Williamson, to John Mark Mulder, Martha Mulder, and, supremely, to my parents, John and Nella Mulder, who are offered the dedication of this study as a token of my love and gratitude. Finally, in the innermost familial circle, the support and forbearance I have had from Ian, my husband, and from our daughters, Maria and Monica, cannot even be reckoned for acknowledgment, but they and I know what I owe to them. I have found my "blessed case of conjunctivitis" protracted, certainly, but not noticeably disabling—thanks to the forenamed and to the wider circle of friends (although unnamed here, they will recognize themselves) who have contributed to my thinking and well-being over the long run.

Janel M. Mueller. *The Native Tongue and the Word*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

1. Introductory

"Modernity" in Prose and Prose Study

As twentieth-century readers, we agree widely in principle on what we expect from a piece of prose. We ask, on the one hand, that it be a serviceable instrument of its writer's thought and, on the other, that it show a vital connection with spoken English, to the extent of sustaining an idiomatic if not always colloquial or conversational mode of discourse. While we vary in our particular judgments regarding "good" prose—a specification that corresponds to our distinction between "poetry" and mere "verse," according to Ian Gordon[1]—we nevertheless typically share a sense of disappointment when we cannot "hear a writer's voice" in what we read, and a reflex of exasperation when sentences (and paragraphs) of prose do not yield up their meaning to us at a single reading. Generally we are willing to linger and take greater pains over what a poem has to "say" to us, without dreaming that such differential treatment reflects anything other than a generic distinction between poetry and prose. In our century, moreover, writers on English prose style and composition have dignified our pair of expectations with the claim that they constitute a peculiarly "modern" awareness of what prose should be and what good prose is. Yet, as long as we stay within contemporary range, there is not likely to be much difficulty in defining modern prose as the proper vehicle of our cognition in language, just as mathematics and logic are its vehicles in formalization, or, as Bonamy Dobrée notes, in identifying the voices which speak in modern prose with those of our own age.[2]

[1]Ian A. Gordon, *The Movement of English Prose* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1966), pp. 7–8.

[2]Bonamy Dobrée, *Modern Prose Style*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 5. For an absorbing account of how the distinction between poetry and prose became fixed on the basis of later nineteenth-century assertions of imaginative and aesthetic autonomy in the use of language, see K. G. Hamilton, *The Two Harmonies: Poetry and Prose in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), pp. 2–9, 39–44, 98–112, 130–38, 143–50, 195–202.

Difficulties can arise, however, when our expectations about prose are projected backward in an effort to locate some specific point at which "modern" English began to be written in a fashion that continues to be recognizable as our own. Proceeding more or less intuitively, a number of influential critics and scholars from the first half of the twentieth century—J. Middleton Murry, Sir Herbert Read, H. C. Wyld, James Sutherland, F. P. Wilson, and others—purported to find such a turning point in the Restoration era, roughly, at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century.[3] While with these men the impetus to periodize English prose in terms of its modernity remained subservient to other interests, it erupted concurrently as the central issue in a protracted controversy between Richard Foster Jones and Morris W. Croll as chief opponents. Since the Croll-Jones controversy is a well-known literary-historical crux that has also received Robert Adolph's book-length retrospective assessment,[4] there is no need here for any detailed recounting. What I wish to bring out in a summary way are the values I consider to have been established by the controversy and the thoroughly relative nature of the term "modernity" in an other than contemporary application.

Jones's position, articulated and elaborated through a series of articles published in the 1930s,[5] grounds itself in a positivistic slant on the history of ideas; it affirms a causal link between the enterprises of the Royal Society and a "new prose" of a secular and, ultimately, also of a religious kind. Beginning with work on antitraditionalism in intellectual pursuits at the end of the seventeenth century—the so-called battle of the ancients and the moderns[6]—Jones went on to argue that the repercussions of

[3]See, variously, J. Middleton Murry, *The Problem of Style* (London: Humphrey Milford, 1922), pp. 5, 55–68; Sir Herbert Read, *English Prose Style* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1928), pp. xii–xiv; Henry Cecil Wyld, *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936), pp. 148–49; James R. Sutherland, *On English Prose* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 9–19, 58–78; F. P. Wilson, *Seventeenth-Century Prose* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), pp. 5–10.

[4]Robert Adolph, *The Rise of Modern Prose Style* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press, 1968). On balance, Adolph sides with Jones over Croll in stressing a "utilitarian ethic" and a late seventeenth-century date as the key aspects of modernity in English prose; see especially pp. 242–43, 301–3.

[5]Richard Foster Jones, "Science and English Prose Style in the Third Quarter of the Seventeenth Century," *PMLA* 45 (1930): 977–1009; "The Attack on Pulpit Eloquence in the Restoration: An Episode in the Development of the Neo-Classical Standard for Prose," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 30 (1931): 188–217; "Science and Language in England of the Mid-Seventeenth Century," *JEGP* 31 (1932): 315–31. These essays are republished with minor revisions in *The Seventeenth Century: Essays by Richard Foster Jones and Others Writing in His Honor* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1951).

[6]Richard Foster Jones, "The Background of *The Battle of the Books*," Washington University Studies no. 7, Humanistic Series no. 2 (St. Louis, 1920), pp. 97–162; *Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Background of "The Battle of the Books,"* Washington University Studies no. 5, Language and Literature no. 6 (St. Louis, 1936).

Baconianism in Restoration England, not only the prescriptions for conducting philosophical and scientific discourse but also the rationalism and antienthusiasm manifested in the period's preaching reforms, comprised the crucial determinants of modern English prose. His account therefore identified modernity with the period 1660–1700, the same reference point as that of the critics and scholars named earlier. Croll, however, saw modern English prose as originating with Bacon himself, not with his followers, in the period 1580–1630. Croll's guiding conception of modernity exhibits an older, Burckhardtian cast in its insistence that Renaissance style is the outgrowth of individualistic self-discovery and self-expression all the while that it incorporates, too, the Renaissance's own conception of the Renaissance as the bringing of classical antiquity to rebirth.[7] Thus, for him, the significantly modern dynamic was the alleged reenactment in the sixteenth century of an opposition dating to classical times between a florid, "Asiatic" school of prose composition and a restrained, "Attic" one. In Croll's representation, "anti-Ciceronianism" or "Atticism" was a rhetorical program for stylistic revolt that came into its own in England with Bacon, Robert Burton, Sir Thomas Browne, and other writers who somehow combined imitation of such models as Seneca and Tacitus with transmutation of the restless, inquisitive, and even skeptical trains of their own thought into prose in the native tongue.

For all of the erstwhile heat generated by its original participants and by George Williamson's efforts to carry Crollian interpretation deep into the Jonesian territory of the later seventeenth century,[8] this controversy has left us not at the site of a victory or of an impasse but with something which Earl Miner remarks as more curious still: a de facto accommodation of the rival orthodoxies, so that the usual approach to teaching or discussing seventeenth-century English prose at present is to splice together Croll on the earlier half of the period with Jones on the later

[7]See *Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll*, ed. J. Max Patrick et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), a volume that supplements with useful annotations its reprintings of the following pieces: "Juste Lipse et le mouvement anticicéronien," *Revue du seizième siècle* 2 (1914): 200–242; " 'Attic Prose' in the Seventeenth Century," *Studies in Philology* 18 (1921): 79–128; "Attic Prose: Lipsius, Montaigne, Bacon," *Schelling Anniversary Papers by His Former Students* (New York: Century Co., 1923), pp. 117–50; "Muret and the History of 'Attic Prose,' " *PMLA* 39 (1924): 254–309; and "The Baroque Style in Prose," *Studies in English Philology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, ed. Kemp Malone and Martin B. Ruud (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1929), pp. 427–56. For some usefully skeptical reflections on the Renaissance's view of the Renaissance, see C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 1–65.

[8]See the review, by Croll and R. S. Crane, of Jones's "Science and English Prose Style" in *Philological Quarterly* 10 (1931): 85; and George Williamson, *The Senecan Amble: A Study in Prose Form from Bacon to Collier* (London: Faber & Faber, 1951); Phoenix Books reprint (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).

half.[9] Miner asks how such an eventuality came about, and what, in the light of it, we can regard ourselves as having learned about how to set our historical and critical referents for the study of English prose. These are excellent questions.

My answer to the first would be that, upon reflection, Croll's and Jones's work discloses a considerable amount of shared perspective in which accommodation can find a place: both invested intellectual history with primary importance as a determinant of literary history, and both absorbed themselves in the historian's concern with tracing forces and setting time spans for crucial developments. As for the second question, what we can regard ourselves to have learned from the Croll-Jones controversy reaches, I think, well beyond their staked-out range of opposition. The extraordinary fruitfulness of their work in engendering solid and sensitive interpretations by other students of earlier prose *style*[10] shows the rightness of their assumption that such study must reckon, on the analytical plane, with the interconnections of a writer's thinking and the forms and constructions in which that thinking receives expression, and, on the historical plane, with larger relations between the ideas of an age and the language of an age. Proportionally, we have Jones more to thank for basing prose study in the issues of a specifically English cultural context, and Croll more to thank for instruction in how to scrutinize and construe sentence forms as vehicles of authorial design. Together they have demonstrated the essentials of what modern prose study includes.

But what of the issue of "modernity" itself, which figures so constantly in our intuitions as contemporary readers of prose? Surely the Croll-Jones controversy also shows us how variable and malleable a referent this is in interpreting the past; we will find this or that "modern" in accordance with how we conceive of modernity. Since this is true, should we not dispense with the concept altogether as a referent in the historical study of prose? My decision in this study has been to retain "modernity" as a referent because it carries associations of what is continuing or

[9]Earl Miner, "Patterns of Stoicism in Thought and Prose Styles, 1530–1700," *PMLA* 85 (1970): 1023–34, esp. 1023–24.

[10]Since Williamson, Croll's influence has been notable in work by Don Cameron Allen, "Style and Certitude," *ELH* 15 (1948): 167–75; Floyd Gray, *Le style de Montaigne* (Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1958); Jonas A. Barish, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960); Joan Webber, *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963); Wesley Trimpi, *Ben Jonson's Poems: A Study of the Plain Style* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), chaps. 1–4; and Lisa Jardine, *Francis Bacon: Discovery and the Art of Discourse* (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974). Jones's principal continuators have been F. P. Wilson (*Seventeenth-Century Prose*), Robert Adolph (*Rise of Modern Prose Style*), and Andrews Wanning ("Some Changes in the Prose Style of the Seventeenth Century" [Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1936], regrettably, never published).

common to us in past ages that I am prepared to welcome. I think it is no bad thing to ask, with the needed allowances, about the degree to which prose of earlier eras "speaks" to us or functions as the instrument of its writer's (and readers') thought. The needed allowances, of course, are explicit and viable definitions. I am aware—I hope sufficiently—that in using terms like "modern" and "modernity" I will have to indicate what I mean by them. While I shall attempt to do this where required throughout this study, my particular concern in this section of chapter 1 will be to spell out the various senses and ramifications of "modernity" on which the subsequent parts of my discussion depend.

