Information-structural impact on adverbial *only* evolution in the Middle English language
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Abstract. The article, dedicated to adverbial *only* rise and the advancement in Middle English (ME), develops an information-structural hypothesis as the key factor of its evolution. The research focuses on two adverbials *ane* and *only* investigated in various ME historical periods, undergoing significant changes over time. It proves the aforesaid adverbials to be Focus marking components, reanalyzing from numeral *ane* into adverbial *only* in the XIII cen. The data analysis based on Rizzi’s formula and Prince’s taxonomy allows to elicit adverbial *only* evolutionary pattern, determine ratio of different Focus type marking, as well as, discourse status representation.
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The data from ME Corpus indicate the emergence of adverbial *only* in late XIII cen. Its diachronic investigation, presented by a number of scholars [4; 5; 12], identifies the adverbial source as follows [1; 5]:

(1a) Numerical *ane* (ME *ane*) > polysemous adj./adv. *only* > exclusive focusing *only* [1: 26].

As regards our data, an insignificant amount (4.68%) of ME examples with numeral *ane* render the adverbial meaning, e.g.

(1b) *Ane mei him na Mon alsa wel demen ne alswa rithe // for nan ne knauð him ase þere; buten ane drihte* (Poema Morale, 109-110)

The paper aims at studying what facilitated *ane* to acquire adverbial meaning. In this light, the research suggests a consecutive application of pragmatic and syntactic methods. The clauses are tested in terms of highlighting discourse Old/New information and sentence Topic/Focus [2; 3; 9; 10; 11] as the elements of information-structure (IS) marking. To differentiate discourse old and new information E. Prince considers the taxonomy of inferred familiarity [6]:

(2) evoked > unused > inferences > containing inferences > brand-new anchored > brand-new

The linguist distinguishes four informational types (Tabl. 1):

Table 1. Types of Information in the Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Hearer old</th>
<th>Hearer new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse old</td>
<td>Evoked</td>
<td>Not-registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse new</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Brand-new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present study proposes to confine to dichotomy discourse/hearer old vs. discourse/hearer new information since singling out purely discourse/new/hearer old information proves challenging for old texts. Discourse and hearer new information (3) suggests no prior reference towards it. Discourse and hearer old information (4) implies its previous allusion.

(3) *Two thingus onli ne do thu to me; and thanne fro thi face I shal not ben hid.* (The Holy Bible…)

The speaker in (3) emphasizes on his readiness for punishment, pleading about two things that should not be done to him. Adverb *onli* refers to the NP *two thingus*, introducing discourse and hearer new information.

(4) Except þe fest of Innocents, þey schul chaunge at þe chapitre of þe sonday or of þe fest or of þe vias; wherefor þat þe seruise of sonday is lefte, & þey schul make memori of þe fest biforne, but þit if þe be a dobel fest, þey schul make only memori of þe sonday* (The Rewle of Sustris Monenyresses enclosid…)

The NP *memori* makes reference to the previous sentence, thus, adverb *only* marks NP that presents discourse and hearer old information.

As acknowledged in Steube [11], a discourse-old element may nevertheless be focused and somehow reactivated in the mind of the hearer. Therefore, it cannot automatically be attributed to Topic. To eliminate the aforesaid inconsistency, it has been proposed to test sentence constituents within Rizzi’s framework [7] where elements are coded by the formula in (5).

(5) [ForceP[TopP[FinP[TP[…]]]]], ForceP identifies correlation of the sentence and context: TopP is the landing site for preposed topics, FinP hosts preposed foci; FinP is used for encoding features related to clause finiteness. On the basis of (5), graphic representation of sentence (6a) comes as (6b):

(6a) *Onli Mardoche bowede not kne* (The Holy Bible…)

(6b)

Fig. 1 Sentence derivational IS model

NP *Mardoche* is sentence Focus, whereas the position of *onli* in Foc enables the NP movement from FinP into FocP. Since the data analysis proves that adverbials in all instances mark focused elements it appears relevant to distinguish different Focus types, which can be subdivided into contrastive, informational and presentational [8]. To differentiate them, the linguists apply such terms: Foc (F(t)) describes an F-structure, in which Foc is the Focus constituent, t and Foc are coindexed, F(t) is an S-structure with t, replacing the Focus constituent. Consequently, the rules for each Focus types are as follows:

Contrastive focus: in Foc(F(t)), Foc1 element is a contrastive focus, iff F(t/Foc2) (Foc2≠Foc1) is c-construable.
C-construable is defined as discourse inferable.

(7) *al heo weren adame ibuhsame and naut ane under his hond; ac under his fet* (OE Hom, Dominica Sec. Post Pascha, pg. 129)

Informational focus: in *Foc(F(t))*, *Foc*₁ element is an informational focus iff it considers that H wants S to specify *Foc*₂ such that *F(t/Foc*₂). In terms of informational focus the utterance requires *Foc(F(t))*, in which S-structure *F(t/Foc*₂) ∈ c-construable for a certain *Foc*₂.

