

# *The significance of paradigms in language research*

Juan DE LA CRUZ  
Universidad de Málaga

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the significance of paradigms in language research and to show that paradigms are real and necessary both as 'created language' and 'creators of language' and, therefore, the 'word and paradigm' model should still be regarded as valid in modern language research.

## 0. PROLEGOMENA FOR THE OCCASION

The birth of yet another learned journal devoted to English Studies in Spain is always a great family event for all of us. The reason is obvious. 'English Studies', as a proper field of study, still carries the connotation of something comparatively new in our country. But if the birth coincides with the happy decision of offering the present number, in due homage, to 'patri et conditori nostro' Emilio Lorenzo, then the event becomes an intimate one and as such I intent to celebrate it.

If I may say so, it is an appropriate occasion to take stock and recall some landmarks. As far as I am concerned, I will never forget the day the late Professor Sebastián Mariner Bigorra, at that time Professor of Latin in the University of Granada (assuming by his benevolence rather by my performance that I could be on the way to becoming a Classicist) enquired whether I intended to do Classics. He was somewhat surprised when I told

him that I did not contemplate doing so as I had decided to enrol in the newly created School of Modern Languages in the University of Madrid. With his characteristic enthusiasm, he wholeheartedly told me that there was only one Professor of English in the whole of Spain —our illustrious Don Emilio. Upon going to Madrid from my native South I was facetiously corrected by the second in command at the time, Don Esteban Pujals, who said to me that, since we only had ‘half a *catedrático*’ (alluding to Don Emilio who was Professor of English *and* German Linguistics), it wouldn’t be a bad thing if we managed to have one and a half. Fortunately, we soon had him as well as Professor and so the boat of English Studies in Spain would neither rock nor run aground. And so, now, thanks to them and some of their scions, like the Elcano eight years ago, we are beginning to sail the seas of the world.

If I may be allowed to do so, I would also like to recall the day when, immediately after graduating from the Complutense, I decided to sail to Belfast with my ‘tesina’ under my arm, a little piece of work which Professor Lorenzo had supervised and I had written on the exotic subject of “Indo-European Elements common to English and Spanish”. That opened to me the doors of Queen’s University, where I enrolled for a preparatory Ph.D. research programme, which materialised five years later in my Belfast Doctoral Dissertation. Though unpublished, it is not entirely unknown in Europe and other parts of the world.

The reader of this paper will by now be impatient with what may appear to be bombastic reminiscences before getting down to my subject. Nevertheless, this introduction was necessary because, not long ago, I discovered that another important personage, this time a purely linguistic one, had slowly broken into my career. I refer to something as straightforward as ‘paradigms’ in all shapes and forms, the importance of which has increasingly become manifest to me. Allow me once again to remember my first public lecture at Queen’s University, which had the title of “The Study of Grammar”. “Words, phrases, linguistic operations”, I said then; “were not mere instruments to be used in a utilitarian way, but rather precious objects worthy of our love and affection”. In the spirit of Francis, the word, the sentence, any word, phrase, sentence or text... should be regarded as our brothers and sisters in our journey through life. Not mere utensils but dear creatures to us, whose invaluable service as bearers and transmitters of joy and distress, happiness and sorrow, are our simple but faithful companions throughout life. Today I would like to show that ‘paradigms’, the organization of words as well as syntagms into sets of commutable elements are no less noble artifacts. They help us in a variety of ways, not the least in the comparison of languages, particularly in the synchronic dimension. But also, in the historical dimension, ‘paradigms’ are important since they are both created language and at times also creators of language.

## I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION: CONCEPT OF PARADIGM

Before Professor Adrados (1969) addresses the important subject of the variety of morphological systems, he states the following on p. 195:

“El estudio de la segmentación lleva, inevitablemente, a estudiar los paradigmas gramaticales: conjunto de formas conmutables que forman una serie cerrada. Suele haber conmutación múltiple, es decir, varios parámetros; por ej., en *amo, ama*, etc., aparecen simultáneamente el de número y persona”.