Prior to any considerations of "modernity" as such, although they later came to have a bearing, has been the working assumption on my part that English prose of a given era could be approached as a self-contained body of materials, a subject in its own right. This assumption may seem innocuous enough—even, perhaps, self-evident—until it is recalled that Croll thought the advent of modernity in English prose depended on the vernacular replay of Latin stylistic developments. He is by no means the only scholar of earlier English literature to have thought along such lines; I hope to give a better sense presently of why this should have been the case. As a first preliminary to reflect our intuitive "modern" expectation that prose be the instrument of thought, I have chosen the sentence unit—in which the clause figures vitally as identical with the simplest type of sentence—for the focus of my analysis. This choice is easily accounted for on all fronts, beginning with Croll's precedent and the regular practice of stylisticians who take their cue from the consensus found among linguists of every persuasion. Simeon Potter may declare for them on the fundamental place of the sentence in English: "Because English is, in the main, an analytic language . . . , the sentence is the most important unit. The sentence is more important even than the word."[11] But for the connection between sentence form and thought that is so indispensable to mentalistic approaches like mine, the more significant evidence has been adduced by psycholinguists like Thomas Bever who have explored "the psychological reality of clause structure." Bever's most germane finding for my purposes is that the construction of English sentences is governed by what he calls a "canonical-sentoid strategy." A "sentoid" is a single, intact clause or simplex sentence that is isolable within a larger sentential unit; he defines it as "a subtree of the base structure whose highest node is *S* [for "Sentence"] and which contains no embedded sentences."[12] A "canonical" sentoid is canonical by virtue of the word order of modern English. It has the

[11]Simeon Potter, *Our Language* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1950), p. 90.

[12]Thomas G. Bever, "The Interaction of Perception and Linguistic Structures: A Preliminary Investigation of Neo-Functionalism," *Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok et al. (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1972), 12:1159–1233; especially 1169, 1176–77.

form of a noun phrase followed by a verb followed by a noun phrase followed by optional modifiers—*NP + V + NP (+Modifier)*—a form which, Bever shows, both elicits and imposes interpretation of the internal relations of the elements as subject, verb, and object, respectively. Since there appear to be only a limited number of quite simple variants on canonical sentoid form, the predictive implication of the strategy is that sentence forms resistant to its application ought to be hard to understand. This has been shown experimentally to be the case.[13] What the work on the "canonical sentoid" offers the study of prose style is a view of the thoroughgoing cognitive consistency and transparency of the clausal unit in English and an invitation to consider how syntax serves—and perhaps also projects—the functional capacities and limits of our minds.[14]

Given the suggestiveness of the findings regarding the "canonical sentoid" as a basic link forged between thought and language, an obvious next question involving "modernity" relates to the history of English—a dimension unfortunately lacking in Croll's and Jones's work: When did the stipulated order of elements in the clause (or simplex sentence) attain a set form? The answer would supply one basis for defining a "modern" English sentence in terms of word-order rules, while also preserving our insistence that it function, for us, as an instrument of thought. A substantial monographic literature has clarified the outlines of emergent modern—that is, *Subject Verb (Object) (Complement)*—order for clauses in English. While clauses in Old English prose conform to one of three types of word order, so-called common order, conjunctive order, and demonstrative order,[15] Middle English is characterized by a gradual evolution toward the all but uniform and single "modern" type. The order *Verb Object* was dominant by 1300 and firmly fixed for both independent and dependent clauses in prose texts by 1400; declarative (*Subject Verb*) order and interrogative (*Verb Subject*) order became generalized as distinct types during the same period. Furthermore, the conditions under which inversion still applies in clause structure—e.g., 'Through the darkness came a beam of light,' 'So am I'—

[13]For summaries of experimental work with the "canonical sentoid" and the so-called click-location tests used to probe subjects' perceptions of language in terms of constituent structure, see Jerry A. Fodor, Thomas G. Bever, and Merrill F. Garrett, *The Psychology of Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics and Generative Grammar* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. 252–53, 328–42, 352–53, and bibliographical references given there.

[14]For a suggestive discussion, see Thomas G. Bever and D. Terence Langendoen, "A Dynamic Model of the Evolution of Language," *Linguistic Inquiry* 2 (1971): 433–63, esp. 454–55, on perceptibility and learnability as the parameters for language change.

[15]See S. O. Andrew, *Syntax and Style in Old English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940). "Common order" is the specific ancestor of the "canonical sentoid."

were stabilized in all essentials in prose texts by 1600.[16] Regarding the major constituents within the clause (*Noun Phrase, Verb Phrase*), Barbara Strang observes that "the general principles governing the structure of *NP*s have been unchanged since late Middle English," while for *VP*s "the main outlines of present usage were established by the sixteenth century." She adds: "By *NP* I mean such structures as serve as subject, object, or complement in simple sentences; by *VP* such structures as serve as predicators."[17] John McLaughlin offers the following general summation on what we can see is the modernity of English word order, judged according to the canonical sentoid, by the turn into the fifteenth century: "For both transitive and intransitive sentences the order subject-verb clearly predominates in the late fourteenth century, as does the order subject-verb-object. Apparently, too, at this stage in the development of word-order patterns, such order is not, as it was to some extent in Old English, contingent upon whether a given sentence is or is not embedded in another."[18]

But if we agree to identify our modern insistence that prose be the instrument of thought with the stabilization of clausal word order into canonical sentoid form, what, if anything, else can we look to find in English prose of the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that will tally with our other criteria for "modernity"? The answer given in Margaret Schlauch's work may startle us at first. She emphasizes that the sentence structures in writing of this period bear an exceptionally close relation to those of actual speech, arguing that such prominent traits as

[16]See Charles C. Fries, "On the Development of the Structural Use of Word-Order in Modern English," *Language* 16 (1940): 199–208; and discussion by Fred West, "Some Notes on Word Order in Old and Middle English," *Modern Philology* 71 (1973): 48–53, and by T. P. Dolan, "On Claims for Syntactical Modernity in Early English Prose," *MP* 74 (1977): 305–10. On vital aspects of constituent structure in the clause, see Bohumil Trnka, *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden*, Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague no. 3 (Prague: Jednota Československých Matematikú a Fysikú, 1930); Victor Engblom, *On the Origin and Early Development of the Auxiliary 'Do'*, Lund Studies in English no. 6 (Lund: Berlingska, 1938); Alvar Ellegård, *The Auxiliary Do: The Establishment and Regulation of Its Use in English* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1953); Hans Marchand, "The Syntactic Change from Inflectional to Word-Order System and Some Effects of This Change on the Relation 'Verb to Object' in English," *Anglia* 70 (1951): 70–89; Walerian Świeczkowski, *Word Order Patterning in Middle English: A Quantitative Study Based on Piers Plowman and Middle English Sermons*, Janua Linguarum, ser. minor, no. 19 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1962); and Bengt Jacobsson, *Inversion in English, with Special Reference to the Early Modern English Period* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1951).

[17]Barbara M. H. Strang, *A History of English* (London: Methuen & Co., 1970), pp. 96, 98.

[18]John C. McLaughlin, *Aspects of the History of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970), pp. 242–43. Cf. Gösta Langenfelt, *Select Studies in Colloquial English of the Late Middle Ages* (Lund: Håkan Ohlsson, 1933), p. xxi: "Generally, one may say that the fifteenth century, as well as part of the fourteenth, in syntactical matters belongs as much to New English as does the sixteenth century."

their doublings back, their loosely continuative progression, and their elliptical turns can be given a unified analysis as close replications of what still are the fundamental syntactic features of conversational—or "free"—spoken English.[19] It seems, then, that if our readerly ears as moderns are attuned to idiomatic expression and the sound of a voice from a page of prose, here is a promising area in which to inquire further. Because the notion of "speech-based prose" requires appreciable discussion in order to be defined adequately for my purposes, I shall postpone consideration of the evidence supporting Schlauch's claim and its ramifications for prose study until the final section of chapter 2. Here I remark only that Schlauch finds nothing at all pejorative to literary interests and values in prose tied closely to the spoken language; she praises the prodigious versatility and liveliness, the constantly maintained premium on communicative transmission of meaning, and even the authorial self-consciousness which imposes "a kind of literary screening to eliminate incoherencies, dialect, and vulgarisms" within prose of the era reaching from Chaucer's time to Shakespeare's.[20] Her praise, while unusual, is not solitary. A philologically trained literary historian of the generation preceding Croll and Jones, John Earle, could affirm in his *English Prose* (1890) that its preservation as a spoken medium for more than a century and a half after the Norman Conquest had "the effect of stamping the English language with one of its most peculiar and most valuable characteristics": "that larger measure of popularity, that greater breadth of contact with the nation, than is found in any other of the great literary languages of the West." Earle adds: "It is in the English of the fifteenth century that this character manifests itself in conspicuous maturity."[21]

In pinpointing texts of the fifteenth century, Earle is referring to the striking phenomenon of the widespread resurgence of English as a written medium which Basil Cottle has subsequently surveyed in *The Triumph of English, 1350–1400*.[22] To students of literature, the most familiar manifestations of this phenomenon are the decisions of the two principal court poets of this half century—the elder, John Gower's, to shift from writing in French to writing in English; the younger, Geoffrey Chaucer's,

[19]Margaret Schlauch, "Chaucer's Colloquial English—Its Structural Traits," *PMLA* 67 (1952): 1103–16; "Early Tudor Colloquial English," *Philologia Pragensia* 1 (1958): 97–104; *The English Language in Modern Times (Since 1400)* (Warsaw: Pánstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959), pp. 56–61, 145–49.

[20]*The English Language in Modern Times*, pp. 30, 34–37, 111–21.

[21]John Earle, *English Prose: Its Elements, History, and Usage* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1890), p. 389, and cf. pp. 422–23.

[22]Basil Cottle, *The Triumph of English, 1350–1400* (London: Blandford Press, 1969), pp. 13–25, citing earlier scholarship. Albert C. Baugh provides an excellent discussion of the reestablishment of written English in *A History of the English Language*, 2d ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), chap. 6.

to write in English alone. But other than literary developments in Richard II's reign extend the movement to reinstate the native tongue as the national medium: in 1362 the law courts were ordered to use English for their proceedings; in 1363 and 1365 Parliament was opened in English; and in 1399 Henry IV accepted the crown with a speech in English.[23] A southwestern deed of 1376 is the oldest private legal instrument surviving in English; the oldest English petition to the Crown is that of the mercers' gild of London in 1386; the oldest English wills in the London Court of Probate date from 1387; and in 1389 returns of the ordinances, usages, and holdings of the guilds were made in English, principally for London, Norwich, and King's Lynn. It is widely recognized from the nature of this evidence that the readoption of writing in English had what in broader historical terms must count as a "modern" impetus: at base, the upsurge of patriotic and nationalistic sentiment as results of political unification and centralization of rule in a capital. But these results are inseparably bound up with and accompanied by others, one of the most important being the growth in numbers, activity, and power of a manufacturing, commercial, and bureaucratic sector of the population. Manifestations of such growth in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century England appear variously in the organization of guilds, trading companies, municipal corporations, and a civil service. In turn these emergent classes, localized in cities, find or make places for themselves in a political and economic power base which was formerly controlled by a nobility and the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[24] Thus, "modern" trends embracing urbanization, secularization, and enlarging popular participation in the national economy and culture become motives or factors for the writing of various kinds of English prose texts in this period. Chapter 3 of this study takes selective measure of this larger picture, but on the whole I place much greater continuing weight on the shaping influence in English prose of the determination to have the Bible, no less, also freely available in the native tongue. This determination, which I call "Scripturalism" when it manifests itself as a stylistic impetus in prose writing, is equally and thoroughly a product of early modern English confidence in the capacities of the native tongue and its users to deal requisitely with the supreme instance of a text, the very Word

[23]Remarkably, the racial memory had preserved to Shakespeare's time the association of the Lancastrians with speaking English, on principle. See the wooing of French "Kate" and her crash efforts at bilingualism in *Henry V*.

[24]For further pertinent treatment of the "modern" aspects of the period with which this study is concerned, see Francis R. H. DuBoulay, *An Age of Ambition: English Society in the Late Middle Ages* (New York: Viking Press, 1970), pp. 27–30, 61–66, 116–19, 160–63, 178; George Holmes, *The Later Middle Ages, 1272–1485* (London: Nelson, 1962), pp. 131–81, and *Europe: Hierarchy and Revolt, 1320–1450* (London: Fontana-Collins, 1975), pp. 105–33, 154–67, 195–213, 230–38, 301–13; and Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300–1500* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 191–319.

of God. Subsequent discussion, starting in chapter 2, will clarify and expand upon the paramount significance which I find in Scripturalism for developments in English prose style between 1380 and 1580.

