investigations in correlations between discourse levels (micro- and macro-levels alike) and intonational and prosodic features.

4. Morphology

In ‘A Native Origin for Present-Day English They, Their, Them’ (Diachronica 35[2018] 165–209), Marcelle Cole argues against the received opinion that the PDE 3PL pronoun is an ON loanword. Rather, Cole suggests, they is a continuation of the OE plural demonstrative pronoun þā (GEN þara, DAT þām). By analysing the translation of Latin pronouns and 3PL verb forms in the Lindisfarne Gospels (BL, Cotton MS Nero D IV), Cole shows that þā was already used anaphorically, in other words as a personal pronoun, in Old Northumbrian. The diphthong in PDE they, which has traditionally been taken as support for the ON etymology, is argued to be a later dialectal development after the original /aː/ had changed to /eː/ in Northern ME.

Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma is the author of ‘Zelotes and Elvnnges: The Extension of Genitive Singular -es in the Gloss to the Durham Collectar’ (Anglia 136[2018] 611–42). This study complements the author’s earlier investigation of the Lindisfarne Gospels (see YWES 98[2019] 23) by looking at genitive marking in the OE gloss in the Durham Collectar (Durham, Cathedral Library MS A.IV.19), which is commonly assumed to have been written by the same scribe, Aldred. It is found that -es has been extended to most nouns which originally had a different GEN.SG ending, except in cases where the NP contains a pronoun in the genitive (e.g. ðinre, dære). The overall conclusion is that the Durham and Lindisfarne glosses show similar systems although they differ in a few cases (e.g. the noun earðe, nouns with the -ness suffix). On the OE case system there is also Aaron Freeman’s ‘Patterns of Retention of the Instrumental Case in Old English’ (NOWELE 71[2018] 35–55). Freeman investigates the survival of the instrumental in pronouns and strong adjectives in the material in YCOE and YCOEP. The data show that the marked instrumental is lost at different rates in different environments, for example its use in temporal NPs like þy geare ‘in that year’ survives longer than in PPs with mid and wiþ, where the instrumental has all but disappeared in late OE prose.

‘Of Lambkins and Piglets in Old English and Beyond’ (TPS 116[2018] 246–56) by Patrick Stiles proposes a revised analysis of OE gefearh sugu ‘sow in farrow/with piglets’, which has traditionally been analysed as a compound. Stiles proposes instead that gefearh was an adjective following the same word-formation pattern as the hapaxes gecealf ‘with calf’, gefol ‘with foal’, and geéan ‘with lamb’, and that these adjectives could be used to describe the mother animal both during and after pregnancy. Stiles also discusses the etymology of *eán ‘lamb’ and its Gmc cognates. Another paper on historical morphology is Arjen P. Versloot and Elżbieta Adamczyk’s ‘Plural Inflection in North Sea Germanic Languages: A Multivariate Analysis of Morphological Variation’ (in Dammel et al., Reorganising Grammatical Variation: Diachronic Studies in the Retention, Redistribution and Refunctionalisation of Linguistic Variants, pp. 17–56). The languages investigated are English, Scots, and six Frisian dialects, and the
authors aim to determine which factors are most important in the retention and innovation of irregular plural noun forms. Using a logistic regression model, they find that the ‘plural percentage’, i.e. the overall frequency of the plural form of a noun, is the strongest predictor of the survival of irregular plural forms. In English and Scots the salience of the plural form is a predictor as well; the authors attribute this to the more widespread i-mutation in these languages in comparison to Frisian, making endingless plurals more recognizable, such as in English mouse–mice as opposed to fifteenth-century Frisian mus–mus with no i-mutation.

R.D. Fulk is the author of A Comparative Grammar of the Early Germanic Languages, a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of the historical phonology and inflectional morphology of the older Gmc languages. The first chapter provides a concise and very well-written introduction to the Gmc language family and the most important reference works. After this follow five chapters on historical phonology (chapters 2–6) and six chapters on historical morphology (chapters 7–12). The individual parts of speech are treated in a way similar to Richard Hogg and Fulk’s Grammar of Old English, vol. 2 (Wiley-Blackwell [2011]), and anyone familiar with that grammar should find the present volume readily accessible. This is true in more than one sense—the e-book version of the book is published in open access and can be downloaded for free from the publisher’s website.

On PDE morphology, there is first Rochelle Lieber and Marios Andreou’s ‘Aspect and Modality in the Interpretation of Deverbal -Er Nominals in English’ (Morphology 28[2018] 187–217). Using a large dataset from COCA and BNC, they examine the semantic roles expressed by verbal -er nominalizations, as well as their aspectual and modal meanings. Their results illustrate a wide range of readings, influenced by the verbal base, context (e.g. animacy, temporal adverbs), and encyclopedic knowledge. They discuss the implications for morphological theory within the Lexical Semantic Framework, arguing against one core meaning for -er. Also on PDE, Hoaran Zhu and Lei Lei ask ‘Is Modern English Becoming Less Inflectionally Diversified?’, using ‘Evidence from Entropy-Based Algorithm’ (Lingua 216[2018] 10–27). The algorithm measuring inflectional diversity is applied to the Hansard corpus of parliamentary records (which is perhaps not the best choice as it reflects neither spontaneous spoken language nor a particular genre of writing) and a smaller set of fiction texts from other corpora. Their results show that there is a decrease in the measure of diversity for nouns and verbs, but not for adjectives. The final contribution on PDE morphology is Elisa Mattiello and Wolfgang U. Dressler’s ‘The Morphosemantic Transparency/Opacity of Novel English Analogical Compounds and Compound Families’ (SAP 53[2018] 67–114). The authors analyse a dataset of 115 new compounds which are based on specific words (beefcake on analogy with cheesecake) or certain patterns (gold-collar after white-collar and blue-collar). Using a six-point scale for transparency, they show that the new compounds are not always transparent (as previous studies suggest) but rather follow the model compound. They further discuss how compound families originate.

We close this section by mentioning the new edition of An Introduction to English Morphology by Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy. Apart from updated recommendations for reading and the addition of a list of terms at the end of each
chapter, there are no major changes; it is still the accessible, comprehensive, yet concise textbook that it already was.

5. Syntax

(a) Modern English

*Levels in Clause Linkage: A Cross-Linguistic Survey*, edited by Tasaku Tsunoda, is a typological study of causal, conditional, and concessive clauses in seventeen languages and dialects, including English. In the introductory chapter by Tasaku Tsunoda and Mie Tsunoda (pp. 1–38), a five-way typology of clause linkage is proposed and compared to a number of earlier studies, including Eve Sweetser’s well-known *From Etymology to Pragmatics* (CUP [1990]). (We note, however, that there is no mention of Functional Grammar or FDG, both of which work with a comparable notion of semantic ‘layers’.) The chapter on English (pp. 77–131), also by Tasaku Tsunoda, presents the findings on PDE on the three clause types investigated: causal (*because, as, since*), conditional (*if, in case, provided that*), and concessive clauses (*although, even though, despite the fact that*). While we are happy to see an analysis of English material put into a broader comparative-typological perspective, it is a pity that the method chosen—asking native speakers to provide acceptability judgements of prefabricated sentences—has not been supplemented with any data from one of the numerous available corpora. We also think it is a most unfortunate choice to collect the acceptability judgements from speakers from five different locations (one Australian, the remaining four from different places in the US). ‘Considerable idiolectal [variation]’ (p. 121) is found between the five informants, but because of the method chosen we have no way of knowing whether this reflects more general dialectal, sociolectal, or stylistic differences.

