation made for Old English weak adjectives, above, and see also Jansen and Lentz [this volume]). Hopper and Thompson (1984: 722) write, "the more a form serves to introduce a manipulable entity into the discourse, the more highly marked it needs to be. Once it has been introduced, it is no longer manipulable, and it may appear with much less linguistic marking". It is most interesting in this respect that the inflections of the strong adjectives — which function, as we have seen, rhematically — are indeed much more distinctive for case, gender and number than that of the weak (cf. [2] above).

Now, if prenominal position and a weak adjectival ending, usually accompanied in Old English already by a definiteness marker, corresponds to thematic or non-salient information, one wonders how Old English speakers would indicate that an adjective may yet be salient in that position. Or the other way around, how would an Old English speaker make clear that a prenominal adjective after an indefinite marker may still be non-salient. It could be done by stress of course, as in Modern English, but we cannot prove this without the help of a native speaker. However, although the weak/strong endings of the adjective in Old English are pretty much determined by the type of determiner that accompanies them (definite or indefinite/zero respectively), there are a few examples where this norm is broken. First of all there are the comparative forms, which are always weak. This can now be explained as follows: the comparative refers back to a positive form and as such functions anaphorically, and is thus non-salient.⁸ The same would be true for the weak form which is always found in the vocative case. When one addresses a person (or persons) as *leofan men* 'dear men', *hlaford leofa* 'lord dear', *snottra fengel* 'wise king' or *god ælmihtiga*, one is using that complete phrase as a name, as a term of address; the adjective is known and gives no new information about the person. Notice that in this case even the adjective used postnominally is weak. It also looks as if the weak and strong forms of *self* (which for semantic reasons occur postnominally⁹) are not always according to the norm. In (19a) *selfa* is postnominal but weak; it presumably has

no stress since it plays no further role in the discourse (it is not manipulable). In (19b) *self* is strong, but here it is salient because it contrasts with ‘others’:

- (19) a. *be þam drihten selfa cydde in þam godspelle*
 about which lord himself showed in the gospel
 (GDPref and 3[C] 26.231.10)
- b. *huru ðæt he self do swa swa he oðre lærð*
 indeed that he himself should-do just as he others teaches
 (CP 60.453.14)

There are other cases of postnominal adjectives, which do not seem to convey new information and it is for this reason that they may be, exceptionally, weak. (20a) is from a saint’s life, where a ‘clean maiden’ has almost become an idiomatic phrase, a term used for any female martyr. Examples (20b) and (c) seem to be instances where the postnominal adjectives do no more than elaborate the prenominal weak ones, adding no new information:

- (20) a. *god ælmihtig heo cwæð ic eom þin þeowa clæna*
 God almighty she said I am your servant pure
 (Marg. 338)
- b. *þis sint tacn þæs hatan magan omihtan*
 these are symptoms of-the hot stomach inflammatory
ungemetfæstlican and *þæs ofercealdan*
 excessive and of-the overcold
 (Lch2.16.1.1)
- c. *... be þære gelicunge þæs magan þe þa yfelan wætan*
 by the pleasure(?) of-the stomach which the evil humours
sceorfendan and scearpan hæfð
 rough and sharp has
 (Lch2.1.1.17)

An example with an order similar to (20b–c) is the following, where we also have a determiner followed by a weak adjective and noun, but the adjective that follows is strong,

- (21) [then came to his mind the words of father Egberht]
se geara mid þone ilcan ceaddan iungne & hio begen
 who long-ago with the same Chad [when] young and they both
ginge on scotta ealonde syndrig munuclif hæfdon
 young on [a] Scottish island separate cloisters had
 ‘...who long ago, when Chad was still young and when they were
 both young, had separate cloisters on a Scottish island’. (Chad.1.184)

Here the adjective is strong because it is clearly predicative, St. Chad's youth is mentioned in connection with the past not as an inherent feature of the saint.