Thus far I have adduced various considerations based on accepted senses of "modernity" to indicate why I propose to expand the scope of what we receive both intuitively and critically as modern English prose as far back as the later fourteenth century, and I expect that these considerations will be genuinely predisposing. We now come to a sticking point in some understandable reservations, which can be captured as a sequence of queries. What, after all, is the strength of the claims that the prose of this earlier era can lay to literary attention? Why did Croll trace the inception of English prose with a fully "modern" literary stature only to a date some two centuries later, and Jones to one three centuries later? Is there something inherently deficient in this earlier prose when regarded, specifically, as literature? The key issue here is what one means by "literary" and "literature," but the reservations are real ones, and they are not likely to be allayed by Schlauch's call for banishing the distinction between the literary and the subliterary in addressing this prose or by Gordon's contention that students of style cannot bypass the vernacular legacy of chronicle histories, wills, charters, guild records, familiar letters, and even recipes and written instructions of other kinds if they are to reckon fairly with the prodigious phenomenon of English prose.[25] To the unconvinced, those less restive with traditional notions of the literary canon than some contemporaries (including myself), such pronouncements may smack of special pleading. I hope that it will be acceptable to propose, as a manner of proceeding, that a text can be acknowledged to have a minimally literary character if its handling of language displays some combination of the qualities of clarity, exactness, directness, and naturalness of expression that figure in our judgments of prose as good by "modern" (contemporary) standards. I hope as well that a text can be granted to be "literary" in kind if it exhibits signs of a self-aware handling of the medium of language in the act of writing. If these working definitions are acceptable for the purpose of continued discussion, we can now take note of a body of evidence that substantiates yet another "modern" aspect of the period and the prose being considered, namely, the emergence of so-called standard English as the single, dominant dialect that the native tongue would assume in writing (and, to an appreciable extent, also in speech).

[25]Schlauch, *The English Language in Modern Times*, pp. 112, 117; Gordon, *The Movement of English Prose*, pp. 7–8, 36–41, 58–64. See, further, Norman Blake, *The English Language in Medieval Literature* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1977), pp. 11–12.

The following review pretends to do no more than trace broad outlines, for the investigation of emerging standard English—identified as the language of the capital, the London-Westminster complex—has proceeded laboriously through scrutiny of phonological and morphological features as reflected in spelling practices in relevant texts, and interpretation of the evidence has altered over time. The widely prevalent view in historical linguistic scholarship until quite recently stressed the primacy of spoken London English in effecting the replacement of what Wyld termed the "regional dialects" of the post-Conquest era with the more or less uniform "class dialect" of the capital. This stress reflected the generally acknowledged principle that language change manifests itself first in spoken usage, thereafter in written. In Wyld's words: "London speech, or one type of it, as it existed in the fourteenth century, is the ancestor of our present-day Received Standard," having been promoted by a cultural "recognition of the superiority of the one type over the others" that had taken place "as early as the fifteenth century, and perhaps earlier still."[26] While sustaining his stress on the spoken origins of standard English, Wyld also was concerned with representing the thoroughgoing speechlikeness—the affinities between speech and prose—manifested by the texts as a positive stylistic feature, one which led ultimately to the glories of Shakespearian dialogue, supremely colloquial and literary at once.[27]

As long as a century ago, however, Lorenz Morsbach took exception to the prevailing stress on the spoken origins of standard English—not, of course, to set aside the role of speech in constituting and disseminating a standard, but rather to contest the straightforward identification of the language found in late fourteenth- to mid-fifteenth-century English texts with the language of London speech during the same period. Focused on three categories of texts—City of London records, royal documents, and Parliamentary documents—written between 1380 and 1475, Morsbach's work yielded evidence of a crucial half-century of transition (1380–1430), during which the royal and Parliamentary documents that at first displayed a preponderance of southern dialectal features assimilated themselves more and more nearly to the east Midland features of the City records. It was Morsbach's view that this process of standardization to a London norm on the written front outran related developments on the spoken front. He accordingly proposed a date of 1430 for the essential completion of developments toward a written standard, and 1460 or

[26]Wyld, *History of Modern Colloquial English*, 3d ed., pp. 4–5. Also see Francis P. Magoun, Jr., "Colloquial Old and Middle English," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 19 (1937): 167–73; and Langenfelt, *Select Studies in Colloquial English of the Late Middle Ages*, p. 3.

[27]Wyld, *History of Modern Colloquial English*, pp. 70, 76, 97–99, 101–3.

shortly thereafter for the felt establishment of a spoken standard (Caxton's testimony playing a decisive part in the latter case).[28]

Building upon Morsbach's findings that the origins of modern standard English were "literary," that is, standardizations self-consciously produced in writing, H. M. Flasdieck showed that this new official medium constituted by the language of City legal documents strongly influenced the language of deeds, wills, and other such writings drawn up in other parts of the country in the middle decades of the fifteenth century. In a still further enlargement of the "literary" picture to be drawn from spelling and compositional practices, Asta Kihlbom reached the following conclusion from a study of the great fifteenth-century letter collections, the Cely, Paston, Stonor, and other remains of communications to and from private individuals in various parts of England: "It is evident that the London language was felt as a Standard to be followed as closely as possible, for the dialectal deviations that do occur, are more or less occasional and generally appear by the side of the 'Standard' forms. . . . Often the influence of regional dialect is apparent only in the marked preference of one spelling, when the Standard vacillates between two."[29] The most recent study in this line, John H. Fisher's "Chancery and the Emergence of Standard Written English in the Fifteenth Century," gives us a circumstantial picture of the self-conscious handling of the written language in Chancery English (the texts produced by a well-trained cadre of official Westminster scribes who serviced both the Crown and Parliament). Tracing the influence toward nationwide uniformity that Chancery English exerted on the preparation of vernacular legal documents between 1420 and 1460, after attaining "a mature form" by 1430, Fisher graphically evokes a sense of the force for linguistic standardization that issued from the authorized production of documents in mainly formulaic language by professionals under regulated procedures for transcription.[30] Summing up on the readjustments in interpretation that have now accorded temporal priority to self-conscious writing practices in the emergence of standard English, Strang has this to say:

> The rise of this special form of English was a very complicated matter, and, which is rarely true, the more we find out about it, the more complicated it looks. The unique position of London in even earlier centuries had long ago set its speech apart from ordinary dialects, giving it a social stratification. . . . What was new in [the period 1370–1570] was a threefold development: first, the evolution of a City of London written standard, which need not imply a spoken one; second, the evolution of a sequence of competing types, of which one (the direct ancestor of P[resent] E[nglish] Standard) dominated from about 1430; third, the rise and spread of a spoken standard (subject to many subsequent variations, but in principle the ancestor of R[eceived] P[ronunciation]) not later than the sixteenth century.[31]

My purpose in the foregoing brief review of scholarship on the origins of standard English has in part been to call attention to another momentous modern development with a bearing on the present study, but even more to emphasize the existence of a good deal of circumstantial evidence—in textual specifics that can be construed phonologically and morphologically—of the deliberate regulating and standardizing of language in the process of writing which, as I have claimed, can be equated with at least a minimal level of literary or stylistic self-consciousness.[32] My emphasis has been the more pointed in view of a regrettable fact which we have now to confront squarely, both in itself and for its undoubted influence on the thinking of Croll and Jones (among many others). The fact is that the subtlety and control which philologists were willing to attribute to earlier writers' spellings and word-groupings as registers of distinctive features in phonology and morphology by and large stopped there. The tradition to which we still owe much illumination of other aspects of earlier English prose scanted the study of sentence form overall, and, where it did not, it took at best a condescending view. A survey of this work and its implications will conclude this section of my introductory reflections on "modernity" in prose and prose study.

The pioneering study of sentence form according to the methods and procedures of late nineteenth-century historical philology was Leon Kellner's *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* (1892). Notwithstanding a careful use of descriptive terminology, Kellner presents a view of the development of English sentence form that is conspicuous for a kind of evolutionary grand design resting on the supposition that syntax in the

[28]Lorenz Morsbach, *Ueber den Ursprung der neuenglischen Schriftsprache* (Heilbronn: Henniger, 1888), pp. 7–9, 165–70.

[29]Asta Kihlbom, *A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth-Century English*, I, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift: Filosofi Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper, Band 2 (1926): 193–94. The earlier reference in this paragraph is to H. M. Flasdieck, *Forschungen zur Frühzeit der neuenglischen Schriftsprache*, Tom. 1–2, Studien zur englischen Philologie, Heft 65–66 (Halle, 1922). I have not seen two other contributions in this line: R. E. Zachrisson, *Pronunciation of English Vowels, 1400–1700*, Göteborgs Kungliga Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Sämhalleshandlingar, Heft 14–15 (1913); and Julius Lekebusch, *Die Londoner Urkundensprache von 1430–1500: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der neuenglischen Schriftsprache*, I, II, Studien zur englischen Philologie, Heft 14–15 (Halle, 1906).

[30]John H. Fisher, "Chancery and the Emergence of Standard Written English in the Fifteenth Century," *Speculum* 52 (1977): 870–99.

[31]Strang, *A History of English*, p. 161, and see further, pp. 162–65.

[32]For illuminating discussion, see Henry Bradley, *On the Relations between Spoken and Written Language, with Special Reference to English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919); and David Abercrombie, "Conversation and Spoken Prose," *English Language Teaching* 18 (1963): 10–16.

classical languages is normative for all others. He envisaged English to have arisen, like other languages, out of a primitive phase in which there was not yet even full clausal structure, only juxtaposed linguistic primaries (in Tarzan-like sequences), for example, 'Man see,' 'Pot empty,' 'Enemy near.' This stage, called "bald parataxis," was alleged to have close surviving analogues in folk sayings like "The more, the merrier," "Like father, like son," "Here today, gone tomorrow," "Easy come, easy go," "Out of sight, out of mind," and the like.[33] After the emergence of clausal units, the next step in Kellner's hypothesized reconstruction of syntactic structure was the joining together of clauses: the step at which his bias toward the classical languages as models for linguistic usage and cultivation is most clearly perceptible. He not only represents co-ordination—with or without a conjunctive particle—as historically prior to subordination of one clause to another; he also holds up hypotaxis as inherently superior to parataxis according to an ideal typology which discloses its conceptual provenance in phrasing at key pionts. Kellner sums up as follows on "Old English (A.D. 500–1200)": "The structure of sentences is in its infancy; co-ordination is frequent, conjunctions are not always made use of in connecting sentences and clauses." And here is the opening of his summary on "Modern English (A.D. 1500–Present)":

> The most characteristic feature of Modern English syntax is *perfection in the structure of sentences*. Both Old and Middle English are wanting in unity and proportion; in Modern English both are attained, favoured, in all probability, by the models of Greek and Latin prose-works. . . . The well-constructed period is of comparatively recent date.[34]

Kellner held comparable evolutionary views about human consciousness (indeed, self-consciousness) in the use of language, and he invoked these as an ultimate explanation for the historical dynamic which he attributed to sentence form. Suggestive in themselves, his mentalistic predilections were unfortunately used to buttress such facile generalizations as the one advanced in the introduction to *Historical Outlines*, where English prose written subsequent to the sixteenth century is alleged to show a "*proportion and unity in the structure of the sentence*" which prior English prose lacks altogether. These are, says Kellner, "the philological facts. But how are we to account for them in a psychological way?" This was his answer:

[33]Leon Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1892), secs. 97–99. Charles Bally also retails this evolutionary myth about sentence formation in *Linguistique générale et linguistique française* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1932), p. 79. For a sensible attack on the myth, with discussion of the linguistic applicability of logical concepts of coordinate and dependent relationships, see M. Sandmann, "Subordination and Coordination," *Archivum Linguisticum* 2 (1950): 24–38.

