Internal Relations in Double-headed Noun Phrases

María de la Cruz Expósito González

UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA

One of the major problems in the analysis of the English noun phrase is related to the internal structure of its head. Among all the possible nuclear categories, nouns take a greater variety of contexts, and constitute the predominating class in the majority of them. The combination of noun+noun implies certain categorization difficulties. The relations established between the elements concerned might be of modification and/or apposition on the one hand, coordination (including for previous historical stages such as the fifteenth century studied here doublet patterns), and compounding, on the other. Those relations viewed from a historical perspective present certain categorization problems that affect the general structural conception of the noun phrase.

Therefore, the impossibility to distinguish the actual function of these units in the structure of the noun phrase is among the greater inconveniencies. This is due to the fact that the pattern noun+noun might be interpreted as a double-head nuclear structure, or as a modification (pre-/post-) structure. In the fifteenth century Chancery documents analysed for this paper, nouns constitute the preferred premodifier category in the noun phrase after adjectives, as postmodifiers their value is also considerable, though not so high. However, the frequency of these structures seems to be historically determined, and a fluctuation can be appreciated between the data of the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. These divergencies can be explained both historically and stylistically.

The structure of the nominal head of a noun phrase is one of the most troublesome aspects when dealing with a sintactyc-structural description of this linguistic unit, particularly in reference to historical periods such as the middle and early modern stages of the English language. The problems that might be met with are mostly related to the analysis of three main phenomena: apposition, coordination and composition. Besides, other structural components of the noun phrase such as premodifying and postmodifying elements are also involved, since their fundamental status will not be clear in many specific examples found in the corpus analysed for this paper. The latter (the modifiers) will be controversial mostly in relation to their classification and distinction as opposed to composite heads, be they compound, coordinated, juxtaposed or appositive. Furthermore, the degree of lexicalization, so difficult to discern and measure even nowadays, is part of the most helpful criteria in discerning which case we are facing, but it is also controversial in itself, even more so when we are dealing with other historical periods, as the 15th century Chancery documents used as a primary source for this paper. These texts from the first half of the century serve as the linguistic model for the study of the pre-standardised English language of the period.

Of a total number of 4397 noun heads in the corpus of Chancery documents analysed, 407 show double head structures, either due to the coordination of elements proper or by the introduction of other types of relation. Three of those combinations coordinate two nouns, one of them in the genitive, and two a noun and a deverbal nominalization in *-ing*. The other 402 cases include two or more nouns in the nuclear slot. Among them, there are some 141 cases formed by a title + noun sequence, with a relationship that, from different gramatical perspectives, has been classified as an apposition. The remnant are either coordinated properly speaking, that is, the union of two elements of the same rank, fulfilling the same function by means of a conjunction (although

there are also examples of asyndetic coordination), with a different referential value, or doublets[1], that is, coordinated elements that share partially or fully their referenciality or denotation.

The combinations of nouns are more frequent in the Chancery texts (9.25% of the total number of noun heads) than in the results offered for a century later by Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) in her analyses of the writings of Thomas More; however, the fact that Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) includes compound-nouns and all other sequences of noun + noun (with the sole exception of the sequences title + noun) in the same group should be borne in mind when considering these results.

The ultimate origen of this syntactic structure that implies the use of repetitive or synonymous words is found in the process through which the speakers of English intended to adequate their language to official and cultural levels that up to then were generally restricted to Latin or French in Late Middle English. This adequation is manifested mainly in the use of loanwords and neologisms primarily through the means of text translation. It is, primarily, a typical feature of the curial style.

Burnley (1986: 593-4) includes the use of lexical doublets and triplets among the characteristic features of the Latin and French curial style, together with "certain anaphoric cohesive devices and extensive clausal qualifiers". This style, natural to official and administrative documents is frequently more concerned with the establishment of pragmatic factors ("mutual attitudes or relative status") than with information content. Even though clarity was one of the features most desired for in the original curial style, in English, throughout the fourteenth century, it was abandoned in favour of syntactic elaboration.