Another interesting contrast may have been intended in the following examples, but the differences are subtle because we have to rely on context, and also it may have been the case that the endings were no longer always sharply differentiated:¹⁰

- (22) a. *ða wolde egeas sum wælhreow* [STR] *dema his bodunge adwæscan and þa cristenan geneadian to þam deofellicum bigencgum*
 'then Egeas a-certain cruel judge wanted to destroy his preaching and the Christians force to [do] those develish rituals'
 (ÆCHom. I, 38 586.31)
- b. *þa wann him ongean sum wælhreow* [STR] *heretoga maxentius gehaten mid micclum þrymme wolde him benæman his lifes and his rices*
 'then fought against him [a] certain cruel general called Maxentius with [a] big force (he) wanted to deprive him of his life and his kingdom'
 (ÆCHom.II, 19 174.7)
- c. *þa wæs geset sum wælhreowa*[WK] *dema agricolaus geciged on anre byrig sebastia gehaten on þam lande armenia. Se foresæda dema wæs swiðe arleas ...*
 'then there was appointed a-certain cruel judge, called Agricolaus, in a place called Sebaste in the country of Armenia. This before-mentioned judge was very wicked'
 (ÆLS [Forty Soldiers]9)

In the first two examples a strong adjective is used, the adjective which is the rule with indefinite noun phrases. It is clear from the context that the information given by the adjective is relevant and salient because the continuation of the clause indicates that further information is built upon this knowledge. In the third example, which has a weak adjective, the case is rather different. Here it seems that 'cruel' is used as a qualifier, a generalizing adjective. The context then goes on to mention that this judge is *arleas*, giving this as *new* information, presumably because the previous mentioning of *wælhreow* had not yet particularized this quality in connection with the judge's activities. It is difficult to be certain about what these subtle differences mean, but it may be interesting to mention that there exists a similar difference in Dutch, where a weak adjective (adjectives ending in *-e*) emphasizes an inherent quality of a person ('een wrede rechter', 'een grote man'), while a strong adjective emphasizes a particular quality, true only for

a particular occasion ('een wreed rechter', 'een groot man').¹¹ I have found two other cases where quite clearly a general quality is indicated by the adjective, and here too the adjective used is weak in spite of the indefinite noun phrase,

- (23) a. *ðeah þe **sum wælhreowa**[WK] gode lac geoffrige, ne bið heo gode andfenge buton he his wælhreawnysse awurpe*
 'even though *some cruel* [man] offers [a] good offering, this will not be well received unless he casts-off his cruelty'
 (ÆCHom II, 37 274.58)
- b. *þes **an blinda**[WK] **mann** getacnað eal mancynn þe wearð ablend þurh adames gylt ...*
 'in-this a *blind man* symbolizes all mankind which was blinded through Adam's guilt'
 (ÆCHom I, 10 154.10)

It must be clear that in these examples it is not a temporary or particular state of 'cruelty' and 'blindness' that is emphasized, but the inherent quality. To my mind this explains the unusual use of the weak adjective in these cases.

4.7 Use with empty and anaphoric heads

In contrast to the examples in (23), the following are of interest,

- (24) a. *hwi ne meaht þu ongitan þætte **ælc wuht cwuces** bið innanweard hnescost and unbrocheardost*
 'why not could you perceive that *each creature alive* will-be inwardly most-soft and most-delicate'
 (Bo3.34.92.3)
- b. *ne wen þu na þæt se yfla **auht godes** gestryne mid his yfle*
 '[do] not you think that the evil [one] *something good* may-beget with his evil'
 (Cato 1.28)
- c. *Eac is **sum ðing digele** on þære dæde* (ÆCHom II, 13 134.228)
 also [there] is *some thing secret* in that deed
- d. *ðone lichoman gesohte **sum deaf man** and feðleas*
 'that body [of the saint] sought-out *a-certain deaf man* and crippled'
 (Mart 5[Kotzor]1924)

Here strong adjectives (some in the genitive case) are combined with a head noun that is "relatively 'non-new-information-bearing'" (Thompson 1988: 174).

In such cases, as Thompson notes for Modern English, the adjectives function predicatively even though in Modern English in cases like 'he is a really nice guy' and in (24d), they are grammatically attributive. All the adjectives here are salient. (24d) forms a nice contrast with (23b) because in this case the "deaf man" is a particular man, who happens to be deaf, and his deafness is highly salient and manipulable in the further discourse, where we learn how he lost his hearing. The genitive case used in (24a, b) indicates source and therefore points to the adverbial nature of the adjective. Note that the cases where the adjective occurs with a non-referential noun ('something, anything') still have a post-nominal adjective in Present-day English.