[34]Kellner, *Historical Outlines*, secs. 432, 484. His italics.

> The syntax of older periods is natural, *naïf*, that is, it follows much more closely the drift of the ideas, of mental images; the diction, therefore, looks as if it were extemporised, as if written on the spur of the moment, while modern syntax, fettered by logic, is artificial, and therefore far from being a true mirror of what is going on in the mind.[35]

While the very sentence form of the foregoing explanation belies its putative truth by pursuing "modern" logic with the "*naïf*" devices of parataxis (including coordinate, appositive, and nonrestrictive relative constructions), the attitudinal effect of Kellner's *Historical Outlines* was powerful and extremely prejudicial, in particular, to English prose which relied extensively on the resources of conjunctive syntax. A later essay, written in German, which sought to adduce other explanations than crudity and ineptitude for redundancy and "shifted" constructions in Old and Middle English sentences, had nothing like the circulation of its predecessor.[36] On this side of the Atlantic, the *Syntax* volume of George O. Curme's *A Grammar of the English Language* adopted the evolutionary grand design of Kellner's view of English sentence form without cavil or modification.[37] The view also deeply influenced Samuel K. Workman's *Fifteenth-Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose*, a study which has properly won respect for its analytical rigor although it is based on the questionable premise that the way to the writing of English prose of literary quality in the fifteenth century lay through exercise in translating from Latin or French into the native tongue. While the results of his qualitative comparisons of translations and original writing from early, middle, and late points in the century are equivocal,[38] interesting evidence of Kellnerian influence emerges in Workman's treatment of the vernacular prose chronicle as a continuous genre of original composition. He duly distinguishes a first stage (1400–1470), "almost invariably char-

[35]Ibid., sec. 9. Kellner's italics. Also see Wilhelm Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1931), secs. 45–48, where coordinating conjunction is classified as a primitive syntactic resource because it conveys only "successive thinking" (*das sukzessive Denken*).

[36]Leon Kellner, "Abwechselung und Tautologie: Zwei Eigenthumlichkeiten des Alt- und Mittelenglischen Stiles," *Englische Studien* 20 (1895): 1–24. Here he offers the appeal of variety and the desire to make meaning maximally explicit as explanations for the syntactic anomalies he identifies.

[37]George O. Curme, *Syntax* (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1931), pp. 28–30, 89, 176.

[38]Samuel K. Workman, *Fifteenth-Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940), pp. 11–13, 20–23, 28–32, 145–50. Based on Workman's own assessments, John Wyclif and Nicholas Love, from the beginning of the period, are equally good at original writing and translating; John Capgrave and Sir John Fortescue, from the latter part of the century, are also equally good at both. Caxton, again at the end of the century, is uneven on both counts. Only Edward of York, working early in the century (ca. 1405), affords direct confirmation of the controlling hypothesis by emerging as a significantly better translator than original writer. Workman distinguishes compositional phases for the vernacular prose chronicle on pp. 42–46.

acterized by an elementary simplicity of structure," in which paratactic sentence form prevails; an overlapping second stage (1460–75), in which hypotactic constructions begin to make inroads; and a third stage (1475–1504), in which hypotaxis moves into the ascendancy over paratactic form. Apart from questions we might now raise about the categorization of various constructions, the interest attaching to these compositional phases for the fifteenth-century vernacular prose chronicle lies, first, in the constant implication that hypotaxis is the means to improved (and superior) style and, second, in the puzzling relation between this evolutionary paradigm and the larger argument. Since the vernacular output of these mostly anonymous chronicle writers is not known to have been connected with any translating activity, if it improves on its own, by Workman's own accounting, in the course of the century in question, then is it really necessary to learn to write English prose by way of translation? The puzzle attests the force of the prevailing pejorative outlook on the heavily conjunctive syntax of what I have been attempting to define as early "modern" English prose.

To be sure, dissent was registered notably by S. O. Andrew and Erich Auerbach in their respective treatments of coordinate sentence structure.[39] But the crucial point is that the scholarly majority had its reasons for the outlook it had adopted—good reasons, too, of a sort. There was nothing in the methods or findings of the syntactic analysis at their disposal to make them suppose that there could be any real interest in the workings of conjunction—anything of cognitive or stylistic value. George Williamson's generalizations from the hypotaxis-parataxis dichotomy to principles for interpreting sentence form are both representative and revealing; as the passage runs its course in ascribing potential functions, it is clear why "the coordinate sentence" was disparaged in comparison with "the complex sentence":

> The coordinate sentence, which is most fully exploited in balance, equates thought, emphasizes alike, and disperses unity and coherence. Structurally the relation between members of a coordinate sentence devoid of balance is the same as that between sentences. Members when united in paratactic structure and unified in thought do not advance logically; they repeat or vary the main idea, or present different aspects of it. When thrown into parallel form they acquire a formal unity. The complex sentence, which is most fully exploited in the cumulative period, subordinates thought to thought, distributes emphasis, and promotes or focuses unity or coherence. It provides its thought with an articulate logic, and in periodic form is well-knit both grammatically and rhetorically; for when so compacted it is shaped so as to accumulate force and sonority. Hypotaxis is

[39]Andrew, *Syntax and Style in Old English*, pp. 87–100; Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), chap. 1.

> the structural principle of climax in a sentence or period; it permits the energy and meaning of a sentence to be centered in a comprehensive rounding.[40]

If it were indeed true that, by contracting likeness or identity relations among its members, the "coordinate sentence" both dispersed "unity and coherence" and failed to "advance logically," it is hard to see how the added felicities of "balance" or "parallel form" could save it from its users' willed extinction. Williamson can plainly be seen to be handicapped here by a critical outlook on conjunction which is so rudimentary that it discloses no more "relation between members of a coordinate sentence devoid of balance" than discrete sentences would show. Despite the limitations of his mode of analysis, he properly claimed of the syntactic configurations which he called "figures" that "For the accurate definition of a prose style it is necessary to determine not only what figures are used but how they are used," and, of his own work, that it was a history of the "most incisive pattern" in "prose style in the seventeenth century." In accepting Williamson's lead with regard to the stylistic significance of syntax, if I am to further my claim that English prose from the era I have designated meets our "modern" expectations of literary interest and accomplishment, I will have to show some reason to think that such interest and accomplishment might attach to the conjunctive sentence forms which surely are the "most incisive pattern" in this prose. I make a beginning with some needed theoretical and critical referents in the following section.

A Stylistics of the Sentence: The Syntax and Semantics of Conjunction

Conjunction, centrally constituted by coordination with *and*, *but*, and *or*, is a fundamental resource in natural language, as familiar a staple of writing as of speech. Traditional grammar captures one of its essentials in defining conjunction as a linkage of elements on an equal syntactic basis, whether or not any semantic dependency can be seen to operate as well. However, an approach by way of a perspective opened mainly by transformational-generative analysis allows us to recognize in conjunction one of a restricted but very powerful group of operations that make for inexhaustible potential in the production of new sentences—the very core of linguistic creativity. What this group of only three operations, conjunction, relativization, and complementation, does is to provide for incorporating sentences within sentences within sentences in an ongoing fashion that has no grammatically determined limits, only the pragmatic ones imposed on all human activities by the limits of

[40]Williamson, *The Senecan Amble*, p. 38. The following references are to p. 31 and p. 7.

energy, attention, and purpose. Because they are potentially so creative, it is not surprising to find them as objects of linguistic play. The play is on conjunction in "And the hip bone is connected to the thigh bone, and the thigh bone is connected to the knee bone, and the knee bone is connected to the leg bone . . ."; the play is on relativization in "This is the dog that worried the cat that chased the rat that plagued the miller that ground the corn . . ."; and the play is on complementation in "We know that they know that you know that I know . . . that I love you." The power of these three sentence-combining operations is such that we cannot call a halt at any juncture on the grounds that the end product is an impossibility in English. Each successive result of these operations is always a possible sentence of English—perhaps more of a sentence than one wants or can see need for, but still, incontestably, a sentence.[41] On analogy with certain functions in mathematics, indefinitely repeatable linguistic operations are called recursive. Recursion in conjunctive sentence forms will be a major focus of concern in the present study.

It is not difficult to see the stylistic interest and, even, complexity that attaches to recursion. In the continuing option to proliferate or not to proliferate sentence form by means, say, of conjunction, the creative potential of language converges with the creativity but also the self-conscious restraint of the human user of language who has an expressive or communicative end in mind. What kind of sentence units are produced by the exercise of recursion can be of vital significance in prose style. Complexity enters, also, with the *and*s of conversational English and with the *and*s of the prose I will be discussing because it is not always certain where a sentence unit ends. For example, at the opening of the Gospel of Matthew where there are forty-five consecutive conjunctions of simplex sentences ("Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob, and Jacob begat Judas and his brethren, and . . ."), we may wonder whether we are dealing with a compound sentence or a discourse. Probably no principled cutoff between sentence form and discourse structure can be formulated. I have proceeded by taking my cues from punctuation (or its lack) in the prose under discussion—admittedly still a developing means for signaling to a reader how the energies unleashed in recursion are also being directed. But there can be no satisfactory

[41]Sanford A. Schane proposed a formal characterization of recursion and other functions in *A Schema for Sentence Coordination*, Information System Language Studies no. 10 (Bedford, Mass.: Mitre Corp., April 1966), pp. 1–60, which serves as the basis of the treatment of sentential conjunction in Robert P. Stockwell, Paul Schachter, and Barbara Hall Partee, *The Major Syntactic Structures of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973), pp. 23–24, 296, 320–67. For pertinent discussion of recursion and grammar-writing, see Paul Ziff, "The Number of English Sentences," *Foundations of Language* 11 (1974): 519–32; and P. Stanley Peters and R. W. Ritchie, "On the Generative Power of Transformational Grammars," *Information Sciences* 6 (1973): 49–83.

alternative to taking the frequently prodigious amplitude of these sentence forms on their own terms in the study of style.

Although conjunction, relativization, and complementation are all and equally sentence-creating recursive operations of natural language, conjunction is unique in kind, precisely because of its linkage of elements on an equal syntactic basis. Relativization and complementation proceed by adjoining, or embedding, newly produced sentences at nodes of a containing sentence which can properly—that is, grammatically—receive them. Recursion of these two operations is like stuffing an envelope. However, since sentences being conjoined with *and*, say, are not being subordinated to each other syntactically, a totally new, higher-order sentence requires to be brought into being in order to sustain equality while creating linkage. The resulting whole is indeed more than the sum of its parts—a singular superstructure which differentiates the "sentence" it is from the "clause" units that can only be its members, or members subordinated to one another in relativization and complementation. The compound sentence is, thus, the defining instance of sentencehood.[42] Lest this point about the unique structure-creating effects of conjunction be thought a mere theoretical nicety, we may directly consider several tests for identifying coordinate structure in the composition of actual sentences. What these tests reveal is a distinctive resistance in compound sentences to having their own internal structure altered or to being absorbed in the internal structure of other sentences.[43]

The first test shows that the main and subordinate clauses of a complex sentence can interchange freely, while the clauses of a compound sentence cannot. Thus, 'She went to the chapel although he was not there' and 'Although he was not there, she went to the chapel' are acceptable sentences. 'She went to the chapel, but he was not there' is acceptable also; *'But he was not there, she went to the chapel' is unacceptable (as the asterisk denotes). A second test shows that it is possible to question an element in the main clause of a complex sentence but not to question

[42]The point is Roger Fowler's, in "Sentence and Clause in English," *Linguistics* 14 (1965): 5–13. He observes that the phenomenon of a compound sentence is the sole basis on which we can distinguish a "sentence" from a "clause." For a clause shares with a sentence the feature of an *S* node immediately dominating (*NP* + *VP*); and, likewise, clauses as well as sentences are sites for the embedding operations of relativization and complementation. Only the structural description of a compound sentence as an entity whose *S* node immediately dominates (*S* + *S* + . . .) gives us the characterization of a sentence which is also, emphatically, not a clause.