Clause structures and clause relationships are therefore correspondingly less important in establishing the coherence of the text than is the clear specification of the meaning of groups or phrases and the relationships between them in terms of reference. Both nominal and verbal groups frequently have pairs or triplets of mutually defining near-synonyms so as to clarify their significance. In addition, in the case of referring expressions (nominal groups), such pairs, or even short lists, function to make explicit or exhaustive their range of reference (Burnley 1986: 596).

The genesis of this usage is, nevertheless, a controversial matter. Burnley (1992: 462ff) relates the existence of this type of syntactyc construct to the first English glosses produced in the 13th century in the Worcester *scriptorium*. In general, translation is an activity that may have contributed to the exist ence and familiarity of the pattern, which is mostly used in texts intended to give an appearance of stylistic elaboration, since *elocutio* (as a component of the Latin classical rhetoric) represented the highest ideal of knowledge (Jones 1953: 6), and it motivated "an attempt to gain eloquence through the introduction of only slightly disguissed classical words". This practice reached its highest peaks in the 16th and 17th centuries, with divergent tendencies in the latter, when the term is even identified with literary value.

However, this was probably not the reason in the original Latin and French curial styles, which presented this same linguistic feature as well. Burnley (1986: 602ff) mentions examples such as: homage et ligeaunce, ordener et charger, maux et damages, hommages, foiautez et ligeaunces, scievaunt et poent, Duresses et Charges, soeffre et ad suffert, bienz et bountezz, eide et remedie, treter et counseiller, protectionem et defensionem, etc.

In the 14th and early 15th centuries there are other factors related to the existence of this pattern (Burnley 1992: 462), on the one hand the lexical and orthographical variation of the period, together with a linguistic instability that not only ascribed different forms to the same term, but which also impregnated one single form with many different meanings. Homonimy was particularly difficult to deal with in translations, so it was only through contextuality and collocation that the specific denotations of the word in question could be decided. This is explicitly

---

[1] The term doublet has been frequently employed to refer to a multiplicity of phenomena whose nature might be either phonetic (phonemic, lexical or syntactical. In this paper I am dealing with the lexico-stylistic structure typical of late middle and early modern English.

stated by a lollard author in 1415 in a concordance to the late version of the Wyccliffite Bible (Kuhn 1968: 272, in Burnley 1992: 463):

> wordis equiuouse,   at is, whanne oon word ha   manye significaciouns or bitoke-
> nyngis. As,   is word *kynde* bitokene   *nature*, and also such a man clepen we *kynde*
> which is a free-hertid man &   at gladly wole rewarde what   at men don for hym.
> An instrument wherwi   we hewen, clepen we an *axe*, & I *axe* God mercy of synnes
>   at I haue don. Such wordis in   is concordaunce ben maad knowen bi sum word
> addid to hem, wherby it may be wist whanne   ei ben taken in oon significacioun &
> whanne in a-no   ir.

According to Blake (1992: 516) the genesis of this type of structure is related to the change undergone by the English language from a synthetic to an analytic typological status and to the fact that the linguistic configuration of the early moments of the period, with the coexistence of three languages that could serve as vehicles of communication in the country, favoured the existence of a greater lexical variability:

The literary language in the Early Middle English period is characterised by showimg few signs of a policy of upgrading by borrowing foreign words, by introducing new compounds, or by adapting unusual syntactic patterns. Some element of archaic vocabulary is certainly present, though it becomes less noticeable as the period progresses. Old English compounds and variation are replaced by a heavier reliance on modification and on the grouping of words into parallel units such as doublets.

The use of doublets or multiple-head structures with an identical referenciality is presented in all its stages in relation to different categorial and syntactical ranks and it affects nouns, verbs, adjectives, noun and verb phrases, etc. This pattern can be found in Caxton's texts as a means to enrich the English text, so it is not just the need to make clear the sense of the text (as it could have been in origin) that moves the authors to use this pairs of synonyms, but it is redefined as a stylistic resource[1].