Several papers investigate specific types of subordinate clauses. Carl Bache analyses clauses with ‘Narrative Before in English’ (*JEL* 46[2018] 23–51), which are subclauses that show certain main-clause characteristics; most importantly, instead of providing background information to the main clause as with temporal *before*, they move the narrative forward, e.g. *They had hardly heard her explanation before Jack burst out crying*. Bas Aarts, Sean Wallis, and Jill Bowie investigate ‘-ing Clauses in Spoken English’, considering their ‘Structure, Usage and Recent Change’ (in Seoane et al., *Subordination in English: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*, pp. 129–54). Based on a study in the Diachronic Corpus of Present-Day Spoken English of -ing clauses of the type *the navy deliberately sinking the ship*, which can function as e.g. subject or object in a clause, they argue that -ing clauses have become more clausal in the last decade (e.g. they increasingly have explicit subjects). The same volume contains a paper by Rahel Oppliger, called ‘Whatever the Specific Circumstances, . . .: A Construction Grammar Perspective of Wh-Ever Clauses in English’ (pp. 263–84). Oppliger presents a corpus study of the academic part of COCA, investigating the verbal slot in wh-ever clauses and the connection to the main clause, before presenting an CxG account with a focus on meaning and pragmatics. Francis Cornish focuses on relative clauses in ‘Revisiting the System of English Relative Clauses: Structure, Semantics, Discourse Functionality’ (*ELL* 22[2018] 431–56). He
analyses the grammatical and discourse properties of relative clauses, following the traditional distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relatives, but adding a third category of ‘a-restrictive’ relative clauses, which are neither.

The paper by Astrid de Wit, ‘The Semantics of the Simple Tenses and Full-Verb Inversion in English: A Story of Shared Epistemic Schemas’ (C&F 10[2018] 210–33), starts from the observation that in sentences with full-verb inversion, simple tense instead of progressive aspect is used to describe ongoing events. De Wit describes in detail the properties of full-verb inversion and simple tense vs progressive aspect, before presenting a CxG account which builds on a shared epistemic meaning for both present tense and full-verb inversion. Also writing on full-verb inversion is Betty Birner, in a paper titled ‘On Constructions as a Pragmatic Category’ (Language 94[2018] e158–e179). She revisits her earlier work on inversion and in particular the relative discourse constraint of placing given information before new. Building on a comparison of properties of inversion, passivization, and non-canonical word orders, she proposes that inversion is subject to two absolute constraints whose restrictions have already been described independently: preposing and postposing. Two contributions to Epistemic Modalities and Evidentiality in Cross-Linguistic Perspective (edited by Zlatka Guentcheva) deal with modality in various clause types in PDE. Agnès Celle investigates ‘Epistemic Evaluation in Factual Contexts in English’ (pp. 22–51), specifically the use of should and would in why-questions (e.g. Why should I apologise for helping charity?) and in complement clauses expressing counter-expectation (e.g. Strange that you should ask). Lionel Dufaye discusses the use of ‘SHOULD in Conditional Clauses: When Epistemicity Meets Appreciative Modality’ (pp. 52–66), and proposes an analysis of If Labour should win the election… and similar uses of should in if-clauses. Also on if-clauses, Cristina Lastres-López’s ‘If-Insubordination in Spoken British English: Syntactic and Pragmatic Properties’ (LangS 66[2018] 42–59) investigates the various functions (request, wish, suggestion, etc.) of insubordinate if-clauses, using the ICE-GB and BNC corpora.

Three papers in the volume The Noun Phrase in English: Past and Present, edited by Alex Ho-Cheong Leung and Wim van der Wurff, concern PDE. Kristin Davidse discusses ‘Complex NPs with Third-Order Entity Clauses’ and works ‘Towards a Grammatical Description and Semantic Typology’ (pp. 11–46). Davidse looks at complex NPs of the type the fact that education is an important factor, where the noun is followed by a clause which expresses a third-order entity, i.e. an abstract proposition. On the basis of a semantic analysis and differences in grammatical behaviour, she proposes that there are in fact two types: one in which the clause is a complement of the noun and one in which the noun is a premodifier of the clause. In ‘The Rich, the Poor, the Obvious: Arguing for an Ellipsis Analysis of “Adjectives Used as Nouns”’ (pp. 77–112), Christine Günther analyses morphosyntactic and semantic properties of NPs consisting of just a determiner and adjective, which either refer to humans, as in the rich, or to abstract concepts, as in the obvious. She proposes that these contain an empty noun, arguing against earlier analyses of reanalysis of adjective to noun. Finally, Marianne Hundt’s ‘Variable Article Usage with Institutional Nouns: An “Oddment” of English?’ (pp. 113–42) is a corpus study of the BNC and COCA that investigates article omission after go to and be at followed by church,
hospital, and university. Using a multivariate analysis she finds that, contrary to general opinion, regional variation is not the most important factor for omitting the article, but rather the choice of noun and the type of modification. The history of each noun is used to explain its preference for omission or retention. More work on NPs is presented by Tine Breban in ‘Proper Names Used as Modifiers: A Comprehensive Functional Analysis’ (ELL 22[2018] 381–401). Using a dataset collected from the Collins WordBanks Online, she carries out a detailed analysis of the function of proper names used as modifiers, e.g. a Yorkshire terrier, re-evaluating earlier distinctions proposed in the literature. Two main functions stand out in her dataset, which she labels epithets (comparable to the red car) and complements (a Kerry supporter).

James Stratton looks at ‘The Use of the Adjective Intensifier Well in British English’ on the basis of ‘A Case Study of The Inbetweeners’ (ES 99[2018] 793–816), as in well angry or well nice. In lieu of a sufficiently large corpus of transcribed speech, Stratton uses the scripted dialogue of a popular television series about a group of adolescents. He finds that well, while not as frequent as e.g. so and very, is used more often than totally and the stereotypical BrE intensifier bloody, and goes on to discuss its collocational patterns and sociolinguistic profile. The grammar of adverbs in BrE is also the subject of Sali A. Tagliamonte’s ‘Near Done; Awful Stable; Really Changing: The Suffixless Adverb in Dialects of the UK’ (Diachronica 35[2018] 107–43). While adverbs without -ly are well known from AmE, they also occur in BrE varieties. Tagliamonte uses a corpus of transcribed interviews with speakers from eight locations in England, Scotland, and Northern Ireland to investigate their frequency and patterns of use. Suffix-less forms occur in all eight samples and in one location in Northern Ireland even account for more than 90 per cent of manner adverbs. She goes on to discuss the implications of these findings for historical (socio)linguistics. Also connecting present-day and diachronic data, ‘Tracing the Development of an Old Old Story: Intensificatory Repetition in English’ (TPS 116[2018] 30–58) by Victorina González-Díaz investigates the functions and development of intensifying repetition of adjectives in the BNC and a number of historical corpora. González-Díaz is also the author of another paper on adjective clusters, ‘Great Big Stories and Tiny Little Changes: Tautological size-Adjective Clusters in Present-Day English’ (ELL 22[2018] 499–522). Her study provides data on the frequency of these clusters, the order of elements in them, and the expanding function of the clusters, especially in interpersonal functions.