[43]I owe the formulation of the four coordinate structure tests to my colleague James D. McCawley. A fifth test involving the clear anaphoric referencing of pronouns in complex sentences but not in compound ones may be found in Lila R. Gleitman, "Coordinating Conjunctions in English," *Language* 41 (1965): 260–93; reprinted in *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*, ed. David A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 80–112, and see esp. p. 94 n.

an element in a coordinated clause. Thus, to the sentence 'The servants gathered in the hall when the earl entered' it is possible to put the question 'Where did the servants gather when the earl entered?' But to the sentence 'The servants gathered in the hall and the earl entered' it is not possible to put the question *'Where did the servants gather and the earl entered?' The third test shows it is possible to relativize a complex sentence but not a compound one. Thus, 'The English proceeded to Agincourt because the French held Harfleur' can be relativized as 'The English who proceeded to Agincourt because the French held Harfleur were the archers.' But 'The English proceeded to Agincourt and the French held Harfleur' cannot be relativized as *'The English who proceeded to Agincourt and the French held Harfleur were the archers.' A fourth test yields parallel results with *for . . . to* complementation. Thus, 'Hastings did not appear at court until Richard summoned him' can undergo complementizing as 'For Hastings not to appear at court until Richard summoned him was a provocative gesture.' But 'Hastings did not appear at court and Richard summoned him' cannot be complementized as *'For Hastings not to appear at court and Richard summoned him was a provocative gesture.' Obviously, the fixity of structure and imperviousness to transformation shown by coordinate sentences are important defining characteristics.[44] Their syntactic independence and self-containedness, I think, may have figured importantly in their stylistic designation as vehicles for sententious form in the prose we shall consider in chapters 5 and 6.

The foregoing tests have revealed some basic constraints on sentential conjunctions already in existence. What about bringing sentential conjunctions into existence? Can any two (or more) sentences be conjoined freely? Chomsky's pioneering account of the subject in *Syntactic Structures* recognized that there had to be some motivating condition for sentential conjunction, and he attempted to define it purely syntactically, in terms of constituents of the same type playing analogous roles in the deep structures of their respective sentences. Thus, in his example, from 'The scene of the movie was in Chicago' and 'The scene of the play was in Chicago' we can proceed to form the conjunction 'The scene of the movie and of the play was in Chicago.'[45] This straightforward example clarifies what, in general, is required to conjoin sentences: first, some

[44]John Robert Ross has articulated these qualities in his proposed Coordinate Structure Constraint: "In a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct." See his "Constraints on Variables in Syntax" (Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1967; mimeographed text distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club), sec. 4.84.

[45]Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957), pp. 35–36 (sec. 5.2).

measure of relevant sameness (in this case, both conjuncts have the following same constituents: *the scene, was, in Chicago*), and, second, some measure of relevant difference which, nevertheless, takes the form of likeness (in this case, *of the movie* and *of the play* are the different, but like constituents). This requisite motivation is called an identity condition—a useful term, so long as it is recalled that the relevant sameness must include relevant difference. If the identity condition were totally met, sentential conjunction would be vitiated by tautology: *'The scene of the movie was in Chicago and the scene of the movie was in Chicago.' The unacceptability of the foregoing conjunction also points to another aspect of the overall operation recognized in Chomsky's early account: in conjoining, the separate occurrences of identical constituents reduce—or collapse—into a single occurrence (hence, in the sentential conjunction of his example, *the scene, was, in Chicago* occur only once). This elimination of surface sameness is known as conjunction reduction; there is a powerful predisposition toward it, although it is not, strictly speaking, obligatory.

As future discussion—beginning with the material now under review—will show, the heightening of sensitivity to the nature and limits of linguistic sameness and difference which attends on the use of conjunctive syntax is of extreme importance both in the creation of new sentence forms by this means and in any stylistic interpretation of them. Subsequent to *Syntactic Structures*, one major line of inquiry addressed in more detail the formation and properties of coordinate phrases as outcomes of sentential conjunction (and conjunction reduction). Lila Gleitman offered an important generalization regarding the difference in identity conditions for conjunction reduction involving *NP*s and *VP*s.[46] Reducing identical *NP*s do so under strong identity: identity, that is, of (*a*) linguistic form, (*b*) sense, and (*c*) reference. Thus, it is impossible to interpret 'A woman entered and began weeping' as referring to two women, one who entered and another who began to weep. In 'Cromwell trusted to Providence but acted energetically,' to understand the *Cromwell* of 'Cromwell trusted to Providence' as Thomas and the *Cromwell* of 'Cromwell acted energetically' as Oliver is equally impossible. The semantic content of the identity condition on conjoining *NP*s may be stated in Gleitman's rule: nonrepetition indicates identity; repetition indicates nonidentity. The rule requires reading Donne's line in "The Indifferent" ("I can love her and her and her . . .") as referring to different women, which is how we do naturally read it. This is a tidy situation, but the one regarding reducible *VP* conjuncts is messier. The condition on the

[46]Gleitman, "Coordinating Conjunctions in English," in *Modern Studies in English*, ed. Reibel and Schane, pp. 88–93.

latter is weak identity: identity of (*a*) linguistic form, (*b*) sense, and (*c*) *parallel* reference only.[47]

The semantic consequences of this difference between strong and weak identity conditions are momentous, and easy to illustrate. Conjunctively reduced *VP*s are widely unspecific in English with respect to the possibilities of "unit" or "individual" interpretation. For instance, the sentence 'Mary and Elizabeth left London' does not convey definite information as to whether the two left together, as a "unit" (one action) or separately, as "individuals" (two actions). This unspecificity may affect an object *NP* within a conjunctively reduced *VP;* in 'Mary and Elizabeth want a cat' it is unclear whether one or two animals are at issue. Further reflection showed that "individual" interpretation of a conjunctively reduced *VP* seems quite certainly to trace to a source in sentential conjunction: the sense of separate actions derives from the separate predicates of the conjoining sentences. But "unit" interpretation has struck certain theorists as having much more in common with plural expressions and number expressions, which are formed as phrases, and, in any case, as having no straightforwardly demonstrable source in sentential conjunction.[48] Thus, to take Curme's long-standing example, the source of 'The king and queen are an amiable pair' is apparently "not an abridgement of two or more sentences"—not, that is, derived from a conjunction of *'The king is an amiable pair' and *'The queen is an amiable pair,' to which reduction of identical material has applied.[49] The unsatisfactoriness of a proposed source in sentential conjunction for the 'king and queen' phrase comes to the fore, likewise, in the unit interpretation of 'Mary and Elizabeth left London.' How can its source be a conjunction of 'Mary left London' and 'Elizabeth left London' when the whole gist of unit interpretation is, in Anna Wierzbicka's

[47]"Strong identity" is a term from formal logic, which builds upon Gottlob Frege's definitions of "sense" (*Sinn*) and "reference" (*Bedeutung*). The sense of a sentence is a proposition (*Gedanke*); the reference of a sentence is a truth-value. Under strong identity, both sense and reference coincide; in the analogous syntactic relation, linguistic form as well as sense and reference do. See "Ueber Sinn und Bedeutung," *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* 100 (1892): 25–50; also T. Schiebe, "Zum Problem der grammatisch relevanten Identität," in *Generative Grammar in Europe*, ed. Ferenc Kiefer and Nicholas Ruwet (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1973), pp. 482–527. On weak identity and its ramifications, see, further, Östen Dahl, "On So-Called 'Sloppy Identity,' " *Synthèse* 26 (1973): 81–112.

[48]For discussion, see Carlota A. Smith, "Ambiguous Sentences with *And*," in *Modern Studies in English*, ed. Reibel and Schane, pp. 75–79; Anna Wierzbicka's (influential but unpublished) paper, "Against Conjunction Reduction" (MIT, 1967), as discussed in Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee, *Major Syntactic Structures of English*, pp. 305–6; and James D. McCawley, "The Role of Semantics in a Grammar," in Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, ed., *Universals in Linguistic Theory* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968), pp. 167–68, revised in "A Program for Logic," in *Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1972), pp. 538–39.

[49]Curme, *Syntax*, p. 161.

words, to affirm a "general proposition" and not to make discrete predications? A much closer source for the unit meaning of 'Mary and Elizabeth' would seem to be 'The two women left London' or 'The pair left London.'

While theoretical debate has confirmed the indispensability and enormous power of sentential conjunction as a source of coordinate structures, the existence of "unit" (sometimes also called "phrasal") meaning has continued to challenge adequate formulation—the more so as its ramifications have been recognized in other constituent structures than *NP*s. For example, unit meaning is present, and sources in sentential conjunction apparently lacking, in the following (italicized) adjective and adverb phrases: 'His trousers were *black-and-white checked*'; 'They returned *time and again*'; 'They wandered *to and fro*'. Any temptation we might feel to treat such locutions as isolated and infrequent anomalies, moreover, is checked by confronting the wealth of unit meaning that opens before us in certain categories and uses of verbs. By far the most important of these are reciprocal and reflexive verbs. What sentential conjunction can possibly be the source of 'Henry and Anne embraced' or of 'Bushy, Bagot, and Green killed each other'?[50] Equally, though less obviously, it is surely possible to say 'She laughed and cried' with the necessary sense that the laughing and crying were one complex, simultaneous action—a unit of meaning.[51] The existence of significant ambiguity in coordinate structure between individual and unit interpretations can prove stylistically crucial, as we shall be seeing at various points in this study. In general, I have found such ambiguity figuring vitally in theological contexts—which is not surprising when one considers that the central Christian paradoxes have received formulation as conjunctions with unit meaning: the Trinity (three Persons and one God), the incarnation (God and man), the virgin birth (mother and maid), transubstantiation and Lutheran consubstantiation (Body and bread). But in secular contexts also, an author's awareness of joint or separate connotations of coordinate phrasing can be conveyed to us in what becomes as much a literary as a linguistic transaction.

[50]For discussion, see Ray C. Dougherty, "A Grammar of Coordinate Conjoined Structures," Parts I and II, *Language* 46 (1970): 850–98 and 47 (1971): 298–339; Robert Fiengo and Howard Lasnik, "The Logical Structure of Reciprocal Sentences in English," *Foundations of Language* 9 (1973): 447–68, and Dougherty's reply in "The Syntax and Semantics of *Each Other* Constructions," *FL* 12 (1974): 1–47; also George Lakoff and P. Stanley Peters, "Phrasal Conjunction and Symmetric Predicates," in *Modern Studies in English*, ed. Reibel and Schane, pp. 121–22; Robert P. Stockwell, *Foundations of Syntactic Theory* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 14, 53.

[51]For discussion of this and other aspects of 'unit' meaning, see R. A. Hudson, "On Clauses Containing Conjoined and Plural Noun Phrases in English," *Lingua* 24 (1969–70): 205–53.

Another major line of inquiry subsequent to *Syntactic Structures* focused on clausal rather than phrasal units under the operation of sentential conjunction. By all odds the most important contribution in this line for students of prose style is Robin Lakoff's "Ifs, Ands, and Buts about Conjunction."[52] She begins by refining a purely syntactic definition of the identity condition motivating sentential conjunction. We cannot, she shows, conjoin any two internally well-formed sentences of English by virtue solely of their identity as sentences. There are relatively more acceptable and relatively less acceptable sentential conjunctions, as the following graded series (adapted from her examples) illustrates:

The king acquired Hampton Court and he also held title to Whitehall.
The king acquired Hampton Court and the queen took title to Greenwich.
? The king acquired Hampton Court and Latimer preached jeremiads.
?? The king acquired Hampton Court and vagabonds plague England.
* The bishop is childless and he has three daughters.
** London is on the Thames and London is on the Thames.