The semantic evolution of many of the terms, originally coreferential, included in this structure, would tend to be divergent in many cases, in order to set in specific and/or specialised aspects or concrete registers. In the 15th century it is difficult to decide whether the referenciality of both elements is total or partial. In many cases, even if we are not facing a complete semantic coincidence, there will probably be a contextual, referencial one. In many of the examples analysed we find clear cases of pure coordination, in the sense that distinct semantic segments are designated; in others, of a smaller number, the referential identity between the words seems to be similar. Nonetheless, there are cases in which both terms are coreferential only partially; the semantic equivalence of most of these show different degrees of identification, and it is certainly difficult to decide whether and to what degree this is the case or not.

Contextuality, collocations and pragmatic values for each specific period should be taken into account when considering the degree of referential identity between words. Thus, Burnley (1984: 203ff) shows that context might be more important in providing referential identity to two different terms than the proper semantic signification of the words. This is the case of Chaucer's use of *lady* and *lemman* in the *Manciples Tale*, and the same happens with Chaucer's *Boece*, in which the terms *ferme*, *stable*, and *stedfast*, are used contextually as "substantial" synonyms (Burnley 1979: 72-3), since there was a clear semantic association among the three of them. And these associations in the minds of the speaker's are frequently the reason why some terms, which are not essentially synonymous, are included in doublet or triplet structures.

---

[1] This tendency will progressively disapear in time, particularly throughout the second half of the 16th and the 17th centuries, when the emphasis will be exerted upon stylistic and logical-semantic clarity: "Syntax becomes significant for the development of style in the sixteenth and seventeentry (sic) centuries, if primacy is given to grammatical features that aid the meaning. In Elizabethan English, to borrow the words of Abbot, '(a) clearness was preferred to grammatical correctness, and (b) brevity both to correctness and clearness. Hence it was common to place words in the order in which they came uppermost in the mind.' (A. C. Partridge 1969: 40)

The frequency of this construction in the Chancery documents is higher (+5%) than the one it will achieve a century later, since in the language of Thomas More doublets reach a 3% of the total number of noun heads. This is not surprising, since it is to be expected that in the 15th century and in texts that are rather formal and epistolary in nature, most of them clearly resembling the Latin and French curial style from which this pattern is a characteristic feature, doublets should be clearly connected to them. It should be borne in mind that the first half of the 15th century might not have seen yet the greatest profusion of this construction in official documents.

The examples included below, as has been mentioned before, might pose problems in relation to their classification as doublets, partial doublets o coordinations properly speaking, since it is both their collocations and their contextual, situational or pragmatic value that most clearly might allow us to envisage their similarity, and much of that has been lost throughout time. Some of them are clearly referring to two or more entities.

> -27.9 to e saide william and Margerie -33.5 for e Priour and Conuent of e Priorie of Seint Oswoldes of Gloucestre -47.7 e same william: william: and Richard -57.13 ees oure lettres and copies closed erin[1] -63.12 yn suche fourme and nombre as is necessarie and vaylable for him -69.32 nouther be land ner water -69.35 yaire vessell and marchandes -81.30 heire and Regent of e Rewme of ffrance -107.10 to the Lieutenant and Soudeours of the Towne of Calays

There are also noun phrases in which the information content of the coordinated elements is clearly the same. In general, they might have a different origin, they might be specific to different registers or there might be a later specialisation of meaning that separates them.

> -1.6 full feith and credence -69.15 in oure good grace et beniuolence -79.6 al ese and fauour at ye may goodely -86.10 vpon his title and possession that he hath now / or elles of newe -107.6 vrgent case & necessite -32.11 our will and desire -64.14 aire attornes or doers yn Court spirituel or temporel -65.4 right and lawe -84.3 grocier and marchant of oure Cite of London -87.3 oure will and entente -87.8 after estatut & ordennances maad ervpon -96.5 e ouersighte and gouernance -105.5 any grond or land -107.7 workemen or laborenis -109.4 other charge or comaundement -113.54 with outen ony parcialtee or fauour -117.15 in his gracioux protection and keping -119.6 an hool aduis and counsail of alle estates of oure parlement -125.12 to e consolacion and comfort of oure trewe subgettes ere. -82.4 of certein grete wronges and griefs doon vnto hym -110.5 be e credible reportes and writinges maad vn to vs and to our said counsail fro tyme to tyme of e singulier diligence & e fulnotable and laborious seruice at [...] -113.42 e prosperitee and welfare of oure souerain Lord and of alle estatys of is land. -118.6 auctorite and power of e kyng oure saide souuerain lord.