In ‘Figurativeness in English Grammar: The Role of Metonymic Tropes and Schemes of Repetition’ (in Böhm and van der Hulst, eds., Substance-Based Grammar: The (Ongoing) Work of John Anderson, pp. 311–36), Graeme Trousdale addresses the question of what role figurative language plays in the grammatical system and especially in language change. He discusses the role of metonymy in derivational processes in English, as well as schemes of repetition in a range of reduplication phenomena in English (e.g. mumbo-jumbo, not going out-out).

Two papers in a special issue of Open Linguistics analyse PDE adverbs from a FDG perspective. Lois Kemp’s ‘English Evidential -ly Adverbs in Main Clauses: A Functional Approach’ (OpenLing 4[2018] 743–61) investigates the functions and distributional patterns of eleven evidential adverbs in BrE news articles.
Some of these adverbs have only a single function, such as supposedly and allegedly, which report second-hand information, and presumably, which expresses speaker inference, while others, such as apparently and clearly, can be used with several different meanings. Evelien Keizer’s contribution ‘Modal Adverbs in FDG: Putting the Theory to the Test’ (OpenLing 4[2018] 356–90) uses spoken and written data from the BNC and investigates ten other adverbs, some of them prototypical modal adverbs (probably, certainly, etc.), others more peripheral members of this category (e.g. hopefully and actually). After providing an initial classification of these adverbs, Keizer looks at their co-ordination patterns, ability to occur in verbal complements, and position in the clause, and proposes a revised classification based on the corpus findings. Interestingly, maybe and perhaps are found to behave very differently syntactically from the (seemingly) synonymous probably and possibly, which leads Keizer to locate them at different semantic layers in the FDG model. The use of maybe and perhaps in BrE is also the topic of Daisuke Suzuki’s ‘Variation Between Modal Adverbs in British English’ (FuL 25[2018] 392–412). The author’s BNC concordances of clauses containing maybe and perhaps were coded for spoken vs written language, subject pronoun, clause position, and co-occurrence with a modal auxiliary. Regarding the difference between the two adverbs, perhaps is found to be much more frequent than maybe both in speech and writing, whereas maybe appears to prefer clause-initial position and often occurs in clauses with a 1st person subject. Suzuki interprets this as an indication that maybe has a more subjective status in BrE than perhaps.

Ursula Lenker, in “‘There’s an Issue There . . .’: Signalling Functions of Discourse-Deictic There in the History of English’ (LS 68[2018] 94–105), surveys the history of there and shows that it has only recently come to be used to refer to the discourse itself. Using data from BNC and COCA, she shows that discourse-deictic there is restricted to spontaneous speech and identifies two interpersonal signalling functions: ‘resumption of topic’ and ‘end of topic’.

In ‘Present-Day English Gerunds: A Multilayered Referential Model’ (FoL 52[2018] 39–74), Charlotte Maekelbergh studies the referential properties of verbal (reading this book) and nominal gerunds (the reading of this book) in present-day BrE and AmE. In addition to the well-known parameters of definiteness and specificity, Maekelbergh considers the actuality vs virtuality and control relations of the gerund. The two types are found to differ more with respect to their actuality status than their specificity.

Carla Vergaro is the author of “‘And the Rabbi Begins the Benediction . . .’: Declarative Shell Nouns in English’ (ES 99[2018] 817–35). This study, grounded in Langackerian Cognitive Grammar, concerns ‘shell nouns’ which refer to declarative speech acts, such as nomination, blessing, benediction, etc., and uses data from COCA to document the various constructions they occur in. Vergaro is also the author of a monograph on the same topic (Illocutionary Shell Nouns in English), which we have not yet received from the publisher.

In a squib ‘On Non-Progressive Being’ (CJL 63[2018] 112–19), Susan F. Schmerling and Diego Gabriel Krivochen discuss sentences of the type I’m being Mary today (i.e. ‘I will be taking over Mary’s functions today’). They argue that such uses are not true progressives, but rather instantiate a special type of restrictive NP reference. Montserrat Martínez-Vásquez studies progressive uses of
love in COCA, COHA, and GloWbE in her paper ‘I’m Loving It! A Corpus-Based Study of the Progress of love’ (JEL 46[2018] 140–66). As well as confirming earlier observations that this use dominates in spoken language, her findings include an increase in frequency and an expansion in grammatical contexts, particularly an intersubjective use. (See also our discussion of Lieselotte Anderwald’s recent paper in YWES 98[2019] 29–30.)

‘Revisiting Hudson’s (1992) OO = O2 Hypothesis: A Usage-Based Variationist Approach to the English Ditransitive Construction’ (ALH 50[2018] 73–101) is the title of a paper by Yoshikata Shibuya and Kim Ebensgaard Jensen. Using various statistical methods, the authors investigate the grammatical characteristics of transitive and intransitive direct objects and argue that these two types of object behave too differently to be considered instantiations of the same syntactic category. Another paper revisiting an older theoretical discussion is Remi van Trijp’s ‘How a Construction Grammar Account Solves the Auxiliary Controversy’ (C&F 9[2017] 251–77). The controversy referred to in the title concerns the analysis of PDE auxiliaries, which in some models (e.g. HPSG) are treated as raising verbs and in others (e.g. LFG) as ‘feature carriers’ in monoclusal structures. Van Trijp claims that a Fluid CxG account of the English VP is superior to these approaches.

Enrico Torre is the author of ‘Concerning the Radial Network View of Argument Structure: The Case of the English Caused-Motion Pattern’ (LS 66[2018] 199–211). This paper addresses the treatment of argument-structure constructions within CxG, specifically the much discussed caused-motion construction (slide an envelope across the table etc.). Torre discusses the various ways this pattern has been dealt with and argues against the ‘radial network’ view that the construction has a ‘basic’ sense from which other senses are derived. Rather, he argues, the argument structure construction itself has only a very general meaning ‘denoting a change in circumstances’ (p. 211), and the various sub-senses are derived from the individual verbs.

The volume Changing Structures: Studies in Constructions and Complementation, edited by Mark Kaunisto, Mikko Höglund, and Paul Rickman, presents a collection of short studies of specific complementation patterns. The chapter by Patrick J. Duffley, ‘Talk Into vs Convince To: Talking as a Cause Leading to Containment, Convincing as a Cause Leading to a Result’ (pp. 15–30) explores the difference between I got Joe to unlock the door and I talked Joe into unlocking the door and tries to entangle the meaning based on the components that make up each pattern instead of analysing it as a construction as previous studies have done. Thomas Egan studies the puzzling observations that ‘Passive Permissives: Being Let and Allowed’ (pp. 31–54) show a skewed distribution (being let is very rare), while their active counterparts are equally frequent. He explains it by looking both at the different semantics of the two verbs and at the type of infinitive (bare vs to). Jouni Rostila’s ‘Goldberg’s Rely On Construction: Overreliance on Generalization?’ (pp. 55–68) re-examines the CxG analysis proposed by Adele Goldberg for sentences such as nibble/rely/bet on something, based on semantically similar constructions in German. Paul Rickman and Mark Kaunisto investigate ‘Aspects of the Use of the Transitive Into -ing Pattern in New Zealand English’ (pp. 71–88), using a newspaper corpus. They find similar frequencies to its use in other varieties of English but also some
innovative verbs unique to NZE. Mikko Höglund explores ‘Complementation of Ashamed—Diachrony and Determinants of Variation’ (pp. 89–108) in COHA and COCA. He finds that ashamed of NP is the most frequent pattern in all periods, but while the to-infinitive was another frequent pattern previously, ashamed is now frequently used without a complement. Veera Saarimäki looks at ‘Sentential Complementation of Propose in Recent British English’ (pp. 109–28), using CLMET and BNC. Her data show that to-infinitives are the most frequent in all periods while other patterns also exist but become less frequent; she also discusses types of subject control in these clauses. Günter Rohdenburg is the author of ‘The Use of Optional Complement Markers in Present-Day English: The Role of Passivization and Other Complexity Factors’ (pp. 129–50), with the optional markers mentioned in the title referring to, for example, complementizer that or infinitive to. He compares active and passive contexts to try and establish whether the Complexity Principle—which states that cognitively more demanding contexts require more explicit markers—holds for the variation in use of these markers. Marcus Callies investigates ‘Patterns of Direct Transitivization and Differences Between British and American English’ (pp. 151–67). Using the BNC, COHA, COCA, and GloWbE, he investigates three verbs (graduate, shop, impact) that are claimed to shift from an intransitive pattern with a PP to a transitive pattern with a direct object. His data show that AmE has a greater and increasing preference for the transitive pattern than BrE. The final three chapters deal with ESL/language contact and will not be discussed here.