(8) *This bawme growth in no place but only þere* (Mandeville’s travels, 1:32)

Presentational focus: in *Foc(F(t)) Foc* element is a presentational focus iff it is not the case that *F(t/Foc)* is c-construable for all *F₂*. (Not registered in our data).

The study is based on ME manuscripts consisting of about 10 million words selected from Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse (years 1150-1500). For numeral *ane* (*an, ane, one, onne, once* etc.) these are XII-XV cen. records irrespective the dialect, with 3,570 instances singled out, among which 167 render adversarial meaning. Table 1 presents the adversarial distribution compared with its other meanings.

Table 1. Adverbial *ane* occurrence in Middle English records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total <em>ane</em> counts</th>
<th>Adverbial <em>ane</em> counts</th>
<th>Adverbial frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME1</td>
<td>1150-1200</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200-1250</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1250-1300</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300-1350</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1350-1400</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 1, adversarial *ane* usage declines towards the end ME3 (1.98%). The overall adversarial proportion for ME1 is 30.72% and ca. 4.3% for ME2. The analysis of the adversarial allotment per number of words in works (Tabl.2) also suggests its low frequency.

The data demonstrate a decrease in adversarial *ane* usage: cf., XII cen. – 0.014%, XV cen. – 0.003%.

The analysis of *ane* placement with reference to the word it modifies, displays 10.8% instances with the adversarial preceding the focused element, whereas 89.2% demonstrate *ane* postmodifying placement.

Table 2. Adverbial *ane* total allotment per work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Approximate sample size (words)</th>
<th>Adverbial <em>ane</em> counts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1200</td>
<td>290,479</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.014%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1250</td>
<td>230,437</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1300</td>
<td>392,838</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0069%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1350</td>
<td>667,121</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.0046%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1400</td>
<td>3,524,487</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.0023%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>970,353</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adverbial *onli* (*onli, onlie, oneli, oenli, etc.*) is encountered in the XIII-XV cen. English manuscripts (Tabl. 3), presenting 802 illustrations (among 1835 sentences registered).

Table 3. Adverbial *onli* total assignment per work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sample size (words)</th>
<th>Adverbial <em>onli</em> count</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME2</td>
<td>1250-1300</td>
<td>126,589</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300-1350</td>
<td>627,147</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3</td>
<td>1350-1400</td>
<td>3,510,464</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>482,155</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The records of early XIV cen. demonstrate a low occurrence of *onli*, with a significant difference in prose and verse. The adversarial frequency per genre would be correspondingly as follows – 0.013% and 0.002%. Late XIV cen. writings show a gradual spread of *onli*, particularly in prose (0.04%), whereas poetry still exemplifies its low performance.

The placement of *onli* regarding the sentence constituents it marks shows that within ME2 and ME3 in ca. 45% of examples the adversarial occurs in postmodification with the reference to the word it modifies.

Adverbial *ane* highlights discourse and hearer old information (overwhelmingly evoked) in 80.24% examples. Discourse and hearer new information is represented in 19.76% instances (Tabl.4).

Table 4. Information structural types with adversarial *ane* in ME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information</th>
<th>Discourse and hearer old</th>
<th>Discourse and hearer new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.24%</td>
<td>19.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus type</td>
<td>Contrastive</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>94.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, *ane*, functioning as a numeral or article, mostly refers to discourse and hearer new information. Therefore, the present research assumes that a specific feature of highlighting old information favored *ane* reanalysis into adversarial *only*. The insignificant amount of illustrations indicates the remnant feature of numeral *one* to mark discourse and hearer new information.

Analysis of adversarial *ane* based on Rizzi’s formula testifies to its Focus modification in 100% with informational Focus amounting to 95.8% (9) and contrastive Focus ratio of 4.2% (10).

(9) *Don al pat mon déo wið uten sunne ane* (OE Homilies, Sawles Warde, pg. 275)

(10) *Ne dude hit noht þe king ane. ah we alle clane;* (Layamon’s Brut, 4395)

Another aspect arising from the investigation is to consider sentence elements and their relation to discourse/hearer old vs. new information and types of Focus registered.

Discourse and hearer old information. The study shows that this IS type is frequently registered with objects, expressed by pronouns (59 instances). Objects presented by a noun total 24 out of 41. These nouns commonly refer to divine powers (God, angel, etc.). E.g.

(11) "Mergaret, thickys hou þis werkys gode? || Beleue onne my lord & be my wyue|| And I wylle no more with þe stryue. (Altenglische legenden, pg.237-238)

The number of illustration with objects rendering discourse and hearer old information amounts to 106 instances (79.1%). Adverbial *ane* mostly occurs after the
element it modifies (12).

(12) His godenes es sa mykel, þare we inwardedly aske hym ane, he wil gyf fyfe; so wele payde es he when we wil set al our e hert to lufe hym. (The Holy Bible…) Four examples with objects render contrastive Focus (13) amounting to 3.77%.

(13) De mann ne leued*naht he bread ane, ac leuedô bi ða wordes de gað ut of godes múde. (Vices and Virtues, pg. 89)

Subjects marking discourse and hearer old information total 15 (11.2%), of these 5 are premodifying Subject instances (14) and 10 are postmodifying (15). Within this number 10 are represented by pronouns and the rest by nouns referring to divine powers.