And he goes on to say (*ibíd.*) that, although “Se ha pensado por muchos que se podría prescindir en la descripción lingüística del estudio de los paradigmas”, this could only be feasible in cases of extreme regularity which, of course, is not often the case. He immediately illustrates some complex paradigms which couldn't easily be accounted for in terms of purely morphemic analysis. And how could it be otherwise? He takes his first example from English. In this language we have verbs with only one form, for instance, *ought* (except in vulgar dialectal or childish \**oughted*) and verbs with up to eight forms, as is the case with the verb *to be* (not too many forms by any standards!). For his second example Professor Adrados resorts to the contrast between the Spanish and English personal pronouns. E. *I* and Sp. *yo* illustrate a nearly perfect correspondance. Both are ‘de-sexed’, to the entire happiness of most feminists, I suppose (!). However, contemporary standard English possesses only one form *you*, as opposed to no less than fifteen forms in Spanish: *tú, vosotros, vosotras, os, Vd., Vdes., ti, te, lo, la, le, los, las, les, se*. There have been in fact some attempts to redress such an imbalance. In some contemporary English dialects ‘plural’ forms such as *yous, yousn’s* and *y’all* with a visible mark of plurality do in fact exist, notably in some parts of the British Isles like Belfast and also in the United States. Cf. de la Cruz & Cañete (1992) p. 198, nota 12.

It is not my purpose here to indulge in other attempts to redress more transcendental matters such as the irreconcilable desire of some feminists who wish to have epicene pronouns such as E. *I* or Sp. *yo*, ‘de-sexed’ and therefore valid both for masculine and feminine, or such as the case of E. *they*, a 3<sup>rd</sup> person. plural form also valid both for masculine and feminine, and which is also becoming increasingly popular for 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular ‘bisexual’ meaning in order to avoid referring to a person as *he* or *she* when the sex is not known in cases like *If anybody is interested in taking part, will they (= he, he or she, he/she) let me know, please*. Cf. de la Cruz y Cañete (1992) pp. 202-204.

All I want to show is that symmetry, although desirable and indeed a tendency often aimed at, is by no means the real stuff of language. As a practising historical theoretical linguist, in addition to being at times an

irreverent generativist, I would be out of business if the real asymmetries existing in language didn't provide for changes to come.

Among the many existing asymmetries which tend to be remedied, partially at least, in the contemporary language, we could adduce some interesting changes in 'paradigms' taking place before our own eyes in many of the well established languages of the world as well as in the exciting field of Creole or Creolized varieties. Let me refer first to the contemporary English paradigm of forms of address. Thanks to the addition of *Ms* [miz] we have a four-term paradigm:

Mr	Ms	Miss	Mrs.
----	----	------	------

Before the adoption of *Ms* we only had a three-term paradigm:

Mr	Miss	Mrs
----	------	-----

In this three-term paradigm, *Mr* is valid for all type of males, whereas in the case of females there is a distinction: *Miss* (= unmarried) as opposed to *Mrs* (= married). The asymmetry here is obvious. After the creation of *Ms* [miz] for females, without any reference to marital status, we may have solved one problem, but the paradigm continues to be grossly asymmetric. The new paradigm still has *one* form of address for men but *three* forms of address for women. This may be discriminatory, some feminists would say. (Note that I do not enter into the issue of the surname, whether this is the *née* surname or the husband's..., an important issue now in some English speaking countries like Britain where the husband, for a change, can now adopt his wife's surname!). One 'partial' solution to the asymmetry of the paradigm, which apparently has been most inefficient to say the least, would have been *Mush* for the unmarried man (*The Devil's Dictionary* 1911, repr. 1943). More recent are the so far unacceptable and certainly amusing solutions mentioned in Baron (1986) p. 167: *Murm* or *Mrd* (= married man) -1977-; *Smur* or *Mngl* (= single man) -1983-. The stark reality is that symmetry has not been achieved. The ideal, it would seem, would be a six-term 'paradigm' with three terms for 'male' and another three terms for 'female'. But, as I have said, the adoption of the pairs *\*Smur*, *\*Mngl*, and *\*Murm*, *\*Mrd* has failed. Cf., however, what a hypothetical 'symmetrical paradigm' would look like:

	male	
marital status not revealed	bachelor	married man or a widower
Mr	*Smur *Mngl	*Murm *Mrd

Female		
marital status not revealed	unmarried woman (single/spinster)	married woman (or possibly a widow)
Ms [mz]	Miss	Mrs

Adrados (1969), p. 835, records that 'pichinglis' illustrates an interesting case. To the epicene *we* of standard English, Sp. *nosotros* (= all males or a group of males and females), and *nosotras* (= all females) there correspond two different forms, although there is no distinction with regard to gender, be it uniform or a mixture of male and female. However, there is a distinction as to the 'grammatical' persons involved. So, to the word *we* there corresponds (1) the word *mifela* (= *I + he* or *he + I*) and (2) the word *yufela* (= *I + you* or *you + I*).