Corpus-Based Studies on Non-Finite Complements in Recent English by Paul Rickman and Juhani Rudanko is a collection of four case studies—three on subject control and one on object control. The first three case studies focus on non-finite complementation after three specific adjectives: scared (chapter 2), terrified (chapter 3), and afraid (chapter 4). Each chapter contains a corpus study of COHA, BNC, and in one case COCA, and aims to identify the differences between -ing complements and to-infinitival complements. One overarching theme concerns possible semantic differences between the two types of complements, specifically the amount of agentivity of the controlled subject in the subclause, phrased as the Choice Principle. Central themes are the Great Complement Shift, one aspect of which describes an increasing preference for -ing complements over to-infinitives, and differences between BrE and AmE. The final case study (chapter 5, previously published in an edited volume in 2014) focuses on null objects after the verb warn followed by a non-finite complement clause (warn against doing/warn someone against doing); since there is an object control context, the null object is unexpected. The book seems more a collection of separate studies than a monograph (each chapter has its own abstract and list of references), with only a short introduction and conclusion. As the authors acknowledge in the introduction, the rather extreme focus on a handful of adjectives and one verb means that there is limited generalizability. The same could be said for the theoretical considerations, the focus on the Choice Principles leaving little room for alternative explorations.

Susanne Wagner’s ‘Never Saw One—First-Person Null Subjects in Spoken English’ (ELL 22[2018] 1–34) is a study of first-person null subjects in interviews collected in Newfoundland. Including a range of factors in a linguistic regression analysis, her findings mostly confirm earlier studies, e.g. null subjects
occur more often in shorter turns and at the beginning of turns, and adds the observation that a more complex verb phrase makes a null subject more likely.

Peter Uhrig published a monograph called Subject in English: From Valency Grammar to a Constructionist Treatment of Non-Canonical Subjects, a reworking of his Ph.D. dissertation. Uhrig sets out to describe the properties of various types of subjects, questioning the notion of ‘subject’ in grammar. The starting point in this investigation is the observation that while verbs are generally said to select their complements, the relation between verb and subject has always been seen as looser. However, Uhrig asks whether it is true that there are no grammatical restrictions on subject choice by the verb. After a very brief introduction, the chapter called ‘Theory’ gives an overview of how the ‘subject’ has been defined in previous studies in various frameworks. After pointing out the problems with any definition of ‘subject’, Uhrig rather disappointingly follows the tradition, in approaching the subject based on a list of characteristics, not all of them strictly speaking applicable to every type of subject. This is also the main point in the concluding chapter: the case studies do show certain restrictions on the subject but they do not allow for generalization. Chapter 3 presents the methods (‘Methodological Considerations’): Uhrig works within the framework of valency grammar and uses various contemporary corpora as well as native-speaker judgements. The following chapters each examine a particular type of clause or construction and aim to assess whether there are restrictions on the type of subject: chapter 4 discusses ‘Clausal Subjects in Active Clauses’; chapter 5 presents an ‘Analysis of Subjects in Passive Clauses’, while chapter 6 presents an ‘Analysis of Subjects in Copular Clauses’; chapter 7 focuses on ‘Extraposition’ and chapter 8 on ‘Existentials’. The book is detailed, data-driven, and descriptive—but sometimes this means that the view on interesting theoretical or explanatory issues is minimal; in such cases, previous work on these issues is not always acknowledged (e.g. accounts of pragmatics restrictions on the prepositional passive).

Two textbooks on English syntax were published in 2018. Introducing English Syntax: A Basic Guide for Students of English is written by Peter Fenn and Götz Schwab. The authors’ aim, as explained in the introduction, is to describe the structure of English phrases and sentences, primarily for non-native speakers studying English. The book contains twelve chapters, starting with defining word classes, phrases, clauses, and sentences, before moving on to the structure of sentences and phrases. The book is structured in such a way that each sentence or phrase is first discussed in its simplest form, after which later chapters elaborate on more complex options; for instance, NPs are introduced in chapter 4, and chapter 10 describes complex NPs; similarly, simple sentences are introduced in chapter 2, while later chapters discuss complex sentences (chapter 6) and specific types of subclauses (e.g. chapter 7, on infinitival clauses). The ‘basic’ in the title is somewhat misleading: the first chapters dive right in with a considerable amount of terminology, and the range of topics described is much more than ‘basic’, or indeed, what most EFL learners need. This means that the book is not really introductory, but it is also not a full reference work or, indeed, a grammar for learners of English. The notational conventions and layout are not always helpful, and for an audience of non-native speakers, the example sentences seem especially random and unnatural (typical textbook examples). We thus feel that
for introductory textbooks and reference works, there are better alternatives already available. The other textbook, Christina Tortora's *Understanding Sentence Structure: An Introduction to English Syntax*, was not received in time for review and will be covered next year.

Finally, we would like to mention Julia Bacskaï-Atkari’s monograph *Deletion Phenomena in Comparative Constructions: English Comparatives in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, published in open access by Language Science Press and freely available online. The focus of this book is mainly theoretical, concerning the analysis of comparative deletion within a minimalist framework with examples from English, Hungarian, Czech, and a number of other languages. From an English perspective the most interesting aspect may be the treatment in chapter 6 of different types of VP-ellipsis, which may lead to ambiguous examples like *More people die each year from falling coconuts than sharks* (p. 171).