In many examples, however, the identity of the referents is not complete, and there is just a partial assimilation of one of the coordinated elements in the sphere of meaning of the other, that is, their meanings would share a common space, while they would also keep another one as their own, or one of the elements would be included in the meaning of the other, being a part or subclass of it.

> -14.2 in oure ambassiat and seruice -wi alle e ryghtes and appurtennances erof -27.7 al her goodis and catels. to vs for e same cause forfait and beyng in oure handes[2] -39.5 by lawe and conscience -44.8 no more compleinte ne poursuite maad vnto vs on is side e see -60.5 to his trewthe and discrecion -63.5 son and heire to william Roos of hamelak at helde of vs in chief e day he deyed on -73.6 by lawe conscience and reson -5.7 yn greet disese and preiudice of e forseide

---

[1] This example could also be considered a partial doublet, since the *designatum* is the same for both members of the coordination, even though the reference is partially different.

[2] This pair of words can also be considered a doublet, since in this period the term *catel* could refer to 'cattle' specifically, or to 'possessions' in general.

> Priour and Couent. -39.4 al e fauour and ese   at may be don -58.7 boothe / right and equite[1] -65.6 for e suggestions or appechementes of him   at calleth hym self person of wortham -67.5 by oure progenitours and predecessours -67.4 for confirmacion of alle e yiftes grantes / priuileges / franchises and liberteed graunted vnto oure saide hows by oure progenitours and predecessours -67.14 of e yifte or grant of oure progenitours and predecessours. -2.8 after effect and pourport of owr said grante -6.4 after yowre good auis and discrecion -26.6 for diuerses dimes and quin¥imes -39.7 yn Reste and quiete -41.3 oure welbeloued seruant and squier -46.4 so hasty and Iuste Remede / restitucion and reparacion vpon suche attemptated doon by oure sugettes in conseruacion of oure trewes / at noman haue cause hereafter to compleine in suche wyse as thai doon for defaute of right doyng. -57.4 e seurtees and prouisions ordeined afore is time for e cours of marchandise 63.3 by expresse and especiale avyse and consent of oure Ri¥t trusty and welbeloued vncle e Duc of Excestre / to whome we had granted by oure lettres patentes e keping of […] -71.6 e better to oure entencion and desir / the whiche been ees at for the seuretee and conseruacion of oure saide contree we wol and desire at […] -84.8 by right and Reson -87.7 wi oute brocage or fauour of persones -102.6 after e lawes and coustumes of oure Rewme of England -103.5 vnto oure yifte and disposicion at this tyme -110.5 be e effecte and euidence of your werkes -113.45 e good Reste and pees of is land -128.2 keper and filacer of your Recordes in thoffice of youre priue seal -130.34 e rumor and noyse -130.54 e noyse and Rumor at was in e halle

Quirk et al. (1300ss) define apposition as a specific kind of relationship that is established between noun phrases. This relationship has to take place necessarily between elements that are inserted in a spectific context. Therefore, those units that are in apposition must share their referencial value, they must be coreferential, and at the same time, the reference of one of the units must be inserted in the other's, this is to say, one of the referents must comprise the other. The nature of the relationship is defined by Quirk et al. as copular, and it is closely related to postmodification, specifically to non-restrictive WH postmodifiers. However, one of the fundamental restrictions is that both units must belong to the same rank.

In the same line, apposition can be either total or partial depending on whether each specific example meets all the requisites explicitly formulated as conforming this kind of relation or not (Quirk et al.: 1302):

> (i) Each of the appositives can be separately omitted without affecting the acceptability of the sentence.

> (ii) Each fulfils the same syntactic function in the resultant sentences.

> (iii) It can be assumed that there is no difference between the original sentence and either of the resultant sentences in extralinguistic reference.

Apposition, from a structural point of view, can also be classified as strict, if both units are noun phrases, that is NP + NP, or weak, when one of the members represents a different syntactic class in the same rank, for example NP + *-ing* Nom.