But what interests us here is not just the actual existence of morphological or 'word paradigms' but mainly the existence of another type of paradigmatic relationship. The main characteristic of 'paradigms', the fact that they constitute sets of commutable forms, normally 'closed sets', can also occur in the syntagmatic realm, that is, syntagms as well as words can constitute relatively closed sets of commutable strings. The aforementioned author (1969), p. 200, gives us as an example of 'paradigm', again with an English illustration, the set *you write / you do not write / do you write? / do you not write?* which, as far as he is concerned, "es comparable a cualquiera de los anteriores de tipo gramatical" (*ibid.*). It is also self-evident that "las diferencias se marcan por cambio, añadido o eliminación de morfemas gramaticales. No se puede separar a los libres de los ligados..." (*ibid.*). Cf., however, Matthews's caveat (1974), p. 172:

"Perhaps, therefore, the Greek term 'periphrastic' might be less misleading. Latin *amatus sum* would thus be a 'periphrastic form' of the Passive (a form involving 'periphrasis' rather than a single word), and French *j' ai vu* a periphrastic Tense-form as opposed to the simple Tense-forms *vois*, etc. But, terminology apart, the crucial point is that they are still divisible into separate words. In Latin, *amatus sum* is no more cohesive than any other group of words; in fact, its constituents may be separated widely for rhythmic or other reasons... In English the constituents of a phrase such as *has helped* are regularly separated in the interrogative (*Has he helped?*)..."

I agree. However, I have no qualms in using the term 'analytic paradigms' as I have done on more than one occasion. I am interested in both types of paradigm both from the point of view of theoretical linguistics and applied linguistics, despite a certain tendency to ignore them in both senses. As a

matter of fact, I am going to start with one aspect which is purely practical and which concerns our current teaching of Old English. The language is initially taught like any foreign language in its purely synchronic aspect and the methodology is therefore, to all effects, the same as that which one could use in the teaching of a contemporary living foreign language.

## 2. PARADIGMS AND ORDINARY LANGUAGE COMPARISON

### 2.1. *The application of paradigms to language teaching*

Here we shall be concerned with inflectional morphology as applied to language teaching. In other words, the presentation and mastering of traditional paradigms, which in fact amount to the 'mnemotecnic tables' of traditional grammar. Let us use as our illustration the method launched by McCrae-Gibson in the 70's and which some of my colleagues and I have used to our entire satisfaction. The idea is to initiate the student to the comprehension and even elementary production of Old English right from his or her first encounter with it. For instance, the student learns the paradigm followed by a substantial majority of masculine nouns, the so-called 'strong masculine declension', represented by such nouns as *biscop* 'bishop', *cyning* 'king', *preost* 'priest', *o tun* 'town'. The student should be aware of the fact that Old English, like Spanish, does not have 'natural' gender but 'grammatical' gender, and *tun*, which is inanimate is a masculine noun just as Sp. *pueblo* is masculine side by side with *ciudad* which happens to be feminine —cf. *el sillón* but *la silla*; *la ventana* but *el ventanillo*, etc., etc.). So the student should get used to enunciating each noun preceded by the appropriate definite article, which in the case of the Old English nouns mentioned is the masculine. So he should memorize *se biscop*, *se cyning*, *se preost*, *se tun*, etc. But, of course, he will also have to become familiar with the entire paradigm before he can understand or produce a simple sentence. Once he knows that the paradigm of *se biscop* is (singular) N. *se biscop*, Ac. *thone biscop*, G. *thæs biscopas*, D. *thæm biscope*; (plural) N. *tha biscopas*, Ac. *tha biscopas*, G. *thara biscopa*, D. *thæm biscopum*, he will know how to decline a substantial majority of masculine nouns, in fact the great majority of the so-called strong masculine nouns, and therefore he will be able to use them in simple sentences. Examples are *se biscop forthferde*, *se cyning ferde to tune*, *thæs biscopas theow is thær*, *thæs cyninges mæden is fæger*, *thara biscopa and thara cyninga theowas sind ealde*, etc. The mastery of these simple facts is stimulated by means of traditional 'drills' which, far from what is often believed, may turn out to be useful and also amusing or at least enjoyable with a bit of help from the teacher, provided they are moderately administered.