(b) Earlier English
Lotte Sommerer’s book *Article Emergence in Old English: A Constructionalist Perspective* proposes a CxG account of the development of the definite and indefinite articles in early English. In addition to the introduction and conclusion along with an appendix with text information, the book contains six main chapters. Chapter 2 provides a detailed overview of ‘Nominal Determination and the Articles in Present Day English’ and defines a number of central terms (‘determiner’, ‘article’, ‘(in)definiteness’, etc.). Sommerer proposes seven criteria for article-hood in PDE, such as ‘no independence’, obligatoriness, and fixed position, which serve to distinguish the (in)definite articles from demonstratives and other determiners. Chapter 3, ‘Article Emergence in Old English’, first surveys the forms and functions of *se* and *an* in OE and points out the differences and similarities between these and the PDE articles. She then critically reviews earlier work on the development of the English articles, including various functional hypotheses, generative work, and language contact scenarios, concluding that earlier accounts have failed to unify functional and formal-systemic motivations and suggesting that a CxG approach offers a way to deal with this issue. Chapter 4, simply titled ‘Diachronic Construction Grammar’, introduces the central tenets of this framework, such as the notions of the constructional network, entrenchment, and constructionalization. Chapters 5 and 6 present the main findings on ‘Nominal Determination in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’ and ‘Nominal Determination in Old English Prose’, respectively. Two of the chronicles are investigated and compared, the Peterborough and the Parker versions. Sommerer applies the seven criteria for PDE article-hood and concludes that while some of them are not easily applicable to OE, the evidence suggests that *se* may be classified as a definite article in the chronicles, while *an* is still a numeral and is only occasionally found with article function. She also finds that the use of definite determiners increases in the chronicles but notes that this may be due to the increasingly narrative style of the chronicles—with more anaphoric NPs—rather than a change in the use of determiners. The findings in chapter 6, however, suggest that there is indeed an increase in the use of *se* between earlier and later OE prose. Finally, chapter 7, ‘Article Emergence: A Constructional Scenario’, proposes an analogy-based explanation of the development of the article category in
English. As Sommerer points out, the observation that a demonstrative has grammaticalized into an article does not explain why this change happens in some languages but not in others. She suggests that the definite article developed in OE because the language already had a ‘determination slot’ at the left edge of the NP which was generally filled in definite NPs, e.g. by a deictic or possessive pronoun. The demonstrative *se* was then recruited as a default ‘slot filler’.

A number of papers investigate the emerging periphrastic passive in OE. ‘The Status of Passive Constructions in Old English’ (TPS 116[2018] 59–90) by Howard Jones and Morgan Macleod revisits an older discussion about the difference between the copulas *weorðan* and *wesan/beon* in this construction. The authors use a selection of texts from YCOE to test how a number of factors, most importantly *Aktionsart*, influence the choice of copula. They find that *wesan/beon* is the only option in the case of non-transitional events (i.e. with no change of state, such as *wait* and *walk*), while there is competition with *weorðan* in the expression of transitional events; however, *wesan/beon* is also the favoured choice here. The authors speculate that this copula may have been preferred because of the disambiguating effect of the semantic opposition between *beon* and *wesan*. In another paper, ‘Grammaticalization and Deflexion in Progress: The Past Participle in the Old English Passive’ (SN 90[2018] 155–75), Javier Martín Arista and Ana Elvira Ojanguren López investigate the degree of grammaticalization in the OE passive by looking at the presence or absence of agreement on the past participle. They also use the YCOE for this purpose and find that the participle is unmarked more often when it appears in the periphrastic passive than in other contexts. (We are not particularly surprised by this finding, as the participle in passive constructions inflects as a strong adjective, which is zero-marked in the NOM.SG; the authors do not seem to take this into account.) Finally, there is Matti Kilpiö’s ‘Passives of Possessive (*Ge*)Habban in a Passage in Ælfric’s Catholic Homily I, 33 in the Light of a Recently Discovered Augustinian Source’ (Anglia 136[2018] 269–79). Kilpiö discusses the striking occurrence of *gehæfd* in one of Ælfric’s homilies, which he takes to be the only certain attestation of possessive (*ge*)habban ‘have’ in the passive in the entire DOE corpus. The passage is an almost gloss-like literal translation of a sermon by Augustine, and Kilpiö argues that both texts deliberately ‘stretch the limits of syntactic and semantic acceptability’ (p. 275) for stylistic purposes.

Michiko Ogura’s book *Periphrases in Medieval English* surveys a number of syntactic patterns in OE and ME, providing copious examples and a critical discussion of the way they are treated in the standard dictionaries. The introduction (pp. 13–18) begins with some general remarks on the change in English from synthetic to more analytic structures (though these terms are only introduced in chapter 14), and goes on to examine a number of entries in the *OED* and other dictionaries. The overarching goals and structure of the book are never explained, and the author’s (evidently very broad) notion of periphrasis is not clearly defined. The following fourteen chapters each discuss a different ‘periphrastic’ phenomenon, such as modal auxiliaries, the perfect and passive, impersonals, reflexives, and particle verbs. The brief conclusion (pp. 89–90) offers some further general remarks. Some of the discussions of individual examples may prove useful to readers working on the patterns in question, but the slim volume does not do justice to the extensive subject matter and suffers from an almost
complete lack of engagement with the linguistic literature from the last decades. More than two-thirds of the references are to the author’s own work, and a conspicuous number of relevant studies are overlooked or ignored (e.g. work by David Denison, Manfred Markus, Ayumi Miura, Ruth Möhlig-Falke, Peter Petré, Anthony Warner, and many others).

The volume Explorations in English Historical Syntax, edited by Cuykens et al., contains papers that were first presented at ICEHL18 in Leuven, 2014. The volume starts with an introductory chapter by Hubert Cuykens (‘Exploring English Historical Syntax’, pp. 1–22) which, in addition to introducing the chapters, also contains an overview of recent developments in the field. As can be expected from a volume like this, the papers deal with a wide range of topics. Bettelou Los examines “‘Permissive’ Subjects and the Decline of Adverbial Linking in the History of English’ (pp. 23–50). She reviews how the loss of adverbial linking in clause-initial position resulted in an increased flexibility of the subject’s semantic roles, and connects this to other changes in the grammatical options available to speakers, in particular the increase in valency alternations such as the causative/ergative Amazon shipped the order/The order has shipped.