4.8 *Adjectives doing double duty: attributive and adverbial*

This last remark leads us to another characteristic of strong, postnominal adjectives, showing again that they are closer to the verbal pole than the nominal. Just as adverbs and prepositions can become verbs quite easily (e.g. 'up' > 'to up'), and verbs can become prepositions (e.g. so-called serial verbs) in grammaticalization processes, similarly the Old English postpositional adjectives may be adverbial in nature. This has already been often remarked with respect to the adjectives in — *weard*, which in postnominal position (in contrast to prenominal) clearly indicate direction or location.

- (25) *forðan ða eagan bioð on ðam lichoman foreweardum and*
 'therefore the eyes are on the body at-the-front and
 ufeweardum
 at-the-top'
 (CP I 1.29.13)

Used preminally, they indicate a quality,

- (26) *gif we hine biddað mid inneweardre heortan*
 'if we him pray with [a] sincere heart'
 (ÆHom 16 39)

But there are also other interesting minimal pairs. One of them is *grene*,

- (27) a. *genim ... grene rudan twa hand fulle*
 'take ... green rue two hands full'
 (Lch II [2]. 32.3.3)
 b. *Gif man scyle mucgwyrt to læcedome habban þonne nime þa readan*
 wæpnedman & þa grenan wifmen to læcecrafte

- 'if one must mugwort as [a] medicine have then take *the red* for-men and *the green* for-women as [a] remedy'
(Med3[Grattan-Singer] 178.25)
- c. *genim þa reade netlan ufewealde*
'take *the red nettle the-top-part*'
(Lch2. 8.1.6)
- d. *Gyf ðu hy grene næbbe, genim hy dryge*
'if you it *green* [fresh] do-not-have, use it dried'
(Lch I[Herb] 30.2)
- e. *nym betonican swa grene*
'take *betony still green* [fresh]'
(PeriD 63.45.24)

It is quite clear from all these examples that *grene* when used postnominally has the meaning of 'fresh', 'freshly picked' (this is especially clear in (27e) with the adverb *swa*, see Section 4.3 above) and thus refers to a temporary state rather than to an inherent quality. It is also clear that when the adjective is used prenominally it refers to a *type* of plant, i.e. to red or green mugwort, to the red nettle, and probably also to the green rue (other references in Bald's *Leechbook* make clear that plants that are similar to the rue have red flowers or red milk, so presumably there is a red as well as a green rue). Other postnominal adjectives that have an adverbial element in them are:

- (28) a. *he ... ða ciricean æpellice gefretwade ... mid woruldlicum frætsum ofersæwiscum*
'he ... the church nobly adorned ... with *worldly ornaments from-overseas*'
(Mart1 101)
- b. *gif he gemeteð oþerne æt his æwum¹² wife betynedum durum oððe under anre reon oððe æt his dehter æwumborenre*
'if he finds another [man] with his lawful wife behind-closed doors or under a blanket or with *his daughter born-in-wedlock*'
(Lawa 42.7)
- c. *þær sint swiðe micle meras fersce*
'there are very *big [many?] lakes fresh*'
(Chron. A. 68.11)

It is clear that in the last example it is not the lake itself that is fresh, but the water in it, so the postnominal adjective is a shortened form for an adverbial phrase 'with fresh water'.

5. Concluding remarks

It is time for a brief conclusion, and some remarks about the literary use of postnominal adjectives in Modern English. I have tried to show that adjective position in Old English is iconically motivated in that prenominal adjectives, when they are weak and definite, convey given information; they behave typically like attributive adjectives which are closer to the nominal pole of the adjective cline, and they are therefore an inseparable part of the head: together with the noun phrase they form the 'theme' of the utterance. Postnominal adjectives, on the other hand, which are typically strong, behave like predicates (are closer to the verbal pole), and they therefore give new information about the noun phrase, i.e. they are rhematic with respect to the noun that they modify. Thus, in the latter case, the nature of the noun phrase itself is not inherently changed by the adjective. As Bolinger showed, it is the linear order of the elements that naturally leads to such an interpretation. When strong adjectives are used *pre*nominally in Old English, they are presumably also predicative in nature and rhematic, but this is not shown linearly. It is likely that stress, which is a different form of iconicity (i.e. phonological iconicity, see Section 2) plays a role here, but without a native speaker of Old English we have no way of knowing. It is clear, however, that the linear system that operated in Old English has gradually given way to a phonologically iconic system. Nowadays we indicate the differences I have discussed in this study mainly by stress and not by linear order.