(14) Per he yette his cnihten: alle heore irlhten. || etc ane be þef æhte; also he lærned hafde. (Layamon’s Brut, 12053-54)

(15) he ane is eure an ilche stude wende þer þu wende. (OE Hom., P. Morale 87).

Among the Focus types two Subject instances render contrastive Focus (15), while the rest introduce informational Focus (16). (15) Neauer hwi mon þe þat heo hit al welþe, þat, wullen ha nullen ha, biwinnde & biwiteþ hit to fe monie ðovre, nawan ane to hare freond, ah to hare fulle fan, ne habben ne maehen [leaf 121, col. 2] prof, þat ha hit hefden sworn, bute hare anes date (Hali Meidenhad, pg. 42-43)

(16) Ac þere-fore seith þet godspel þet hedden i-be idel: þo þet hi nedden bi-leued ane god almichti, ne him louie ne him serui. (An Old English miscellany pg.34)

Adverbial element presenting this information structural type accounts for 13 instances (9.7%), whereas premodifying ane is registered with one illustration (17). E.g.

(17) He micelne wæstm of monynne aber þurh his anes ðeðal (Homilies, 74/24)

The verbs are not registered with this IS type. Diagram 1 graphically reflects idem.

**Discourse and hearer new information.** Amounting to 19.76%, Focus marking elements render exceptionally informational Focus. Indicative of this type is a frequent amount of verbs marked as Focus (21.2 % overall illustrations), E.g. (18)

Næt, for þu þe ane dreddes nawt wiþ pin anre deore bode to þifte áynamis alle þe æhelille deutes of helle. þat hwuch of ham swa is lest laðeliche, and grureful. (Old English Hom...., Sawles Warde pg. 271).

Table 6. Information structural types with adverbial only in ME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information</th>
<th>Discourse and hearer old</th>
<th>Discourse and hearer new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount (%)</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus type</td>
<td>Contrastive</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount (%)</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>63.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the general proportion of informational and contrastive Foci is 63.75% to 36.25% respectively. When marking informational Focus, adverbial only in all instances renders the meaning of exclusiveness (21).

(21) And þei seyn wel þat the creatures þat worschipen hem ne ben no goddes, but þei worschipen hem for the vertue þat is in hem þat may not be but only be the grace of god. (Maneville’s, 1:202)

**Discourse and hearer old information.** While modifying the element pertaining to this type, adverbial only oftentimes marks sentence object, i.e. 378 instances amounting to 58.15% (22). The distribution for other sentence constituents is as follows: S (23) –136 (20.93%), V (24) – 48 (7.38%), X (25) – 88 (13.54%). Diagram 3 graphical presents the highlighted figures.

(22) Nor the lesse be that reason pondage and tonnage may not be rekaned as parcell off the revenues wich the kyng hath ffor the mayntenance off his estate, bi cause it
ought to be applied only to be kepynge off the see. (The governance of England, pg. 123).

(23) Noght anelie oure tym is schorte: bot alswa oure elde feles as þe wiseman sais (Rolle, pg. 136).

(24) And also the kyng hath geven parte off this livelod to his moste worshipfull brotherryn, whic not only haue serued hym in the maner ffor said, but bith also so nygh in blode to his highenes, that it be satte not is magnificence to haue done in oper wyse. (The governance of England, pg. 126).

(25) þe: ii: þat þou think noght it is in þi might / slike deuocions & steryngs til haue / ai when þou wil; bot anelie thorough goddis grace / when he wil þain send. (The Rewle of Sustris, pg. 153).

When marking the verb, it is notable that as few as five examples with only+V represent contrastive Focus; therefore, the major part of the verbs in the constructions renders informational Focus. Within overall ratio of informational to contrastive Focus the figures are 89.58 % to 10.12%. Verbs presenting informational Focus in this study refer to information inferable from the previous discourse, while the verbs relating to contrastive Focus render information evoked previously.

**Discourse and hearer new information.** Indicative for this type is a frequent marking of VO(X) part (81.5%). Moreover, one may observe a rapid rise in verb marking, comparing to other information-structural types (33.8%). The distribution for other sentence-constituents is as follows: S –7 (4.6%) – (26); O – 69 (45.7%) – (27); V – 51 (33.8%) – (28); X – 24 (15.9%) – (29). Diagram 4 reveals the schematic figures for the highlighted type.

(26) for ecb man longip after good, and þe last good and best in which oonly man shulde reste is blisse (Select English works of John Wyclif, pg. 4).

(27) Samarytans also the fyue* bokis of Moyses wryten

in as feele lettris, oonli in figuris and printis dyuersynge; (The Holy Bible, CAP XIX, 668).

(28) The apostlis oonli jorsken the boot and the nettis; the widwe putte two mytis*, [minitis I.] into the tresorye of God, and it is put before the richessis of Cressi. (The Holy Bible, CAP. VIII. (75)

(29) And yit thei knowe not the vertue pereof but bei coueyten it & louen it only for the beautee. (Mandevile’s travels, 1:130)
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