Nikolaos Lavidas’s ‘Cognate Noun Constructions in Early Modern English: The Case of Tyndale’s New Testament’ (pp. 51–76) analyses how Tyndale translates Greek cognate noun constructions (as the PDE example He laughed a loud laugh). He argues that there is no translation effect from Greek but that Tyndale draws on an earlier productive English pattern of cognate noun constructions, which fits his tendency to use archaic forms. Günter Rohdenburg, in ‘On the Differential Evolution of Simple and Complex Object Constructions in English’ (pp. 77–104), reviews diachronic evidence of a range of verbs which shows that the ‘simple’ object in English has expanded functionally, compensating for the loss of many patterns with prepositional objects and adjuncts. In contrast, more complex object structures have been lost. Brian Lowrey studies ‘Finite Causative Complements in Middle English’ (pp. 105–39), focusing on VP+that and VP+NP+that. He argues that VP+that is an OE structure which remains marginally productive in ME, while VP+NP+that is an ME innovation, part of the many changes in the causative system at the time. Yoko Iyeiri also considers causatives, but focuses on ‘Causative Make and Its Infinitival Complements in Early Modern English’ (pp. 139–58). Her data from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries show that bare infinitives were initially a minority pattern but later replaced the to-infinitive as the majority pattern. Iyeiri then investigates various factors (e.g. type and length of object) that influence the alternation between the two forms, all based around the Complexity Principle: a more complex environment requires a fuller form, in this case to. In their chapter, Mark Davies and Jong-Bok Kim examine ‘Semantic and Lexical Shifts with the “Into-Causative” Construction in American English’ (pp. 159–78) in various large corpora from 1800 onwards (COHA, COCA, BNC). They present a large amount of new data on the increase both in the frequency of this construction and in the range of verbs used, as well as some smaller shifts in the semantics of the construction. Carla Bouzada-Jabois studies ‘Free Adjuncts in Late Modern English’, providing ‘A Corpus-Based Study’ (pp. 179–202). Using the PPCMBE to search for these free adjuncts (e.g. PDE Inflating her lungs, Mary screamed), she describes factors such as the type of head, the position, and the element that
introduces the free adjunct, comparing her data in detail to similar studies on eModE and PDE. David Tizón-Couto’s ‘Complexity and Genre Distribution of Left-Dislocated Strings after the Fixation of SVO Syntax’ (pp. 203–34) uses the parsed corpora of historical English to analyse the development of left-dislocated items since ME. He traces the overall decline, provides a logistic regression analysis to find out which factors influence the use of short or long dislocated items, and considers the effect of genre. Christine Eilsweiler, in ‘Why Scotsmen Will Drown and Shall Not Be Saved: The Historical Development of Will and Shall in Older Scots’ (pp. 235–58), provides a corpus study of will and shall in the Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots (1450–1700). She analyses frequency, developments in types of modality expressed (e.g. volitional will declines), and the effect of grammatical person on the type of modality. Kousuke Kaita provides ‘A Study of Old English Dugan: Its Potential for Auxiliation’ (pp. 259–82) looking at the obsolete preterite-present verb dugan, which has been described as a non-modal in earlier studies. Kaita argues that while in OE it is used as a lexical verb, the ME data show signs of auxiliary status. Finally, Reijirou Shibasaki investigates ‘Sequentiality and the Emergence of New Constructions’ by considering the shell-noun construction ‘That’s the Bottom Line Is (That) in American English’ (pp. 283–306), using COHA and COCA. It is argued that this recent phenomenon is an apo-koinou construction where two clauses have one word in common, in this case resulting in a merger of anaphoric and cataphoric meaning. The rise of this construction is explained using the CxG framework.

Ilkka Mönkkönen looks at ‘Negators in Contrastive Constructions in Old English’ (SN 90[2018] 1–16), i.e. constructions of the type X (and) not Y, not Y but X, etc. The negations na, nalles, and næs, which all occur in such constructions in OE, are investigated in a small corpus of prose and glosses. The texts differ substantially in their choice of negation, but na appears to be preferred in the later texts; for instance, it is the only negation used in texts by Ælfric (e.g. þeostru. and na leoht ‘darkness, and not light’), whereas Bede only uses nalles (e.g. wilsumlic, nales geneðedlic ‘voluntarily, not compulsory’). Mönkkönen also discusses the rhetorical functions of the various types of contrastive constructions. Another paper on OE, ‘Complex Quantifiers with Genitive and Concord in Old English and Beyond’ (JCGL 21[2018] 381–419) by Dorian Roehrs and Christopher Sapp, proposes a generative analysis of NPs with ‘etymologically complex’ quantifiers (naenig, awiht, etc.) and compares the OE findings with OHG and OlIcel material.

The topic of a paper by Jerzy Nykiel is ‘Onmang þæt—Incipient Grammaticalisation in Old and Middle English’ (TPS 116[2018] 574–93). Following a productive OE pattern, the preposition onmang ‘among’ combines with the complementizer þæt and grammatizes into a temporal subordinator. It is used in OE and ME, but lost in the late thirteenth century. Nykiel uses a generative framework to model the process of grammaticalization and discusses the features of incipient grammaticalization, which in this paper is understood as a halted process of grammaticalization. Another paper which discusses ‘unsuccessful’ grammaticalization, but in a later period, is Mégane Lesuisse and Maarten Lemmens’s ‘Grammaticalisation Cut Short: A Diachronic Constructional View on English Posture Verbs’ (in Coussé, Andersson, and Olofsson, eds., Grammaticalization Meets Construction Grammar, pp. 43–74). The authors
analyse the cardinal posture verbs *sit*, *stand*, and *lie*, which have not grammaticalized into e.g. locative or habitual markers in English, in contrast to cognates in closely related languages. Their study provides further data on the use of these verbs between 1500 and 1920, showing that there are initially some signs of grammaticalization, but only some fixed patterns are used in an extended sense of *sit*, *lie*, or *stand*, and these are ultimately also lost. The authors find only limited evidence for an earlier hypothesis that the grammaticalization process stopped because the verbs acquired a dynamic meaning.

Elly van Gelderen’s textbook *Analyzing Syntax through Texts: Old, Middle, and Early Modern English* appeared in 2018 (according to the front matter; the publisher’s website has 2017). This book is neither just an introduction to historical syntax nor a traditional anthology of texts, but something in between. It takes OE, ME, and eModE texts as the point of departure for an introduction to the grammatical changes that characterize these periods, and it thus gives the student more reading practice than most historical syntax introductions and more grammatical explanation than most anthologies. The first chapter provides a very brief introduction to UG, grammaticalization, the analytic/synthetic distinction, and like matters, after which chapter 2 introduces the major syntactic changes from OE to eModE. The three remaining chapters are devoted to OE, early ME, and late ME and eModE. Excerpts from a number of medieval and early modern texts are discussed on the basis of facsimiles of the original manuscripts and prints, and various grammatical features are pointed out, such as constituent order, inflectional endings (or lack thereof), and the choice of relative markers. The book is written in a casual and accessible style, but unfortunately it also contains quite a few inaccuracies. A gloss of a Latin text is used as evidence for OE word order (p. 18), the OE *a*-prefix is said to be a ‘weakened’ form of the prefix *ge*- (p. 79), and passages in the texts are often missing from the translations (e.g. pp. 31, 157). Many of the transcriptions are also unreliable, and the facsimiles themselves often of low quality. We thus find the intentions of the book laudable, but wish that it had been written and edited with more care and attention to detail.

The volume *The Noun Phrase in English*, edited by Alex Ho-Cheong Leung and Wim van der Wurff contains several papers on earlier English. Annette Mantlik and Hans-Jörg Schmid’s ‘That-Complementiser Omission in N + BE + That-clauses’ (pp. 187–222), zooms in on one particular type of *that*-complementizer clauses, namely those following an abstract noun and a copular verb, as in *The truth is that she never wanted to come anyway*. They trace the variation between omission and retention of *that* in the COHA and a self-compiled corpus, and argue that initial stages show stylistic variation and a restriction of the zero variant to one noun, *truth*, whereas more recent stages show signs that the zero variant might become a separate construction. Alex Ho-Cheong Leung and Wim van der Wurff, in ‘Anaphoric Reference in Early Modern English: The Case of *Said* and *Same*’ (pp. 143–86), aim to trace and explain in detail the decline of the anaphoric expressions *the said N* and *the same*, which were both frequent in the sixteenth century but declined quite dramatically afterwards. Based on a selection of texts from the EEBO between 1500 and 1700, they conclude that these are two separate developments, suggesting two separate explanations for the decline, building on the specific semantic and grammatical context for each form.
Victorina González-Díaz looks at ‘Adjective Stacking in Early Modern English’, presenting ‘Some Stylistic Considerations’ (pp. 47–76). Focusing on pairs of two adjectives in the PPCEME, she provides data for this relatively new pattern in eModE, comparing it to the older pattern of co-ordination of adjectives. She also considers the possible effects of genre, finding that the stacked pattern is more frequent in less formal written genres.