In this context (and in the context of the interdisciplinary nature of this book), it is interesting to observe, however, that especially in poetry, linear order may still be used to express these differences. I have not had enough time to look at examples in poetry in any systematic fashion, but the few poems I have looked at nearly all seem to use Noun-Adjective order according to the 'natural' rules I have sketched for Old English. Thus, in the example that Anderson (1998: 293) gives in his recently published book, of a rhetorical figure called *anastrophe*,

- (29) In States unborn and accents yet unknown (*Julius Caesar* III, I,
111-13)

it is clear that the postnominal adjective phrases "unborn" and "yet unknown" have all the trappings of verbal or predicative adjectives: they are both derived from verbs, they contain a negative element, and one adjective is even modified by the adverb of time *yet*. In a book I picked up randomly, containing poetry selections from the Renaissance up till the present day (Phythian 1970), I counted a total of thirty-four instances of Noun-Adjective order. All but three are

according to the parameters sketched in Section 4. In (30) I give some examples of this. (31) shows some possible exceptions.

- (30) a. We are prepared: we build *our houses squat*
(Seamus Heaney, 'Storm on the Island')
- b. If rubies, lo! her lips be rubies sound;
(Spenser, *Amoretti*, Sonnet 15)
- c. And then to awake, and the farm, like *a wanderer white*
With the dew ... (Dylan Thomas *Fern Hill*)
- d. When the tired flower of Florence is in gloom beneath *the glowing*
Brown hills surrounding (D. H. Lawrence, 'Bat')
- e. Studying *inventions fine*, her wits to entertain:
Oft turning others' leaves, to see if thence would flow
Some fresh and fruitful flowers upon my sun-burn'd brain.
(Sir Philip Sidney, 'Sonnet')
- f. how Love fled
And paced upon *the mountains overhead*
(W. B. Yeats, 'When You Are Old and Grey')
- (31) a. On russet floors, by *waters idle*,
The pine lets fall its cone (A. E. Housman, 'Tell Me Not Here')
- b. When I consider how my light is spent,
Ere half my days in *this dark world and wide*
(Milton, 'On His Blindness')

Thus, in (30a), the adjective "squat" behaves like an object complement (in spite of the fact that the verb 'build' does not normally take object complements in English) rather than an attributive adjective: it refers not so much to the quality of the houses but to the way they are built, so to the activity of building. In (30b) the poet wants to emphasize that his lady's lips are not just like rubies (in love poems all ladies have ruby lips) but that they are rubies with an extra quality, that is, they are rubies *and* sound into the bargain. (30c) is an example where the adjective is further modified by a prepositional phrase, making it more verbal. In (30e) the adjective "fine" is highly salient as is clear from the ensuing discourses, which further elaborates the notion that "fine" expresses. Finally (30f) is an instance where the adjective itself is adverbial in nature, expressing location (cf. the *-ward* adjectives discussed in Section 4.8). Of course, in all these cases there are also often metrical or rhythmical reasons for putting the adjective behind the noun, but it is clear that this use of postposition, which is exceptional in prose, is bound to rules. Intuitively, poets realise that postposed adjectives are verbal rather than nominal, they convey rhematic information, describing

qualities that are not inherent but which pertain to the activity of the moment. In other words, the way adjective position is used by poets in Modern English shows that their choice is iconically motivated. This is what we would expect given the fact that iconic structures are by their very nature not language specific, and therefore the same 'rule' would apply whether the language is Old English or Modern English, Italian or Greek.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Andreas Fischer, Willem Koopman and Max Nänny for their careful reading of an earlier version of this paper.