Take, for example, the Genitive construction, which automatically brings to the student's mind the so frequently called in Spanish 'genitivo sajón' which, by the way, is not even a typical 'Saxon' phenomenon in Modern English. Nor is it even in its origins an exclusive peculiarity of Germanic. A Genitive singular in *-( )s*, incidentally not the only Genitive marker of masculine nouns in Old English nor in the other Old Germanic languages, is also found in other Indo-European languages. Cf. *L. rex regis* and the ancient *pater familias*. And who might have imagined it? We now seem to have it in the ubiquitous *Paco's* of many of our modern Spanish shops! But the 'genitivo sajón' is not even a mere relic of the old 'Saxon Genitive', since the Genitive in *-( )s* of Old English, like the Genitive in *-( )s* of Latin is a real 'case' with a desinence or ending attached to the stem of the noun in question. This is not the case of contemporary English where, apart from the apostrophe, 's or s' has become a 'particle' instead of a desinence or ending. The proof is obvious. The element 's can be attached not only to words (as would be the case of a desinence or ordinary ending) but also to phrases and, occasionally, even to entire sentences. This is what has been called 's migration of the original Genitive ending in English. Cf. *the boy round the corner's girlfriend* where *corner's* is not the Genitive of the noun *corner*; *the corner* is not the possessor of *girlfriend* and therefore cannot be in the possessive case. The simple fact is that 's is not attached to *corner* as such but to the phrase *the boy round the corner*; the possessor is the qualified boy. Cf. the humorous *he is the woman who is the best friend this club has ever had's husband*, mentioned in Pyles & Algeo (1982). Cf. de la Cruz & Cañete (1992) p. 167.

This by now famous 'genitivo sajón' was not a simple ending for the Renaissance intelligentsia either. Hence the misguided use of the apostrophe as a symbol of an abbreviation for *(h)is*: *Joyce (h)is book* > *Joyce's book*. It was subsequently generalised to other cases like *Mary her book*, *the Parliament their papers*, as if *(h)is* might have ever been appropriate in these cases! In this way the particle 's became a universal possessive particle for the singular. It was slightly transformed orthographically for the plural: *s'*. Hence *Mary's book*, *the Parliament's papers*, *the boy's books*, etc.

So, even without such an elaborate presentation, it may be fun to practise simple 'word and paradigm syntax'. Here is a simple demonstration:

*Se cyning is thær* 'The king is there'.

*Mid theowe?* 'With a servant?'

Answer: *Thæs cyninges theow is thær* 'The king's servant is there'.

Cf. a similar case in the plural:

*Tha abbodas sind thær* 'The abbots are there'.

*Mid theowum?* 'With servants?'

Answer: *Thara abboda theowas sind thær* 'The abbots' servants are there'.

Cf. similar cases but with a pronominal element for the ‘possessive case’:

*He ferth thider* ‘He goes there’.

*Mid theowe?* With a servant?

Answer: *He ferth thider mid his theowe* ‘He goes there with his servant’.

*Hie sind thær* ‘They are there’.

*Mid biscopum?* ‘With biscops?’

Answer: *Hie sind thær mid hiera biscopum* ‘They are there with their bishops’.

The same can be done with verbal paradigms whether of weak verbs, strong verbs or special verbs. Let us choose the special verb *don* ‘do’. Present: (singular) *ic do / thu dest / he deth / (plural) we, ge, hie doth*. Here are some illustrations:

*ic do Godes word* (literally) ‘I do (= I put into practice or I practise) the word of God’.

*And hie?* ‘And they?’

Answer: *Hie doth Godes word* ‘They practise the word of God’.

*Thu dest swa se preost bodath* ‘you (singular) do as the priest preaches’.

*And he?* ‘And he?’

Answer: *He deth swa se preost bodath* ‘He does as the priest preaches’.

Why give up a method which is simple and extremely useful? I leave it to the reader to judge for himself/herself.

## 2.2. *Lexical clusters, a type of “lexical paradigm”. Their application to lexical codification*

Here are I am not referring to the ‘diachronic equations’ of the type illustrated in Gk. *hypobaino*, L. *subuenio*, Ger. *aufkommen*, E. *come up* or Gk. *probaíno*, L. *prouenio*, Ger. *vorkommen*, etc. These are verbs the stems of which and the elements (prefixes or so-called ‘separable prefixes’ in the case of German or just ‘locative particles’ in English) with which they form units, belong respectively to the same original Indo-European etyma. Even though these combinations of elements that constitute ‘diachronic equations’ have often developed widely different semantic values throughout the history of the various languages, their comparative study has been extremely useful. Such diachronic equations were the starting point of my British Ph.D. Dissertation (see References). Cf. also de la Cruz (1977), pp. 271-274.