However, apposition is a linguistic feature whose nature is not clear at all, and it has, therefore, been considered from the perspective of many and greatly varied methodological and conceptual positions. Many authors acknowledge the close proximity between modification and

---

[1] As can be observed in this list of examples, the same word can be part of partial or complete doublets in combination with different elements. Thus, one term is associated with some or other words depending on which aspect of its meaning is being emphasised. In fact, 'right' and 'law' coincide totally in their meaning in the doublet *right and law*, while 'equity' is one of the most outstanding features of 'right', therefore *right and equite*.

appositive structures[1], both from a syntactic point of view and from a semantic perspective. This similarity, in many cases, has posed many problems when deciding about the position that should be assigned to any particular nominal specimen in the Chancery.

Acuña Fariña (1994: 418ss) emphasises several factors that might facilitate the conception of apposition as a type of modification. They are mostly related to the similarities that, from the point of view of their internal structure, appositive structures share with non-restrictive postmodification. Above all, they are defined in terms of the hierarchical projections that are drawn in a tree diagram, in which the projection of the non-restrictive modifier would be sister of the maximal projection that represents the first element of the apposition.

This conception of apposition as a form of modification is also supported by the configuration of the message and its content, both from the perceptual and communicative point of view, since the second element of the apposition adds new information about the first, thus "modifying" and explaining the denotation and referenciality of the first[2]; and this is further confirmed by the position itself adopted by both elements, since non-restrictive modifiers in general are preceded by their heads. As regards apposition, it is always the first element the one that governs the agreement with the rest of the clausal and sentence constituents, or so its seems, and not the second, so it is to be expected that the latter, more than fulfilling the same function as the first, will be inserted in the maximal level of projection of the first, and its function will be mostly that of modification.

In fact, in the process of analyses of the Chancery corpus used here, some of the problems that were met with were related to the establishment of boundaries between modification and appositive structures. The apposition and coordination of noun heads is problematic mostly in those cases in which each head does not incorporate its own phrasal structure. When a noun carries its own restrictors, it is analised as an independent noun phrase. When they are used by themselves, they are considered to be part of a sintagmatic structure with a double head.

The sequences of elements such as title + noun are also considered as a single noun phrase with a double head, even though one of the elements, either the first or the second, does not stand by itself in a substitution or ellision test. The consideration of this constructions as appositive structures, just as apposition itself, is controversial; however, they are classified among them in this paper in order to allow the comparability with other studies of a similar configuration.

The following are examples of appositive structures extracted fron the 15th century texts.

> -142.1 youre pouere seruiteur Thomas Haseley on of e Clerkes of youre Corone
> -142.7 Thomas Payn of Glamorganshire Walsshman that brak e Tour of London nowe beyng in Neugate sumtyme Clerk and Chief conseillour to sir Iohn Oldecastell Traitour atteint to your seid gracoius ffader The sequences of title + noun show structures that are peculiar inside apposition itself. -11.4 Richard harowedon monk of Westmins… -15.4 hugh ffastolfs knyght -19.5 Iohn hohon

---

[1] In fact, one of the examples introduced by Quirk et al. (1302) as a partial apposition ("*Norman Jones, at one time a law student*, wrote several best sellers") is very close to a non-restrictive postmodifier. Thus, if it was extraposed to initial position, it would immediately acquire an adverbial value; that is something that typically occurs with non-restrictive postmodifiers, which are difficult to be distinguish from adverbial complementation.