The decreasing acceptability of the foregoing sentences has a semantic explanation. We have already observed that the identity required of conjoining sentences must include a measure of difference-in-sameness in order to block tautology. Now, to proceed from the head of the list, it is clear that the first sentence is thoroughly acceptable as a compound of different predications about a same subject (*the king* = *he*) and that the second sentence is also thoroughly acceptable as a compound of different predications about perceptibly like subjects (*the king* and *the queen*). The third sentence is questionable, despite the correspondent subject + transitive verb + direct object structure of its conjuncts, because it is hard for us to carry interpretation beyond "Two men kept busy in their own ways—so what?" Acceptability will depend on knowing that Hampton Court is a lavish palace and that the prophet Jeremiah denounced sins of worldliness. The fourth sentence is still more unacceptable than its predecessor because it complicates the search for relevant semantic identity with linguistic anomaly: a predication referring to an action and a specific time (the verb *acquired*) is paired with one referring to a state holding for an indefinite time (the generic verb *plague*). Yet this conjunction may become acceptable if we know or can intuit a connection, say, between royal extravagance and the circumstances under which vagabondage emerges as a national problem. The last two examples, however, seem more or less firmly unacceptable. At the opposite extreme from tautology, contradiction works powerfully to disqualify sentential conjunction by denying a motivation in sameness; all

[52]Robin Lakoff, "Ifs, Ands, and Buts about Conjunction," in *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, ed. Charles J. Fillmore and D. Terence Langendoen (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971), pp. 114–49.

is (or appears to be) difference. The only shift for saving the sentence with a single asterisk is somehow to find, in irony or innuendo, the needed measure of likeness—the possibility of reading, say, with the following intonation: 'The bishop is "childless"—and he has three daughters!' Extrapolating from the observable gradation in acceptability which I have just illustrated, Lakoff concludes that "paired constituents must be reducible to partial or complete identity . . . for a conjunction to be appropriate"; they must, that is, have a "*common topic*." This name, she continues, points to the localization of motivating identity in the "pair of constituents in the two conjuncts that are *what the sentence is particularly about*. This, I think, is the normal way in which conjoined sentences are interpreted."[53]

Much more than the advance it registers on earlier, purely syntactic definitions of the identity condition motivating sentential conjunction, Robin Lakoff's formulation in terms of a "common topic" signals sharp divergence from a then prevalent literary and stylistic outlook on the "coordinate sentence" as an entity that, to requote Williamson, "emphasizes alike, and disperses unity and coherence." Lakoff's common topic both specifies what the emphasis on "alike" consists in and recognizes its effect as the promoting of "unity and coherence." The enabling implications for the analysis of sentence form are immediate, as her own essay proceeds to show. After identifying in the notion of a common topic the semantic core of the condition governing the conjoining of sentences, Lakoff examines the types of sentential conjunction and the specific properties of conjunctive particles from her continuing semantic perspective. The point of departure for her typology is the standardly drawn distinction between "symmetric" conjunction (conjuncts in interchangeable positions) and "asymmetric" conjunction (conjuncts in fixed, invariant positions). Symmetric conjunction is observably the more demanding and binding relation, for there are many sentences that cannot be put together in an indifferent order. Those that can, therefore, tend to display clear set membership or other overarching connections—for example, 'Patricia does needlework, and Larry watches television, and Ruth rebinds books, and Elizabeth reads spy thrillers, and Steve breeds gerbils.' The common topic is unmistakable: leisure-time activities. By contrast, asymmetric conjunction, especially with *and*, is easily entered upon—so easily, in fact, that a loosely continuative series of coordinated sentences is the most common pattern for spontaneous speech.

Significantly, however, Lakoff notes a further principle operative in asymmetric sentential conjunction with *and*: a superimposed binary division that offsets the looseness of connection by giving the larger sen-

[53]Ibid., p. 122, and cf. pp. 118, 148. Her emphases.

tence unit a discernible turn or break. Its force is semantic: one of the conjoining sentences will serve as a crux or pivot. In her example, the crux is in the initial conjunct, 'the police came in': 'Well, the story is as follows: the police came in, and everyone swallowed their cigarettes, and Bill choked on his, and they had to take him to the hospital, and his mother just about went frantic when she heard, and I had to placate her by lending her my copy of *Portnoy's Complaint*.'[54] How much my own analysis of symmetric and, especially, asymmetric sentential conjunction owes to Lakoff's will be evident throughout the ensuing sections of this study, particularly chapter 3. My increased attentiveness to the crux or pivot superstructure which is part of my debt to her work tends to indicate, however, that a late or final conjunct is a far likelier site for a semantic turning point, since it will give the asymmetric sentential conjunction a climax form (*pace* Williamson and others under Kellnerian influence, who ascribe climax distinctively to hypotaxis). I illustrate, once again, from the Gospel of Matthew (7:25, 27), with italicizing to indicate the climactic conjunct:

> And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, *and it fell not:* for it was founded upon a rock.
>
> And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, *and it fell,* and great was the fall of it.

It is advisable to interrupt exposition of Lakoff's essay and turn attention briefly to Francis Christensen's *Notes toward a New Rhetoric*, a manifesto for the teaching of writing that advanced slightly earlier and much stronger claims than Lakoff's for the stylistic potentiality of asymmetric sentential conjunction, though without the incisiveness of her analysis. According to Christensen, "The foundation for a generative or productive rhetoric of the sentence is that composition is essentially a process of addition." In explaining what he means, he comes close to anticipating Bever's "canonical sentoid" strategy in his focus on the "main clause" and he emphatically anticipates my claim for the modernity of the prose which is the subject of this study in characterizing "the typical sentence of modern English" as "what we may call the *cumulative* sentence":

> The main clause, which may or may not have a sentence modifier before it, advances the discussion; but the additions move backward, as in this clause, to modify the statement of the main clause or more often to explicate or exemplify it, so that the sentence has a flowing and ebbing movement, advancing to a new position and then pausing to consolidate it. . . . Thus the . . . form of the sentence . . . serves the needs of both the writer and the reader, the writer by compelling him to examine his thought, the reader by letting him into the writer's thought.[55]

[54]Ibid., p. 127.

I find Christensen's account of the "cumulative sentence" somewhat too rigid in allowing only for "backward" addition from a main clause located at the head of a larger sentence unit, but its sturdy insistence that an additive, asymmetrically progressing sentence is the optimal (and "modern") vehicle—in English—for pursuing and developing a train of thought is well taken, indeed.

Returning, now, to Lakoff's essay, we note her signal perception that the distinction between symmetric and asymmetric types of sentential conjunction (1) holds for *or* and *but* as well as *and*, while also (2) intersecting in definite ways with the recursive potential of these conjunctions. *Or* in natural language is quite unlike its counterpart in formal logic: it places propositions in relation to each other as exclusive alternatives. So basic is this semantic function of *or* conjunction that the positing of alternatives is its "common topic." Symmetric *or* seems to be freely recursive: 'We'll take a drive or we'll walk in town or we'll go to a movie or. . . .' Asymmetric *or*, the less common type, seems nonrecursive in allowing only two conjuncts. Its semantic force is a causal or contingent implication extending from the first alternative to the second. Interestingly enough, this asymmetry diminishes the possibility of actual choice between the specified alternatives. Thus, we find asymmetric *or* used in ultimatums or other "no-choice" situations: 'You'll be back by one or you'll be grounded'; 'It's do or die'; 'Your money or your life'; 'Give me liberty or give me death.'[56]

Lakoff's analysis of sentential conjunction with *but* incorporates various prior insights in transformational-generative analysis,[57] among them Gleitman's to the effect that *but* is always nonrecursive. Apparent recursions involving *but* are actually separate conjunctions at discrete levels of underlying structure, as can easily be seen in 'The prince was tall but sickly' (lower node), 'but his page was healthy' (higher node). In discussing the common topic in *but* conjunction, she also builds on an observation first made by Zellig Harris in purely syntactic terms: sentences conjoined with *but* standardly exhibit a minimum of two elements of difference-in-sameness, while sentences conjoined with *and* and *or* exhibit a minimum of one. The usual manifestation of this minimal twofold difference is in different lexical material at corresponding points of constituent structure; thus, 'The army marched on Rochester but it

[55]Francis Christensen, *Notes toward a New Rhetoric* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 4, 6–7. His emphasis.

[56]Lakoff, "Ifs, Ands, and Buts," p. 144.

[57]Ibid., pp. 133–36, building on Gleitman, "Coordinating Conjunctions in English," p. 82; and Zellig Harris, "Transformational Theory," *Language* 41 (1965): 363–401.

did *not* march on *Canterbury*'; 'The friar ate meat, but the *monk* did *not*.' Moreover, the overt presence of a negative particle endows these *but* conjunctions with a kind of normative status, for, as Lakoff's semantically oriented analysis makes clear, the common topic in *but* conjunctions is a "combination of similarity and difference"—more precisely, the registering of difference over against similarity. She distinguishes two senses of *but:* one, more impersonal in tenor, termed "semantic opposition"; and another, more subjective and personal, termed "denial of expectation."[58] Semantic opposition *but* is the ordinary type: 'Wolsey is wealthy but Bilney is penniless.' Denial of expectation *but* may be illustrated by 'They scheduled the landing for dawn, but it was stormy'; 'Anne prayed long for a son, but she bore the princess Elizabeth.' In rounding out her typology of symmetric and asymmetric conjunction, Lakoff is inclined (understandably enough) to rank denial of expectation *but*, with its built-in dual time reference, among the asymmetric conjunctions, and semantic opposition *but* among the symmetric ones. Such a division of semantic labor appears feasible while offering the additional theoretical advantage of bringing *but* into alignment on syntactic and semantic criteria as, by and large, an antitype—a negative counterpart—of *and*.

For stylistic reasons, it is worth prolonging reflection on the factor of semantic opposition that identifies *but*, for antithesis is sometimes made so blurry a concept that mere structural (or other) responsion passes for its defining feature. Specifically, just as the semantics of *and* proscribe the total identity of tautology, so too the semantics of *but* rule out the total opposition of antonymy unless the subjects of the conjuncts themselves differ. Thus, unless irony or other special interpretation comes to the rescue, we cannot accept *'Wolsey is wealthy but he is penniless,' while the acceptability of 'Wolsey is wealthy but Bilney is penniless' is a matter of course. This essential semantic opposition, controlled with regard to how little and how much is predicated, probably explains why the occurrence of *but* is restricted to two conjuncts: to focus the required balance of difference and sameness. Osgood and Richards have shown in interesting experimental work that the presence of negative connotation is the sole known psycholinguistic determinant for the choice of *but* over *and* in sentential contexts that could admit either connective.[59] But, in a literary-critical quarter, the strongest recognition I know of the tight oscillation of *but* in balancing semantic polarities comes from Kenneth Burke, who comments as follows on antithesis in *A Rhetoric of Motives:*

[58]Lakoff, "Ifs, Ands, and Buts," p. 132.

[59]Charles E. Osgood and Meredith M. Richards, "From Yang and Yin to *and* or *but*," *Language* 49 (1973): 380–412.