Two papers by Ayumi Miura investigate the history of denominal verbs. ‘One hour hath orphan’d me, and widow’d me: A Syntactic and Semantic History of English Verbs Converted from Human Nouns’ (ES 99[2018] 194–215) focuses on verbs derived from human nouns, such as orphan, bully, usher, etc. Using the OED as a corpus, Miura documents the changes in productivity and syntactic context of these verbs from OE to PDE. The second paper bears the title ‘Shall sweet Bianca practise how to bride it? The Role of Dummy Object It in the Diachronic Transitivity Change of Denominal Conversion Verbs’ (SN 90[2018] 17–31). Here the use of the ‘empty’ object pronoun it with denominal verbs is investigated, as in ‘Lord Angelo Dukes it well in his absence’ (Measure for Measure (F1) III.i.360). Miura argues that this construction, which is first attested in the sixteenth century, has served different functions for different verbs, acting both as a transitivizing and a de-transitivizing strategy.

On OE word order, there is Anna Cichosz ‘The V-2 Rule in Old English Conjunct Clauses’ (FLH 39[2018] 253–96). Cichosz convincingly shows that there is no reason to separate conjunct and non-conjunct clauses in studies of V2 in OE: she analyses inversion in conjunct clauses in the YCOE, demonstrating that the same factors that influence inversion in non-conjunct clauses also apply in conjunct clauses (although unfortunately, instead of analysing information structure, she equates definiteness with information status, not acknowledging that this is a proxy at most). The only difference she finds is that there are fewer relevant contexts in conjunct clauses for inversion, i.e. fewer topicalized elements. Also on V2 and its subsequent loss, there is Bettelou Los and Ans van Kemenade’s ‘Syntax and the Morphology of Deixis: The Loss of Demonstratives and Paratactic Clause Linking’ (in Coniglio et al., Atypical Demonstratives: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics, pp. 127–58). The authors illustrate how the morphologically rich demonstrative paradigm in OE had an important function for discourse linking, clausal linking, and topic shift, especially in initial position, in turn closely embedding it in the V2 system. They discuss how the loss of this paradigm played an important role in the loss of V2 by making certain grammatical options unavailable, which led to an increase in alternative strategies.

Anna Cichosz studies aspects of inversion in historical English in two papers. In ‘The Constituent Order of Hwæt-Clauses in Old English Prose’ (JGL 30[2018] 1–42), she presents a detailed analysis of clauses with hwæt in initial position in the YCOE. She considers the position of the verb and various other factors known to influence verb and subject placement, concluding that hwæt-clauses do not pattern with subordinate clauses, as previously proposed, but with co-ordinated clauses. In ‘The Origin of English Clause-Initial Quotative Inversion’ (JHS 8[2018] 318–55), Cichosz traces the history of clauses with inversion where the verb and subject precede a quotation (said a pollster: ‘...’). Using the Penn-Helsinki parsed corpora, BNC, and COHA, she demonstrates that the pattern is present at all historical stages of the language, although it is
Two papers discuss ME word order. Eric Haeberli’s ‘Syntactic Effects of Contact in Translations: Evidence from Object Pronoun Placement in Middle English’ (ELL 22[2018] 301–21) investigates the influence of French source texts on word order in ME translations, focusing on the position of object pronouns. He first shows that the known decrease in SOV orders with object pronouns is quicker when outliers are excluded, and then analyses these outlier texts, which are all close translations from OF and AN. Influence of the source texts is ‘very plausible’, but is statistical (i.e. showing higher rates for a particular order) rather than a result of the use of non-native patterns. Eva Zehentner, in ‘Ditransitives in Middle English: On Semantic Specialisation and the Rise of the Dative Alternation’ (ELL 22[2018] 149–75), investigates two developments in ME ditransitives which she argues to be strongly correlated: the establishment of the systematic alternation between the direct object pattern and one with a prepositional to, and a narrowing of the semantics associated with the direct object pattern. Her detailed empirical investigation of the PPCME2 data locates these developments in the lME period. She provides a formal analysis in the CxG framework, which builds on an underlying ‘constructeme’ with two different expressions.

Ann Taylor and Susan Pintzuk make a case for ‘Why We Need Parsed Corpora’ by presenting a study on ‘Split Coordination in English’ (Diachronica 35[2018] 310–37) e.g. cases such as and this is where my aunt lives and my uncle. They show that such a study would be impossible in large corpora with limited or no annotation. Their investigation makes clear that there are two types of split co-ordination in OE, one which survives into PDE, and another which is lost at the end of eModE. They also find a small effect of weight on splitting.

Nikki van de Pol is the author of ‘Adapting to Survive: The English Absolute and Its New Functional Niche’ (FuL 25[2018] 363–91). This paper traces the development of the absolute construction from OE to PDE and documents a major functional change starting in ME. Whereas the OE absolute was predominantly used with temporal and other clearly adverbial meanings (as in þyss-um gefylled-um these-DAT ended-DAT ‘when these had ended’), from ME onwards circumstantial and ‘elaboration’ uses become increasingly frequent, with the absolute in many cases behaving more like a co-ordinating construction. Van de Pol attributes this functional shift to ME case loss, which meant that the absolute was unmarked for case and hence less well suited to unambiguously adverbial functions.

In a volume on Category Change from a Constructional Perspective, edited by Van Goethem et al., asks ‘Why Would Anyone Take Long?’, discussing the role of ‘Word Classes and Construction Grammar in the History of Long’ (pp. 119–48). Denison’s point of departure, long, can usually be classified unambiguously as either an adjective or an adverb, but appears to defy classification in expressions like It won’t take long, I won’t be long, etc. He investigates the history of these patterns and suggests that the problem of classification is only really a problem if one assumes discrete word-class boundaries a priori. Looking at it from a CxG point of view, there is no problem because word classes are
merely seen as linguists’ generalizations, and elements of individual constructions need not fit neatly into these categories. In the same volume, Lauren Fonteyn and Liesbet Heyvaert investigate ‘Category Change in the English Gerund: Tangled Web or Fine-Tuned Constructional Network?’ (pp. 149–77). The topic here is the various functions of bare nominal and verbal gerunds in ME, which could refer to either generic event types or (non)-specific instances of events. An important subtype of the latter is the ‘clausally grounded’ use where the context calls for a specific reading even though there is no determiner, as in *I had never so grete sorow as I have for losyng of yondir knyght* (Malory, *Morte Darthur*), i.e. ‘for my loss of that knight’. The authors find that bare nominal and verbal gerunds both occur with generic, non-specific, and specific (‘clausal’) meaning in ME, although the last type is more frequent with verbal gerunds, as are examples with multiple possible readings. They interpret the rise of the verbal gerund as the development of a new ‘hybrid’ category which is gradually specialized to express clausal deixis.

Karen Sullivan’s ‘Being-Clauses in Historical Corpora and the US Second Amendment’ (*ES* 99[2018] 325–43) provides a good example of applied historical linguistics, using corpus data to shed light on the much-discussed Second Amendment to the US Constitution. One of the controversies surrounding this amendment is how the first clause (‘A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State . . .’) should be interpreted against the second (‘the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed’). Sullivan discusses four possible readings and investigates their use in three diachronic corpora and the writings of James Madison, the main author of the amendment. She concludes that the most likely reading of the being-clause in the Second Amendment is an external causal one, followed by temporal and epistemic causal readings.