Here I am referring to the importance of codifying the variety of ‘lexical clusters’ consisting historically of a locative element and a verbal root. In



the first place English has strongly inherited from the Indo-European preverbal consolidation the well known clusters with the native reversative prefix *un-* and the somewhat archaic *be-*, and has considerably developed the productive *over-* and *under-* as well as created the interesting productive *out-*. Here are some representative cases of reversative *un-*: *unbind, uncover, undo, unearth, unhinge, unleash, unload, unlock, unpack, unravel, unroof, untie, unsex, unsheathe, unveil, unwrap*, etc. Representative cases of *out-* are: *outclass* 'to surpass', *outdistance* 'leave far behind in a competition', *outlast* 'last longer than', *outride* 'ride beyond or faster', *outrival, outwit*, etc.

In other Germanic languages the richness of the prefixes inherited from the Indo-European preverbal consolidation is greater. Cf. Ger. *ent-* (*entdecken* 'discover', *entehren* 'dishonour', *enteignen* 'expropriate', *enterben* 'disinherit', *entfaren* 'escape', *entlassen* 'let go'). Cf. *ver-* (*verbrechen* 'perpetrate -crime-', *verfallen* 'fall due, expire', *vergehen* 'pass away', *verlernen* 'unlearn, forget', *verzahlen* 'miscount'), etc.

Of a different order are a comparative reduced number of formations, some newer and some older but mostly relics of the old order 'PV' of phrasal verbs where P is not originally a real prefix but a locative particle in adverbial function attached to the verbal stem. Cf. *upgrade, uphold, uplift, upset*, etc.

But English also possesses an enormous wealth of lexical clusters of Romance origin worth codifying for its own sake. Just as Latin excels for its enormous amount of derivatives from *a(b)-, de-, ex-, in-, pro-*, etc., English, being a language with a considerable amount of originally foreign material, is also renowned for its own 'Romance clusters'. Cf. the L. stem *-clinare* in *decline, incline, recline*; the L. stem *-cludere* (*cludere*) in *conclude, exclude, include*; the L. stem *-ducere* in *adduce, induce, introduce, produce*; the L. stem *-mittere* in *commit, emit, dismiss*; the L. stem *-portare* in *export, import, report, support*; the L. stem *-pellere* in *dispel, expel, impel, repel*; the L. stem *-plicare* in *comply, imply, reply* and *\*-plicate* in *complicate, implicate, replicate*; the L. stem *-rumpere* in *disrupt, erupt, interrupt*; the L. stem *-scribere* in *inscribe, prescribe, subscribe, transcribe*; the L. stem *-sumere* in *assume, consume, presume, resume*; the L. stem *-tenere* in *contain, detain, retain, sustain*; the L. stem *-vertere* in *convert, invert, pervert, revert, subvert*; the L. stem *-vocare* in *convoke, evoke, invoke, revoke*, etc., etc.

However, where the native Germanic element of English has been enormously productive in the formation of 'lexical clusters' is in what I have called the 'new phrasal verb' of the Germanic languages, a new Germanic creation, although considerably influenced semantically by Latin. Cf. de la Cruz (1972 a) pp. 73-96 y (1972 b) pp. 1-42. For a vision of the coexistence of clusters of verbs of Latin origin and clusters of verbs of Germanic origin in English, see *op. cit.* (1972 b), particularly pp. 34-42.

### 3. PARADIGMS AND LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION (INFLECTIONAL AND DERIVATIVE MORPHOLOGY)

#### 3.1. *Grammatical paradigms. Creation of paradigms by the morphological process of vowel change (vowel alternation or "ablaut")*

Here we are concerned with inflectional morphology and the actual creation of paradigms. Take the case of the strong verb in Germanic. Are the strong verbs of Old English, for example, mere taxonomic tables learned through experience, as one would say that a Spanish child learns *sé* instead of *\*sabo* and *supe* instead of *\*sabí*, or are they the automatic result of the application of the phonological rules of the language to minimally specified stems? The second possibility was first launched by Anderson (1970). It was later incorporated in Lass & Anderson (1975) pp. 24-58 and 249-254. There are more specialised works available, but for a first initiation I refer the reader to Matthews (1974) pp. 216-236. Cf. also my elaborate discussion on the subject in de la Cruz (1983) pp. 376-378, specifically what I said when I expounded Lass & Anderson's theory:

"Consiste en la obtención de las vocales radicales del presente, pretérito, pretérito y participio pasado de las distintas clases, simplemente mediante la operación, debidamente ordenada, de reglas fonológicas sincrónicas (según contexto sintáctico -presente / pretérito / pretérito / participio pasado- y fonológico) sobre un elemento vocálico indiferenciado /V/... Se postula, pues, que en el caso de *bindan* (de la clase 3), por ejemplo, lo que pasa (procedente del léxico) al componente fonológico es /bVnd/ + las especificaciones que correspondan, y esta secuencia resultará en cualquiera de las formas de superficie del verbo *bindan* (*bint*, *band*, *hunde*, etc.) tras la aplicación del 'paquete fonológico', es decir, el conjunto de reglas de la fonología del inglés antiguo... Por el mismo procedimiento obtendremos cualquiera de las formas de superficie de *sprecan* (de la clase 5), a partir de /sprVc/".

Cf. *ibíd.*, the complete 'paradigm' of *bacan*, of class 6, where we specify all the rules independently of the fact that some operate vacuously and do not affect their input which is therefore also their output, for the simple reason that their instructions do not recognise adequate material upon which to operate. However, in principle they all operate.

#### 3.2. *Grammatical paradigms. Creation of new words by the morphological process of suffixation to a specific item in a paradigm (suffixing operates on one particular item of the set)*

Once again we are concerned here with morphology, though this time derivational instead of inflectional. But the source is an inflected item

which is itself a member of a paradigmatic set of commutable words. Whether the right form is a noun or a verb, if the source of the derivation is essentially part of a paradigm, we might have here reason enough to support the existence of paradigms in the mind of the speaker or, what is the same, the real existence of their individual constituent items. Take the case of the Spanish dialectal form *\*sapiendo* for *sabiendo*. It seems obvious that *\*sapiendo* has been taken from the preterite *supe* instead of from the stem of the infinitive *saber*, which gives the standard *sabiendo*. By the same token, the OE deverbal nouns *cyre* 'choice', *hryre* 'fall, destruction', *lyre* 'loss, scyte 'a shoot', etc., are no doubt formed from the pret. of the verbs *ceosan* 'to choose', *hreosan* 'to fall, go to ruin', *leosan* 'to lose' and *sceotan* 'to shoot'. Remember that the pret. of the aforementioned verbs is (indicative *cure*, *curon*, subjunctive *cure*, *curen*; *hrure*...; *lure*...; *scute*... All the deverbal nouns mentioned illustrate the rhotacism subsequent to the operation of Verner's law: *\*cuse*, *\*cuson*, etc., with [s] which becomes voiced (through Verner's law) and subsequently [r], hence *cure*, *curon*, etc. The [y] of *cyre*, *hryre*, *lyre*, *scyte*, etc., is due to the phenomenon of i-umlaut as a result of an i-type nominalising suffix (the final -e) which has the effect of 'fronting' the stem vowel of the pret. of the verbs they come from. Similar is the case with deverbal causative verbs such as *sprengan* 'to scatter', literally 'to cause to jump', derived from *springan* 'spring', or *drencan* 'drown', literally 'to cause to drink', derived from *drincan* 'drink'. These causative verbs are obviously formed from the stem of the pret. of *springan* and *drincan*, namely *sprang* and *dranc*. As in the case of the deverbal nouns, here too we have the i-umlaut effect of the verbal suffix -jan on the stem which, previous to a rule of nasalization, was in the case of *springan* *\*spræng* and in the case of *drincan* *\*drænc*, hence the 'fronting' we see in the outcome of *\*spræng + jan > spreng(e)an* and of *\*drænc + jan > drenc(e)an*. Other deverbal causatives are *dræfan* from the pret. of *drifan*; *lecgan* from the pret. *læg* of *licgan*, *settan* from the pret. *sæt* of *sittan*; *feran* from the pret. or from the pret. of *faran*, *fiellan* from the pres. or from the past part. of *feallan*, etc., etc. Of all these the most interesting cases from the point of view of Modern English are the reflexes of the pairs OE. *licgan/lecgan* = Mod.E. *to lie/to lay* and OE *sittan/settan* = Mod.E. *to sit/to set*. Following Lass and Anderson's observations, I have dealt with this issue in detail (1983) pp. 378-379, parag. 81.4. (*Psicología y lingüística*). Cf. también de la Cruz (1988) pp. 49-52.