> Once you grasp the trend of the form, it invites participation regardless of subject matter. Formally, you will find yourself swinging along . . . even though you may not agree with the proposition that is being presented in this form. Or it may even be an opponent's proposition which you resent—yet for the duration of the statement itself you might "help him out" to the extent of yielding to the formal development, surrendering to its symmetry as such. . . . But in cases where a decision is still to be reached, a yielding to the form prepares for assent to the matter identified with it. Thus, you are drawn to the form, not in your capacity as a partisan, but because of some "universal" appeal in it. . . . You feel how it is destined to develop—and on the level of purely formal assent you would collaborate to round out its symmetry by spontaneously willing its completion and perfection as an utterance.[60]

While antithesis—*but* conjunction—is the only nonrecursive form in the core group also including *and* and *or*, there is a considerably larger group of connectives that impose an insistent binary design on or within coordinate sentence form: these are the so-called correlative conjunctions (sometimes also called emphatic conjunctions). The staples of this group include *both . . . and, not (only) . . . but (also), either . . . or, neither . . . nor, as . . . so.* It is noteworthy that clauses connected by correlatives show the same resistance to the manipulations of the coordinate structure tests as do those joined by *and, but,* or *or.* What is more, they exhibit a cognitive and rhetorical dynamic analogous to that identified by Burke in antithesis. Virginia Tufte aptly observes that "the correlative creates an order all its own, one of *logical* progression or inevitability in which the idea introduced [by the first member of the pair] is known to be incomplete and remains in a kind of suspension until finally . . . the missing material is supplied as introduced by the conjunction." Not only is such an insight into the specific workings of correlative conjunction accurate in itself and useful in correcting the Kellnerian imputations of "logic" and "suspension" only to hypotaxis, but it will also prove important to my developing formal argument in chapters 4 through 6 that the prose of the long period with which I am concerned undergoes a comprehensive shift from what I call "open sentences" to "directed syntax." Tufte, in summing up on correlative conjunction for her purposes, gives an introduction in brief to mine: "This quality of the correlative to direct the reader to the intended logical and syntactic conclusion allows its use, even without the ordering effects of a strong parallelism, as a 'ready-made' source of control over the arrangement of some rather lengthy and complex structures."[61]

[60]Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), pp. 58–59.

[61]Virginia Tufte, *Grammar as Style* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1971), pp. 107, 109. See, further, on the range and effects of diverse placement of conjunctive particles in phrase structure, Simon C. Dik, *Coordination: Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1968), p. 53; and Georgia M. Green,

Besides the precision and intensiveness that transformational-generative analysis has contributed to our understanding of sentential conjunction, an almost equal benefit has been the expansion of our awareness of its resources. Application of the concept of deep structure has disclosed the hitherto unsuspected origins in sentential conjunction of a number of ostensibly dissimilar constructions, the most important of which are nonrestrictive relatives, so-called sentential relatives, parentheticals, and appositives. It is vital to our estimate of the specifically literary potential of coordinate structure that these constructions should be recognized as family members, for, as I shall indicate in the following selective discussion, they make apertures in sentence form through which the author can put in an appearance—that is, interject a voice, often with something pointed to say.

In the formation of nonrestrictive relative constructions, an underlying symmetric conjunction of two sentences with *and* is transformed by the adjoining of one of the sentences within the other, in accordance with the following procedure.[62] Given a pair of sentential conjuncts, each of which contains a coreferential—that is, identical—*NP*, one of the sentential conjuncts can be moved to a position immediately following the coreferential noun in the other conjunct and adjoined there (with minor attendant alteration of its internal structure). Notably, however, the syntactic independence—or coordinate status—of the affected sentences is not compromised in either case. Thus from an underlying symmetric conjunction like the following, 'The Englishman was a skilled archer and the Englishman won the flitch of bacon,' either of a pair of nonrestrictive relatives can be derived: 'The Englishman, who won the flitch of bacon, was a skilled archer,' 'The Englishman, who was a skilled archer, won the flitch of bacon.' For this pair, the respective intermediate step in derivation would be sentential conjunctions of the form 'The Englishman, and the Englishman won the flitch of bacon, was a skilled archer,' 'The Englishman, and the Englishman was a skilled archer, won the flitch of bacon.' To generate a nonrestrictive relative conjunction is to exercise an option with respect to stylistic focus. At the same time that two independent pieces of information are being vouched for—or, more

"The Lexical Expression of Emphatic Conjunction: Theoretical Implications," *Foundations of Language* 10 (1973): 197–248.

[62]This analysis was first proposed by John R. Ross, *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, secs. 4.2.3, 6.2.4.1; the argument for the coordinate origins of relative clauses generally was first made by Sandra A. Thompson, "The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses," *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, ed. Fillmore and Langendoen, pp. 79–94. Stockwell concurs with Thompson in *Foundations of Syntactic Theory*, pp. 162–63. The coordinate origins of nonrestrictive relative constructions are not in dispute.

precisely, "two predications" are being made "on the same argument"[63]—one of these (the adjoined clause) is nevertheless relegated to what, on the surface, is a secondary status while the other (the "matrix" clause) retains its primary status. Still, the matrix clause does not absorb the adjoined clause as in the sentence-within-sentence embeddings found in nominalization and relativization. The nonrestrictive relative preserves and continues to (we might say) assert its syntactic independence through a characteristic intonation contour, reflected more or less acutely in the punctuating of written English over time. The contour is a segmenting one; its force can be seen in these clearly nonidentical sentences: 'Lovers who exalt their mistresses are idealistic,' 'Lovers, who exalt their mistresses, are idealistic.'

At this point, transformational-generative analysis empowers a further fundamental observation: we see that the essential syntactic and semantic difference between nonrestrictive relative and restrictive relative clauses corresponds to that between coordinate *NP*s with individual and unit meanings. Specifically, restrictive relative constructions, like coordinate *NP*s with unit meaning, are set-creating: 'lovers who exalt their mistresses' are constituted together as a unit within the class of lovers generally. Nonrestrictive relative constructions, by contrast, exhibit individual meaning. The characteristic comma intonation (or punctuation) operates to maintain the discreteness of the sentential components: thus we have 'Lovers, who are idealistic. . . .' (It is interesting, moreover, that analogous comma intonation or punctuation can be employed to signal individual meaning for coordinated *NP*s: note the lack of ambiguity with regard to unit or individual meaning in 'Henry danced, and Anne,' 'Henry, and Anne, danced.') Compounding the indications given by such correspondences of a source in sentential conjunction for nonrestrictive relatives, their attendant stylistic focus strongly suggests the same source. For nonrestrictive relatives function as commentary elements injected into the matrix sentence whose truth or validity is vouched for independently of the matrix. Thus we have as a typical instance: 'Polonius, who trusted his own shrewdness, persuaded the king that Hamlet was lovesick.' The assertion of self-trust has nothing to do, one way or the other, with the persuading. The commentary function may, moreover, occasion ambiguity if there is more than one possible commentator: for example, 'Ophelia related how Hamlet, who was in a fit of madness, paid her a visit'; 'Hamlet declared that the murder of Claudius, which was long overdue, was justified revenge.' Whose views of

[63]Thompson, "The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses," p. 87. See, further, Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum, *Transformations, Style, and Meaning* (Walthan, Mass.: Xerox Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 101–2.

madness and murder are these? Only the context informs us that Ophelia says no such thing about Hamlet but that Hamlet does berate himself about delay. These semantic and stylistic dimensions are of special interest in the confirmation they lend to the view that the effect of extraneousness—created by nonrestrictive relatives as they project content into a matrix sentence from a source outside—derives from the syntactic independence conferred by origins in sentential conjunction. For, as we have been noting, the workings of nonrestrictive relatives make explicit the presence of a "speaker" in the sentence, and they do so twice over: once in the commentary function itself, and once in the content of the commentary as an addition to the "common topic" by someone with a store of knowledge.

We are now in a position to examine other conjunctively originating structures which, moreover, point at their family resemblance to nonrestrictive relatives through the same features of adjunction and segmenting intonation or punctuation. "Sentential" relatives are cousins at two syntactic removes from nonrestrictive relatives: (1) a sentential relative clause takes a whole sentence, or at least a *VP* and not just an *NP*, as its referent; and (2) its source is an underlying conjunction of an asymmetric rather than a symmetric type.[64] Sentential relatives are exceedingly common in speech and writing alike, for example, 'The lecture took only an hour, which pleased me' (the referent for *which* is the full clause, 'The lecture took only an hour'); 'She climbed right over the fence, which she had no business doing' (the referent for *which* is the *VP*, 'climb over the fence'). It will be obvious from the examples that the semantic and stylistic functions of sentential relatives are more transparent than those of nonrestrictive relatives; we always know that the producer of the sentence is the commentator.

Unlike sentential relatives, which trail their clausal or *VP* referent, and more like nonrestrictive relatives, appositive and parenthetical constructions tend to be positioned within matrix clauses; this is so because they, too, like nonrestrictive relatives, are adjoined to *NP*s under a motivating identity condition.[65] Bespeaking their source, they may optionally undergo a kind of conjunction reduction from clauses into phrases. With their optionally reducible elements parenthesized, one example of an appositive and two examples of parenthetical constructions follow: 'Henry VII,

[64]John R. Ross, "Adjectives as Noun Phrases," in Reibel and Schane, ed., *Modern Studies in English*, p. 357; also Thompson, "The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses," pp. 84–94.

[65]On appositives, see Otto Jespersen, *Analytic Syntax* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, 1969; rpt. of 1937 ed.), pp. 17, 21, 123; Ross, *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, secs. 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 6.2.4.1; Charles F. Hockett, "Attribution and Apposition," *American Speech* 30 (1955): 99–102; and Orin D. Seright, "On Defining the Appositive," *College Composition and Communication* 17 (May 1966): 107–9.

(who was) the king of all England, knelt in the tiny chapel'; 'He called for the destruction of Antichrist, that is (to say), the papacy, from the pulpit at Paul's Cross'; 'Arriving at Dover, which she had longed to do, put the countess in good spirits.' In their reduced form, especially, appositives may seem indistinguishable from coordinate *NP*s. Yet there is a fundamental semantic difference: coordinated elements are understood as referring to different things, appositives to the same thing.[66] This marked separation of function reflects still further on the wealth of nuance regarding semantic and syntactic likeness-and-difference that comprises the resources of sentential conjunction. Because the difference between identity and nonidentity is always vital in language, it is important to note that certain syntactic cues signal the respective relations of apposition or coordination—for instance, serial apposition never takes an *and* connective while serial coordination nearly always does. Thus, if *and* is omitted from a serial coordination, it may become correspondingly ambiguous. Compare in this connection 'They hailed Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Chief Justice, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans' (apposition: one object of the action); 'They hailed the knight, the lord, the baron, the viscount' (serial coordination: four objects of the action). But the more routinely difficult distinction to draw is that between coordinate *or*—always disjunctive, as noted previously—and appositive *or*, which multiplies alternative names for the same referent. Only comma intonation or comma punctuation, again the surface sentential reflex of syntactic independence deriving from conjunctive origins, can be looked to for cues to the presence of appositive *or*: 'He sailed for Constantinople, or Istanbul'; 'Steenie, or the duke of Buckingham, was the king's favorite.'