The volume *Subordination in English*, edited by Elena Seoane, Carlos Acuña-Fariña, and Ignacio Palacios-Martínez, contains several papers that are relevant for this section. Hendrik De Smet’s chapter ‘From *Flying Sancho* to *Swooning Altisidora*: The Changing Use of Premodifying Present Participles in Three English Translations of Cervantes’ *Don Quijote*’ (pp. 25–42) looks at present participles used as premodifiers in NPs, e.g. *the sobbing boy*, which describe an event which is backgrounded relative to the main clause. Using a small and very specific corpus—an eModE, a lModE, and a PDE translation of *Don Quijote*—he shows that these participles become more frequent and that they expand functionally. Alexander Bergs’s ‘*Because Science!* Notes on a Variable Conjunction’ (pp. 43–60) shows by means of data from COHA, COCA, and GloWbE that the use of *because* followed by an adjective or NP is not a recent innovation but has increased in recent times, especially in online communication. He provides a CxG analysis, focusing on the pragmatic difference between related constructions. David Denison discusses ‘*That*-clauses as Complements of Verbs or Nouns’ (pp. 61–84). Data from COHA show that communication verbs move from being complemented with a shell noun followed by a *that*-clause (*it highlighted the fact that this was a unique case*) to being complemented by only a *that*-clause (*she acknowledges that it was a blunder*). He suggests analogy as a cause for this change but also discusses differences in grammaticality judgements between speakers. In ‘Semantic Roles as a Factor Affecting Complement Choice:
A Case Study with Data from COHA’ (pp. 85–102), Juhani Rudanko examines the complementation of the adjective *unaccustomed*, specifically the choice between the *to*-infinitive and *to* followed by a gerund. His data show that the gerund replaces the *to*-infinitive as the more frequent option in recent times. He explains this with reference to the Choice Principle, which relates to the semantic role of the subject, where the *to*-infinitive is associated with more agentive subjects. Günter Rohdenburg, in ‘Expanding the Type You Can’t Help Laughing’ (pp. 103–28), investigates the expression in the title as well as can’t help but laugh and traces their frequency and characteristics in the BNC and a newspaper corpus, pointing out extensions of this type of construction (e.g. addition of a preposition, using can or could instead of able to). Hubert Cuyckens and Frauke D’hoedt’s ‘Resourceful Ways of Recruiting Members: The Origin and Development of Mental Zero-Secondary Predicate Constructions’ (pp. 155–84) investigates the history of clauses such as *I thought her strongly beautiful* (also known as small clauses), using the Penn-Helsinki parsed corpora of historical English. They show that these zero-SPCs have increased in frequency since OE and come to be used with more types of verbs; they investigate the second point in detail, looking at both language-internal (analogy) and language-external (French influence) factors. Christian Mair studies ‘The Rise of Long Catenary Constructions in Modern English’, showing that these series of verbs attract ‘New Sub-Schemas and New Stylistic Options’ (pp. 185–208). Focusing on *make NP want to* in COHA and COCA, he observes an increase in these forms in recent periods, as well as an increase in length and syntactic complexity. He analyses this within a CxG framework and also looks at translation to German and Spanish.

James Berry’s ‘A Generative Approach to Lexicalisation’ looks at ‘Speech-Act Frankly in the History of English’ (*WORD* 64[2018] 135–56), which has changed from modifying a verb to being a sentence-initial speech-act modifier. He traces these changes in various diachronic and synchronic corpora and argues for a development of lexicalization, modelling this in a generative cartographic framework. Another study on one specific word and its changing function is Ole Schützler’s ‘Grammaticalisation and Information Structure: Two Perspectives on Diachronic Changes of Notwithstanding in Written American’ (*ELL* 22[2018] 101–22). Using the COHA, Schützler shows that while notwithstanding could initially be used for several grammatical functions, it later becomes mostly restricted to a postposition function as well as declining in frequency overall. He further argues that among concessive adpositions, notwithstanding is relatively frequent because of the unique options it presents for structuring information in the sentence.

On diachronic CxG, there is the paper ‘The Changing Functions of Competing Forms: Attraction and Differentiation’ (*CogLing* 29[2018] 197–234) by Hendrik De Smet, Frauke D’hoedt, Lauren Fonteyn, and Kristel Van Goethem. Working within a CxG framework, the authors address the question of how functionally overlapping forms develop over time, discussing the traditional scenarios based on competition leading to differentiation or substitution, but adding to this alternative ideas of attraction—where forms become more similar and continue to co-exist—and a refined notion of differentiation within constructional networks. They illustrate and substantiate these notions with several case studies on
syntactic change in Dutch and English (begin followed by -ing vs infinitives, secondary predicate constructions, start followed by -ing vs infinitives). Working from a similar perspective on causes of language change, Lauren Fonteyn and Charlotte Maekelberge, in ‘Competing Motivations in the Diachronic Nominalization of English Gerunds’ (Diachronica 35[2018] 487–524), investigate the indefinite nominal gerund (e.g. a gallant twirling of his moustache) in lModE. Using data from CLMET, they show that this form is a true innovation in this period and continues to show increasingly nominal behaviour over time, i.e. is a case of diachronic nominalization. In explaining the innovation within the constructional network, they argue that this nominal gerund does not fill a functional gap, but rather shows an extension of options available for other nouns in the language.

Peter Petré and Freek Van de Velde’s ‘The Real-Time Dynamics of the Individual and the Community in Grammaticalization’ (Language 94[2018] 867–900) is a detailed study of the spread of future be going to in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century BrE. The writings of thirty-six authors born in the seventeenth century, grouped into four generations, were searched, and all instances of be going to were analysed for a number of syntactic and semantic features correlating with a future interpretation (argument/adjunct fronting, passive voice, inanimate subjects, etc.). There is a marked increase of such features between generations one (born 1606–16) and two (born 1625–31), suggesting that only the latter group acquired future be going to in childhood. The development of be going to is also discussed in Sune Gregersen’s review article ‘Some (Critical) Questions for Diachronic Construction Grammar’ (FLH 39[2018] 341–60). Among more theoretical issues relating to diachronic CxG, Gregersen discusses Elizabeth Closs Traugott’s recent analysis of be going to (see YWES 97[2018] 51) and argues that this overlooks the early emergence of inanimate subjects. Seventeenth-century material from EEBOCorp is used to document this innovation.

Another review article is ‘Cyclical Ups and Downs’ (SiL 41[2017] 1007–26) by Jeffrey Heath, which discusses the notion of ‘cyclical’ language change as explored in two volumes edited by Elly van Gelderen (Cyclical Change [2009] and its sequel Cyclical Change Continued [2016], both published by Benjamins). Both volumes contain studies on the history of English and on cross-linguistic phenomena with close parallels in English, such as Jespersen’s cycle in Afrikaans and other languages. Heath is impressed by the general quality of the individual contributions but also questions the usefulness of viewing successive changes as part of a ‘cycle’ if this is merely epiphenomenal and the individual steps can be described and explained without reference to cyclicity. This criticism is well known in the context of grammaticalization studies, but as Heath argues, ‘replacement cycles’ of the Jespersen type may suffer from the same theoretical weakness.

6. Semantics

The Diachrony of Verb Meaning: Aspect and Argument Structure by Elly van Gelderen offers a comprehensive account of language change in verb meaning in