Notes

1. I have used the reference system as given in Healey and Venezky (1980), which is also employed in the machine readable version of the *DOE*. To save space I have not given a gloss and translation in each case. I have been careful to give a literal translation of the noun and adjective phrases in question, while I have felt free to translate the rest of the sentence somewhat less literally when necessary for comprehension. A dash between words in the translation indicates that in the Old English text these words are represented by one word, square brackets indicate words not present in the Old English text.
2. I have found this to be definitely true for the glosses and also for texts directly based on a Latin text, such as *Bede* and the *Cura Pastoralis*. Here the authors simply follow the Latin word order very strictly. These cases do not conform to the rules that I will be presenting in the course of this article.
3. Cf. also Vendler (1967: 175), who notes that "adjectives are tied to their subjects [the nouns they qualify] in different manner", that is, some adjectives, expressing natural or inherent qualities of the thing they refer to, are of a "substantial" nature (p. 183), while others refer to an "appropriate action involving the thing" (p. 175), i.e. they are tied to their subject verbally. The hypothesis I am putting forward here is that in Old English (and in Dutch) this difference could still be expressed by a difference in the form and the position of the adjective.
4. For this reason it is not surprising that most of the quantifiers in Old English appear only in a strong form (cf. Quirk and Wrenn 1955: 31, 40). As quantifiers they usually convey indefinite information. They are also a type of adjective found very frequently in post position. Similarly 'ilca' appears always in the weak form, and is always preposed, because by its very meaning ('the same') it cannot be but definite.
5. Markus (1997) notes in his study of adjective position in Present-day English that adjectives that are themselves modified by PPs begin to occur more and more frequently before the noun. It seems to me that this development may be due to the fact that adjective position became grammaticalized to prenominal position, whereby the iconic function of position was lost but taken over by phonological iconicity. It may also be for this reason that so-called infinitival relatives (as in *This is an easy violin to play on*) did not yet occur in Old English, where the adjective *easy*, being clearly predicative, would still occur after the noun. It seems to me

therefore that the rise of what are now called infinitival relatives must be looked for in the fixing of the adjectival position, and that in fact infinitival relatives did already occur in Old English only in a different shape (pace Dubinsky [1997], followed by Miller [forthcoming], who believe there was a grammar change here involving null operators).

6. Of all the occurrences of *gesewenlic* in the *DOE* (93 in total), 34 occur prenominal, while 25 are postnominal, the other occurrences are either predicative or adverbial. The proportion here between pre- and postnominal is quite exceptional considering that the rule is, when there is only one adjective, for adjectives to precede the noun they qualify. Similarly the adjective *un(a)tellendlic* occurs in total ten times in the *DOE*, two are prenominal, two are postnominal, the rest is predicative.
7. The same is true, as we have seen with (13), when one of the two adjectives is a past participle.
8. The case may be a little more complicated with the superlative form, which is generally also weak but may be strong when used predicatively (cf. Quirk and Wrenn 1955:69), only, however, in the nominative singular and the accusative singular neuter (cf. Brunner 1962:62). The reasons for this severe restriction are not clear.
9. When *selfa* is used prenominal, it is always weak, like *ilca*, and it has the same meaning as *ilca*, 'same'.
10. This is certainly true for late Old English texts, where especially the endings *-an* and *-um* were often interchangeable.
11. I would like to thank Camiel Hamans for confirming my own native intuitions here and for drawing my attention to quite a large body of literature on this question, such as his own discussion (Hamans 1980), and the discussion in the *ANS* on p. 330 and Vendler 1967. The principle behind this difference is well explained in Vendler, who shows that adjectives such as *wreed* may connect up both with the noun, in which case they describe an inherent quality (weak *wrede*), as well as with the verb, in which case the adjective qualifies the noun only in respect to the function it expresses (strong *wreed*). This second case is therefore most common with action nouns such as 'judge', 'dancer', 'cook' etc. (cf. 'to judge, dance, cook' etc.).
12. Note that *æwe* by itself is used for a 'married woman' in Old English indicating that *æwe wif* can almost be considered a compound. Also a lawful wife would be unique, whereas a lawfully born daughter could be contrasted with other daughters not so born.