The parting reflection to be made on the extended family members among those constructions having a source in sentential conjunction is stylistic, and it turns on a possible effect of their syntactic peculiarity as a group: their adjunction within a matrix or containing clause. The feature of adjunction carries with it a remarkable latitude, for it can produce suspensive or successive effects that completely confound the simplistic distinction drawn between hypotaxis and parataxis in traditional philology. If adjunction occurs at the head or at some internal node of clause structure, and if the material being adjoined is of any bulk, the effect will be to suspend the progression of main elements in the clause and to complicate perception of the clause as an integral unit, no matter whether the source of the adjunct is conjunction or one of the two embedding operations, relativization or complementation. Conversely, if adjunction is performed only at the tail end of clause units, the effect

[66]George L. Dillon, *Language Processing and the Reading of Literature: Toward a Model of Comprehension* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), pp. 90–91.

will be trailing, additive, and inherently more perspicuous.[67] Thus the resources of conjunctive syntax—especially as augmented by analysis tracing nonrestrictive relatives, appositives, and parentheticals to origins in subsurface coordination—emerge in a much more dazzlingly various light than that shed upon them by earlier means. Yet, as we shall have occasion to see, there may be correspondingly deeper shadows—obfuscations and obscurities—produced if these staple resources are exploited in ways that frustrate the "canonical sentoid" strategy for English sentences by encumbering its $NP+V+NP$ progression with adjuncts: thereby, in Christensen's picturesque phrase, "loading the patterns" on which we rely for understanding what we hear and read.[68]

To draw this introduction to a close, and to prepare the way for future discussion of a major aspect of Scripturalism in English prose style in the period with which I am concerned, I wish to make a summary review of the features of sentential conjunction that characterize so-called Semitic or Hebraic sense parallelism, the parallelism characteristic of lyric, oracular, and sententious passages, even whole books, of the Bible. Although sense parallelism is now, properly, regarded as a poetic device, this knowledge of its character had long been lost to sight, in Jewish tradition as well as more generally, until Bishop Robert Lowth's momentous rediscovery in the eighteenth century. The fact of this rediscovery bears rehearsing in the present context for several reasons: the first, to clarify that Biblical parallelism was construed and appreciated, prior to Lowth, as a species of heightened prose. In those eras, when Biblical parallelism was imitated, it was imitated in prose.[69]

How poetic form could have been transmitted (and translated, and retranslated) for centuries in such a fashion that the form was preserved, ready for recognition and yet unrecognized, becomes less a puzzle when one takes account of its fundamentally syntactic and semantic, rather than lexical and phonological, composition. Lowth lucidly set out the

[67]The distinction to which I am alluding has been formulated in an important way for linguistic study as one between "left-branching" (suspensive) and "right-branching" (successive) constructions by Victor H. Yngve in "A Model and an Hypothesis for Language Structure," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association* 104 (1960): 444–66. For useful discussions, see Judith Greene, *Psycholinguistics: Chomsky and Psychology* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972), pp. 148–54, 169–83; and Fodor, Bever, and Garrett, *The Psychology of Language*, pp. 406–19.

[68]Christensen, *Notes toward a New Rhetoric*, p. 5. His injunction is: "Don't load the patterns."

[69]For accounts of relevant developments in England, see Israel Baroway, "The Bible as Poetry in the English Renaissance: An Introduction," *JEGP* 32 (1933): 447–80; "The Hebrew Hexameter: A Study in Renaissance Sources and Interpretation," *ELH* 2 (1935): 66–91; " 'The Lyre of David': A Further Study in Renaissance Interpretation of Biblical Form," *ELH* 8 (1941): 119–42; William Whallon, "Hebraic Symmetry in Sir Thomas Browne," *ELH* 28 (1961): 335–42; Harold Fisch, *Jerusalem and Albion: The Hebraic Factor in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

principles of composition in sense parallelisms in the Preliminary Dissertation appended to his translation of Isaiah (1778): "The correspondence of one Verse, or Line, with another, I call Parallelism. When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it, in Sense; or similar to it in the form of Grammatical Construction; these I call Parallel Lines; and the words or phrases answering one to another in the corresponding Lines Parallel Terms."[70] He proceeded to distinguish and describe three main kinds of "Parallel Lines." Synonymic lines "correspond one to another by expressing the same sense in different, but equivalent terms; when a Proposition is delivered, and it is immediately repeated, in the whole or in part: the expression being varied, but the sense entirely, or nearly the same." Antithetic lines "correspond with one another by an Opposition . . . sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only. Accordingly the degrees of Antithesis are various; from an exact contraposition of word to word through the whole sentence, down to a general disparity, with something of a contrariety, in the two Propositions." What becomes remarkable about Lowth's definitions in the context of the preceding linguistic excursus is that Hebraic sense parallelism makes creative capital of the very sameness-and-difference relations that inform the workings of sentential conjunction. Thus, as Lowth indeed recognized, synonymic and antithetic sense parallelisms comprise the paradigmatic types of composition in this mode; they subsist together in syntactic and semantic complementarity.

Over against this paradigmatic complementarity, Lowth defined a third type of Biblical parallelism which he termed "Synthetic or Constructive": in it the joint syntactic and semantic specifications are relaxed so that "the Parallelism consists only in the similar form of Construction." In other words, synthetic parallelism is what we ourselves mean by "parallelism" as a stylistic term. The lines in a synthetic parallelism are bound together by the "mere correspondence between different Propositions, in respect of the shape and turn of the whole sentence, and of the constructive parts: such as noun answering to noun, verb to verb, member to member, negative to negative, interrogative to interrogative." In fact, subsequent scholarship has disclosed even more possibility for variety in synthetic parallelism than Lowth recognized: it may retain a form parallel to a preceding line while being shorter (containing fewer constituents); or it may depart from parallel form at some point in its sequence. To bring out more explicitly these possibilities for variation

[70]Robert Lowth, Preliminary Dissertation to Isaiah, pp. xix, xx, cited in George Buchanan Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (London, New York, Toronto: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915), pp. 48–49.

from the norms of the synonymic and antithetic types, synthetic parallelism is today more commonly known as the "incomplete" type.[71]

The still definitive study of the subject in English, George Buchanan Gray's *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, provides a number of literal translations of Biblical sense parallelisms in which hyphens are inserted to mark the units of constituent structure that become the correspondent parts of the Hebrew composition. The following illustration of the three types derives from Gray:

(*a*) *Synonymic parallelism:*
I-will-divide-them in-Jacob,
And-I-will-scatter-them in-Israel. (Genesis 49:7)
For-the-heavens like-smoke shall-vanish-away,
And-the-earth like-a-garment shall-wax-old. (Isaiah 52:6)

(*b*) *Antithetic parallelism:*
The-glory-of young-men is-their-strength;
But-the-beauty-of old-men is-their-gray-hair. (Proverbs 20:29)
A-soft answer turneth-away wrath,
But-a-grievous word stirreth-up anger. (Proverbs 15:1)

(*c*) *Incomplete (or synthetic) parallelism:*
I-will-restore thy-judges as-at-the-first,
And-thy-counsellors as-at-the-beginning. (Isaiah 1:26)
As-for-man his-days are-as-grass;
as-a-flower-of the-field so-he-flourisheth. (Psalm 103:15)
Her-hand to-the-tent-peg she-stretched-forth,
And-her-right-hand to-the-workman's-mallet. (Judges 5:26)
For-Yahweh knows the-way-of the-righteous;
But-the-way-of the-wicked will-perish. (Psalm 1:6)[72]

A very considerable portion, well over a third, of the Old Testament is composed in sense parallelisms, with paired lines forming the staple verse unit out of which larger thematic responsions are built. In the overall binary patterning, single lines and groups of threes and fours are rare. The pervasive effect is rhythmic, either that of "balancing rhythm," in which a complete parallelism in a second line matches a first, or that of "echoing rhythm," in which an incomplete parallelism answers only partly to the form and sense of its predecessor. The resulting intensity of this shaped, reduplicated mode of expression con-

[71]Gray discusses incomplete parallelism extensively (ibid., pp. 59–74). Other useful discussions in English include Theodore H. Robinson, *The Poetry of the Old Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1947); and Norman K. Gottwald's entry, "Poetry, Hebrew," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962).

[72]Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 60–62, 75–78.

duces to song, to prophecy, to aphorism, and other kinds of consciously charged or weighty utterance. Accordingly, parallelistic composition characterizes the whole of Proverbs, Lamentations, and Canticles, extensive portions of the Psalms and Job, and parts of Ecclesiastes as well as Isaiah and the nonbiographical part of Jeremiah among the major prophets, while among the minor prophets too, from Hosea through Malachi, such composition is quite continuously maintained. In addition, interpolated parallelisms are found sporadically in the Old Testament historical books, in victory songs, cultic hymns, words of counsel, blessings, denunciations, and curses. (A snatch of a victory song is illustrated in the parallelism from Judges 5:26 cited above.) Finally, while parallelistic composition is comparatively much rarer in the New Testament, it nevertheless makes notable appearances in the Magnificat (Luke 1:46–55), in the Beatitudes (Matthew 5:1–11), in stretches of the Pauline Epistles (particularly in Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 and 2 Timothy), and in extended passages of 1 John and the visionary evocations of Revelation.[73]

Some excellent recent discussion by Roman Jakobson and Ruth apRoberts has focused literary attention on the singular amenability of Hebraic sense parallelism to replication from language to language—a characteristic that qualifies it as a poetic universal.[74] Jakobson's articles cite evidence from Chinese and Vedic traditions, which, of course, are independent of the Hebrew, to show that synonymic and antithetic parallelisms undergird the most ancient verse productions of discrete cultures. The analysis offered by apRoberts addresses itself more to the psychological impact of this mode of composition—what she finely calls "the ideational rhyme of parallel members" that at once engages and heightens consciousness:

> The essential pattern prevails, the parallelisms that are the radical formal element of Hebrew verse. By these patterns the poem refers back to itself, sets up expectations within itself, and resolves itself. . . . For the reader or hearer actively correlates the two members, the pair of "rhyming" ideas, by discovering the logic of similarity or contrast. . . . Those who are familiar with traditional musical form will recognize a strong similarity here: repetitions with variations, paired phrases, refrains, da capos, resolutions, and tonality. But the remarkable thing is that although the form is "musical," the patterns are not of sound but of

[73]Ibid., pp. 132–57. The listing of parallelistic composition in the Old Testament is taken from pp. 37–40; information on its occurrence in the New Testament derives from Amos N. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 104–15.

[74]Roman Jakobson, "Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet," *Language* 42 (1966): 399–429; and "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry," *Lingua* 21 (1968): 597–609; Ruth apRoberts, "Old Testament Poetry: The Translatable Structure," *PMLA* 92 (1977): 987–1004.

meaning. The sense unit coincides with the form unit, constitutes, in fact, the form unit. It is what Ernest Renan called a *rime des pensées*, a rhyme of thoughts, or a music of ideas. . . . The Old Testament poem is intelligible—as indeed many poems are; but, by virtue of the way in which its members explain each other, it reaches a consummate degree of intelligibility; it is an art form that has been used, or understood, perhaps more than any other in history.[75]

To supplement apRoberts's focus on the cognitive and perceptual effects of sense parallelism as heard or read, observations from rabbinical scholarship, as reported by Gray, offer insights into the motives of writers employing the mode. Ibn Ezra (1093–1163) first commented that the repetition of a thought in synonymous words was a stylistic elegance befitting prophetic utterance, while D. Kimhi (ca. 1160–1235) identified the power of the style of Isaiah with the "reduplication of meaning by means of synonymous terms" practiced by the book's author.[76] Louis Newman, a twentieth-century Hebrew scholar, has sought to extend insight into the authorial perspective still further by grounding parallelistic composition in two of the "deepest psychological principles": (1) the specific sensation of strong feelings as successive "waves of emotion" and (2) the common human inability to "leave with one statement what is felt as a profound insight." He postulates a pair of corresponding rules that harness these psychological principles in parallelistic composition: (1) a "demand for orderliness" confronts the waves of emotion, imposing stichic form and binary responsion on their expression, while (2) a countervailing "demand for repetition" is accommodated, but at the price of stylization that rules out indulgence in verbatim reiteration.[77]

It will by now have become evident, from historical and formal vantage points in the linguistic domain, why seeking to trace the impact of Scripture upon vernacular English prose has a commanding stylistic interest for me: writers whose native mode of composition abounds in conjunctive sentence forms encounter in the immediacy of their own tongue what to them is divine utterance, and it abounds in the same mode. What are the effects of such an encounter on the writing of prose? Yet, stated only linguistically, such a question remains insensitive to the intense additional interest that accrues specifically from the context of the English national experience during the two centuries from 1380—above all, the singularly deflected and delayed process of securing the

[75]ApRoberts, "Old Testament Poetry," pp. 988, 990, 998, 999, 1000.
[76]Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, pp. 17–18.
[77]Louis I. Newman, *Studies in Biblical Parallelism*, I: *Parallelism in Amos*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology no. 1.2 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1918), pp. 57–59.

Bible in English before any absorption into popular consciousness can be assessed for its literary effects. Of necessity, then, the principal critical referent for my study—Scripturalism—is as much an ideological term as a formal one. I shall undertake to make its calculated duality both cogent and fruitful in the pages which follow.