[2] Dik (1989: 264) speaks of extraclausal constituents that "are not part of the clause proper, but more loosely associated with it in ways which can most adequately be described in terms of pragmatic functionality". From this perspective, it would be possible to postulate a correlation at a phrasal or syntagmatic level, with the existence of elements more loosely associated to nouns, whose pragmatic function would be serving as "'comments" on the clause [term] proper' (p.265). In this line, we could find elements traditionally classified as appositons and all kinds of non-restrictive postmodifications, since they would fit perfectly well all the general properties ascribed to them (265): "-They may precede, interrupt, or follow the clause proper; / -They are typically "bracketed off" from the clause by pause-like inflections in the intonation pattern; / -They are not sensitive to the clause-internal grammatical rules, though they may entertain relations of coreference, parallelism (e.g. same case marking), or antithesis (e.g. negative Tag with positive clause) with the clause they are associated with. / -They are not essential to the integrity of the internal structure of the clause: when they are left out, the remaining clause structure is complete and grammatical."

knight -20.5 maister Thomas Bolton [bringer of   is   e same prebende. -25.3 Maistre Iohan Cruche Comenceour and licenced in diuinitee. -25.7 to Thomas ffeltewell preest -28.3 oure maistre mason -31.3 Robert haburgeham Sqwyer berynge heere in oure seruice on   is syde of   e See in   e compaignie of our trusty and wel beloued   e lord ffi¥hugh oure Chamberlein -35.3 maistre henri ware. Elit to   e Bysshopriche of Chichestre. -43.7 Duc Iohan of Baire -45.3 oure welbeloued squier Iohan Ascow -52.2 vnto oure Welbeloued clerc Iohn Hethe -61.2 vnto oure welbeloued seruant Piers Logge -72.3 sir Thomas Suthwell preste -73.3 by William Mynours. yeman -78.8 oure welbeloued clerc William Toly -63.5 vnto oure trusty and welbeloued Cousin Iohn.

Sequences of two nouns, other than those mentioned above, include the problem of the lexicalization of compounds as well. This is difficult enough to decide upon in present day English, in the case of 15th century English the subsequent addition of diachronicity should be taken into account. Thus, only those cases which pose no doubts in relation to their lexicalization at the time under scrutiny will be classified as such.

Raumolin-Brunberg (1991: 152) states that "all noun + noun sequences are treated as compounds" in her study of Thomas More's language. The examples she classifies (186, nota 5) are: *algorisme stone, backe side, bede(s)-man, buttry bar, godchildren, handekercher, horeson, horseman, household, paryshe priest, play felowe* and *sterre chamber*. Even though some of these examples conform double-head structures of a nominal nature, others are evident lexicalizations, which implied a unique reference as early as the 16th century, such are *godchildren, horseman* or *household*.

This is not the type we should be looking for in a structural study of the syntactic patterns of the noun phrase, but the first one, the one that implies the combination of two or more units that are semantically and syntactically distinct. In many cases it is difficult to discern to which degree the lexicalization of both units has taken place completely or only partially, that is the reason why I have decided to treat the majority of the examples in these frequences as premodifying or postmodifying nouns.

Some examples, as the ones that follow, might be considered unequivocal cases of lexicalization in the 15th century:

-115.5   e hors Shoo -150.31 the chirche yerd -107.7 of workemen or laborenis -96.5   e ouersighte and gouernance

The difference between these lexical units and premodifying and postmodifying structures is mainly related to the degree of lexicalization that characterises them. There are other aspects to be taken into account. These might be of a prosodic or semantic nature and are difficult to apply to this corpus. In relation to premodification, nouns are the second most frequent category, after adjectives. From the semantic point of view, nominal modification is fundamentally restrictive, while adjectives tend to introduce a non-restrictive modification (Warren 1993: 59-60). This fact could explain the phonological and syntactic differences (which concern fundamentally differences of accentuation and of possible combinations in the premodifier structure) between both categories in this function. There are 18 items fulfilling this function in my corpus: *fee, estat¥, North, hors, feod, midsomer, gold, sergeant, cheker, cession, knight, dower, liege, wolle, Christmass, halewyn, sheriff* and *teithe*.

Noun postmodifiers are more frequently found with noun heads (73.52%) than with deverbal nominalizations (17.64%) or pronouns (8.82%). The syntactic configuration of those structures in which we find two nouns together is not clear at all, as has been mentioned in relation to premodifying nouns, appositive or juxtaposed constructions in which both elements share the same sintag-

matic structure, and it can also be observed of postmodifying nouns[1]. The greatest problem in most of the cases is discerning which element modifies and which one functions as head. In some examples the greater specificity of the first element leads us to believe it is the one that sustains the structure.