#### 4. THE ANALYTIC PARADIGMS OF THE GENERALLY ACCEPTED BASE FOR ENGLISH

In de la Cruz & Trainor (1989 a) pp. 46 and ff., we have shown that a simple base for English along the lines of an AUX consisting of Tense,

Modals, perfective aspect with *have -en/-ed* (= PERF.), progressive aspect with *be -ing* (= PROG.) and passive with *be -en/-ed* (= PASSIVE), can generate 16 and only 16 different chains.

1. Tense + Main Verb
2. Tense + Modal + Main Verb
3. Tense + PERF + Main Verb
4. Tense + PROG + Main Verb
5. Tense + PASSIVE + Main Verb
6. Tense + Modal + PERF + Main Verb
7. Tense + Modal + PROGR + Main Verb
8. Tense + PASSIVE + Main Verb
9. Tense + PERF + PROGR + Main Verb
10. Tense + PERF + PASSIVE + Main Verb
11. Tense + PROG + PASSIVE + Main Verb
12. Tense + Modal + PERF + PROG + Main Verb
13. Tense + Modal + PERF + PASSIVE + Main Verb
14. Tense + Modal + PROG + PASSIVE + Main Verb
15. Tense + PERF + PROG + PASSIVE + Main Verb
16. Tense + Modal + PERF + PROG + PASSIVE + Main Verb

If we include affirmative and declarative negatives, the output would be 32 chains. If we also include non-interrogatives and interrogatives, then the output would be 64, and so forth and so on. For a synoptic view see de la Cruz (1989) p. 39.

We must be aware of the fact that although this provides us with a fairly normal account of the living paradigms of the English verb from the point of view of the Auxiliary, not all possible theoretical combinations are equally current and acceptable in all specific grammatical contexts. For instance, there is no such sequence as *\*I can have done it* as against *I can't have done it* which is perfectly normal. Cf. de la Cruz & Trainor (1989 a) p. 198, parag. 6.2.1. And last century, and even at the beginning of this century, the *been being* sequences generated according to points 15 and 16 above were hardly acceptable. Our 16 chains are but the result of historical development (still not perfectly symmetrical as we have seen in *\*I can have done it*).

I have been recently concerned with Middle English structures of the type *I shall mowe go*, *I shall kunne go*, etc. Cf. de la Cruz (1992 forthcoming). Here is a representative chronological table of the aforementioned type of structure following Visser's evidence:

## 'Double modals' in ME and early Mod.E.

shall mowe + inf.	shall conne + inf.	shall will + inf. mowe kunne + inf.	must kunne + inf.
(shall may + inf.)	(shall can + inf.)	+ inf.)	(must can, may can
Gen. and Ex. c1250	Poema Morale c1180	Ormulum —	Lanfranc c1400
Hampole c1340	Ormulum c1200	Chaucer —	Pecock —
Wyclif c1380	Cursor M. c1300	Bokenham 1447	
Chaucer c1386	Hampole —	Caxton —	
Cloud of Unknowing c1400	Ayenbite 1340	Th. More —	
Paston L. 1422-1509	Chaucer —	( <i>should</i> <i>will to</i> also in Pecock)	
Chauliac's G. Chirurgie c1425	Cloud of Unknowing —		
Castell of Perseverance c1425	Pecock c1445		
Caxton c1489	( <i>should can</i> also in Caxton)		
Linacre's Progymnasmatia c1512			
Th. More 1557			

These structures are no longer possible in contemporary standard English. And neither were they in existence in the Old period. I concluded that they were innovations which did not manage to become firmly established in the 'modern' language. As a matter of fact, as I have also recently pointed out (*ibíd.*), Old English lacked the following types of structure:

- (1) Co-occurrence of MODAL, PERF and PROG (Mod.E. *he may have discussed it and he may have been discussing it*).
- (2) Co-occurrence of PERF and PROG (Mod.E. *he has been discussing it*).
- (3) Co-occurrence of PERF and PROG and PASSIVE (Mod.E. *it has been discussed*).
- (4) Co-occurrence of PROG and PASSIVE (Mod.E. *it is being discussed*).
- (5) Co-occurrence of PERF and PASSIVE (Mod.E. *it has been discussed*).