References

- Anderson, E. R. 1998. *A Grammar of Iconism*. Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- ANS. 1984. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Edited by G. Geerts, W. Haeseryn, J. de Rooy and M. C. van der Toorn. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof.
- Bolinger, D. L. 1952 [1972]. "Linear Modification". *Language* 67: 1117–1144. Reprinted in F. Householder (ed.) *Syntactic Theory*, 31–51. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bolinger, D. L. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication". *Lingua* 18: 1–34.
- Brook, G. L. 1955. *An Introduction to Old English*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Brunner, K. 1962. *Die englische Sprache. Ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*. Vol. II. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. "Where Have All the Adjectives Gone?". *Studies in Language* 1: 19–80.
- DOE, Dictionary of Old English Project, *The Complete Corpus of Old English in Machine-Readable Form*. 1998. A. DiPaolo Healey and R. Venezky (eds). University of Michigan (www.hti.umich.edu/english/oec).
- Dressler, W.U. 1990. "The Cognitive perspective of 'Naturalist' Linguistic Models". *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 75–98.
- Dressler, W.U. 1995. "Interactions between Iconicity and Other Semiotic Parameters in Language". In *Iconicity in Language*, R. Simone (ed.), 21–37. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dubinsky, S. 1997. "Infinitival Relative Clauses in English: An Antisymmetric Approach to Discontinuous Constituency". *Proceedings of the 1996 Eastern States Conference on Linguistics* (ESCOL 1996), 82–93, Cornell University: CLC Publications.
- Fischer, O. C. M. 2000. "The Position of the Adjective in Old English". In *Generative Theory and Corpus Studies. A Dialogue from 10 ICEHL*, R. Bermúdez-Otero, D. Denison, R. M. Hogg and C. B. McMully (eds), 153–182. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fónagy, I. 1999. "Why Iconicity?". In *Form Miming Meaning. Iconicity in Language and Literature*, M. Nänny and O. Fischer (eds), 3–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hamans, C. 1980. "Waarin was de goede moordenaar goed?". In *Filosofische Lezingen gehouden op de Eerste Nederlandse Filosofiedag 15 September 1979*, 74–80. Amsterdam.
- Healey A. and R. L. Venezky. 1980. *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English*. The Dictionary of Old English Project, Center for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.
- Herzberg, J. 1968. *Beemdgrass*. Amsterdam: van Oorschot.
- Hopper, P. J. and S. A. Thompson. 1984. "The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar". *Language* 60: 703–750.
- Kytö, M. 1991. *Manual to the Diachronic Part of The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Langacker, R. W. 1997. "Constituency, Dependency, and Conceptual Grouping". *Cognitive Linguistics* 8: 1–32.
- Lecercle, J. J. 1990. *The Violence of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Markus, M. 1997. "'The Men Present' vs. 'The Present Case': Word Order Rules Concerning the Position of the English Adjective". *Anglia* 115: 487–506.
- Miller, G. Forthcoming. *Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, B. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Plank, F. 1979. "Ikonisierung und De-Ikonisierung als Prinzipien des Sprachwandels". *Sprachwissenschaft* 4: 121–158.

- Phythian, B. A. 1970. *Considering Poetry. An Approach to Criticism*. London: The English Universities Press.
- Quirk R. and C. L. Wrenn. 1955. *An Old English Grammar*. London: Methuen.
- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum. 1973. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Sørensen, K. 1956. "Substantive with Two Epithets". *English Studies* 37: 261–264.
- Stavrou, M. 1996. "Adjectives in Modern Greek: An Instance of Predication, or an Old Issue Revisited". *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 79–112.
- Strang, B. M. H. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Methuen.
- Thompson, S. A. 1988. "A Discourse Approach to the Cross-Linguistic Category 'Adjective' ". In *Explaining Language Universals*, J. Hawkins (ed.), 168–185. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vendler, Z. 1967. "The Grammar of Goodness". In Z. Vendler, *Linguistics in Philosophy*, 172–199. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Vincent, N. 1986. "La posizione dell'aggettivo in italiano". In *Tema-Rema in Italiano. Symposium, Frankfurt am Main, 26/27–4–1985*, H. Stammerjohann (ed.), 181–195. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.