-19.8 Maude somtyme wife of Pierres Mauley knight -75.3 oure seruant Iohn Bayll barbour

Other examples are interpreted as postmodifiers, either because they represent structures that originally, in Old English, were carried out by oblique cases, or because nowadays they might be paraphrased by prepositional phrases.

-50.5 of .iiij. d (e day) granted vnto hym by certein lettres patentes / confermed by vs -50.4 on is side e see -61.4 paiement of al at is behinde and due vnto him of vj. d a day / by e handes of e visconte of Wilton -107.11 his felship marchantes -139.7 vj d a day -143.14 on oure lady even assumpcion

In the case of temporal/adverbial constructions, it is clear that the second noun or phrase specifies the reference of the first, therefore becoming the postmodifier.

-93.12 to morwe here day -106.7 fro e feest of Seynt Michel. the yere of oure Regne xv<the>. -135.1 e xxviij day of April e xvij ye of e kyng -143.13 on Cristemasse even

Other nouns, however, show a greater ambiguity in this respect, and so it must be the speaker's intuition that has to be invoked, but never as definitive criteria.

-28.3 oure maistre mason as maistre Steven was -127.2 sergeant porter in youre worshipfull houshold

Some nominal premodifiers show a structure that is quite similar to the apposition title + noun, even though they are not so. These are mainly those that refer to professions and specific job-categories performed by individuals:

-109.12 Be ¥owre powre liege[2] Iohn Cappe -89.3 oure seruant Iohan Hertishille -127.1 vnto youre contynuell seruant Iohn Stok -143.3 your most humble liege man

A surprising structure is found in the 1437 petition (SC8/27/1305: Fisher et al. n°. 201) where a noun phrase is structured like a sequence of title + noun, although that is not what it represents:

-154.26 y 36 The said william Pulle Rauyshour

Other examples of premodification by nouns which clearly do not resemble signs of lexicalization and whose referencial identity is marked precisely is found in the explicitation of dates or in references to the kind of material out of which certain objects are made:

-69.4 vn to Alhalwen tyde -120.27 by mydsomer day. next folowyng -120.29 in gold l -121.24 the seide Mary Magdelyn day -143.13 on Cristemasse even -143.13 on Midsomer even -143.14 on alle halewyn even -150.20 iij yron broches -150.22 j bras morter with a pestell of yron

The examples that pose more problems in order to be classified as compounds or mofidiers are those heads whose reference is specified by the premodifier noun in such a way the general denotation of the term is restricted to a class or subclass inside the general aplication of the noun.

-43.22 al e fee fauor and chere / at may be doon yn goodly wyse. -50.6 of e fee ferme of oure Cite of Canterbury. -107.11 his felship marchantes -130.1 in the

---

[1] In this corpus, as opposed to the data analised by Raumolin-Brunberg (192 y 239), premodifier nouns are less frequent (18 cases) than postmodifiers (32 examplos) showing practically the inverse proportion (34 phrases vs. 13 phrases in Raumolin-Brunberg's corpus).

[2] *Liege* is very close to lexicalization when it is combined with *man, louerd,* etc.

> Sterre Chambre -130.43 vpon the Cheker borde   e which borde stode a fore   e benche. -130.93 at   e cession tyme -131.37 by knyght Ceruice -136.13 in dower terme of yeres -142.48 with wolle cloth -142.23 in   e counseil chambre of   e seid parlement -150.31 the teithe hay

Postmodification by nouns might also introduce structures that show similarities to the sequences of title + noun; in certain cases the second element seems to be the one that implies the meaning of position, rank or occupation:

> -1.4 our Comissaries berers herof -25.3 Maistre Iohan Cruche Comenceour and licenced in diuinitee

Again, dates and temporal specification seem particularly prone to be postmodified by nouns.

> -50.5 of .iiij. d (e day) granted vnto hym by certein lettres patentes / confermed by vs -93.12 to morwe here day[1] -139.7 vj d a day -142.31 xl li a yere -143.14 on oure lady even   assumpcion[2]

The rest of the noun heads that are postmodified by other nouns show constructions inherited from Old English. Among these we may find those units that govern a partitive genitive, measure genitive and the defining genitive in the anglo-saxon construction; in those the construction in *of* is used in late Old English. In relation to the genitive of definition, the construction introduced by *manner* is present in the Chancery texts. Kisbye (1972: 65-66) states that French loanwords *manner* and *sort* "in many respects took the syntax of *kin(d)*"; in these cases, however, as opposed to what had happened with *kind*, which around 1400 had acquired an adjectival sense, the nominal value is preserved, since the constructions analised in this corpus introduce structures that are not compatible with an adjectival nature of *manner*:

> -5.9 of al such manere newe and wilfulle gouernance yn   e matire forsaide. -151.6 alle manere proffites of alle manere plees within the saide Cite fines Amerciamentes forfaitures.

In the second example, the noun might be considered as a genitive, even though there is no sign that supports this idea. Mustanoja (1966: 86) defines the construction as an apposition since the 13th and 14th centuries, even though the perifrastic *of*-construction is also frequent during this period. He (1966: 84) also classifies some constructions with a genitive of measure as appositive constructions:

> After words expressing measure (distance, length of time, weight, number, etc.) apposition occurs in many cases where one would naturally expect a partitive genitive [...]. In instances of this kind apposition instead of the partitive genitive is not uncommon in the 13th and 14th centuries. The competition of the periphrastic genitive with *of*, however, reduces its use drastically towards the end of the period and causes it largely to disappear.

Examples of this type are also found in the Chancery texts. Some are clear reminiscencies of the genitive of measure, other cases, as the one that uses *side* as head seems to be the result of the diffusion of this structure to other contexts:

> -41.5 on   is side see -50.4 on   is side   e see -146.13 every pounde weighte -150.14 iij paire bedes of corall -150.15 j paire bedes of aumbor -150.15 j paire bedes of gete -150.19 j paire trostell -150.24 ij paire wightes for gold -150.24 .j. dial a bowe -150.23 xx lb wex -150.27 j payre wheles

---

[1] In this case the nominal structure *here day* can either be considered as an apposition to *to morwe* or as a postmodification in which the exact date is made explicit.

[2] This example is closely related to genitive premodifiers, but with an added difficulty, the fact that the phrase seems to represent a double genitive, *lady* and   *assumpcion*, both without a case mark. In this sequence *lady* would modify   *assumpcion*, and this would in turn modify *even*, despite being in a discontinuous sequence.

The internal structure of these heads is one very difficult aspect to deal with in this kind of analyses. Relations such as apposition, coordination (and doublets) and composition that are established between nouns inserted in the same phrase, show, in a historical study like this, categorization problems that affect their general structural conception. This is particularly true of pre- and postmodification structures. However, this type of double-head structure seems to be less frequent in our corpus than a century later, in Thomas More's writings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acuña Fariña, J. C. 1993: *On So Called Appositive Structures in English*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Tesis doctoral inédita.

Blake, N. 1992: The Literary Language in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol.II. > Norman Blake, ed. CUP.

Burnley, J. D. 1979: *Chaucer's Language and the Philosophers' Tradition*. Woodbridge, Brewer.

Burnley, J. D. 1984: Picked Terms. *English Studies 65*: 195-204.

Burnley, J. D. 1986: Curial Prose in Prose in English. *Speculum 61/3*: 593-614.

Burnley, J. D. 1992: Lexis and Semantics in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol.II. > Norman Blake, ed. CUP.

Jones, R. F. 1953: *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, Stanford U. P.

Kisbye, T. 1972: An Historical Outline of English Syntax. Tryk, Akademisk Boghandel.

Mustanoja, T. F. 1960: *A Middle English Syntax. Part I.* Helsinki, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 23.

Quirk, R. et al. 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.

Raumolin-Brunberg, H. 1991: *The Noun Phrase in Early Sixteenth Century English*. Helsinki, Société Néophilologique.

Warren, B. 1993: Nominal and Adjectival Modifiers of Nouns. > *The Noun Phrase in English. Its Structure and Variability.* Andreas Jucker, ed. Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag C. Winter: 57-68.

* * *