The study of 'analytic paradigms' should also cover (1) the peculiarities of bi-functional verbs (verbs which function sometimes as 'modals' and sometimes as 'main verbs'), (2) the peculiarities of so-called semi-auxiliaries and (3) the interesting phenomena recently observed in some 'semi-modals'.

With regard to (1) cf. *need* as main verb in de la Cruz & Trainor (1989 a) pp. 187-188, as against *need* as 'modal' (*ibid.*) p. 88. Particularly interesting is the semantics of *need* (*ibid.*) pp. 189-190. Cf. *she needn't have done so and so* 'there was no need for her to have done so and so (as she has done)'; *she doesn't need to have done so and so* 'it is not necessary for her to have done so and so, for example, in order to qualify for a job, etc.'; *she hasn't needed to do so and so* 'it hasn't been necessary for her to do or to have done so and so'. The case of *dare* is no less challenging. We have main *dare* 'to challenge', we have main *dare* 'to have sufficient courage to do something', we have modal *dare* with the same meaning, and we have a 'mixed bundle', also with the same meaning, represented by such cases as *she dares not do it*, *dared she do it?* and *she dared not do it*. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 190-191.

With regard to (2) cf. the chains currently called semi-auxiliaries like *used to* (which used to have a present but lacks one at the present time), *have to* (*hafta*, *hasta*), *have got to*, *got to* (*gotta*), *had better*, *had rather*, *be bound to* (*bounta*), *be going to* (*gonna*) and *be to*. Except for *had rather*, the major feature in common with ordinary auxiliaries is their regular capacity to allow the passive of the complete sequence. Of course, there are other 'catenative verbs' with similar properties. Cf. *the police are sure to have caught the thief*, which means exactly the same as *the thief is sure to have been caught by the police* as against *the police are sure that they have caught the thief* and *the thief is sure that he has been caught by the police*. In the first two examples it is the speaker or reporter that possesses or reports the certainty of the arrest. In the last two examples it is the police and the thief respectively who possess that certainty.

With regard to (3), cf. the data adduced in Lass & Anderson (1975) p. 236, in connection with the influence of paradigms. We have the semi-modal structures *I go complain to...* and *you go complain to...* which appear

in fact to be imitations of the modal paradigm *I may go* etc. But notice that we do not have *\*he goes complain* or *\*he go complain*. It is as if *go*, a main verb could not follow the pattern of *may* or other modals in the 3<sup>rd</sup> p.s. because in this person *go* has an ending (*goes*) whereas the modals have not! Cf. de la Cruz (1988) p. 69.

I would like to conclude by saying that there are also other analytic paradigms worth describing. Cf. in connection with Spanish what F. Adrados (1969) p.768, has to say:

“Concretamente, E. Lorenzo ha hecho ver recientemente cómo en español, al lado de una perífrasis aspectiva bien conocida como es la de *estar* + gerundio, funcionan ya otras menos notadas y de igual origen: *llevar* + participio (*llevaba marcados cinco tantos*), *llevar* + gerundio (*llevo estudiando dos años*), que indican acción inconclusa; *ir* + gerundio (*ir corriendo*), de valor durativo; y otras.”

Finally, the paradigmatic study of elements should not be exclusively a matter of morphology, lexicology or even basic syntax and phraseology. There are very specific points concerning the syntactical behaviour of verbs, which are largely dependant on the idiosyncratic properties enshrined in the lexicon. These also form ‘paradigms’ and as such should be analysed and studied. Cf. the case of what would appear to be a pure and simple lexical type like *to expect* and *to be expected*. We believe there is a syntactic paradigm here. Cf. de la Cruz & Trainor (1990) p. 409-410, note 14.

## CONCLUSION

Paradigms are real and necessary both as ‘created language’ and ‘creators of language’ and, in consequence, the ‘word and paradigm’ model is still valid.

## REFERENCES

- Akmajian, A. et al., “The Category AUX in Universal Grammar”, *Linguistic Enquiry* 10, 1, 1979, pp. 1-64.
- Allan, W.S., “Lightfoot noch einmal” *Diachronica* 4, 1988, pp. 123-157.
- Allen, C., “Old English Modals”, in Gimshaw, J. (ed.), *Papers in the History and Structure of English*, Amherst 1975 (Univ. of Mass.).
- Anderson, J.M., “‘Ablaut’ in the Synchronic Phonology of the English Verb”, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 75, 1970, pp. 166-197.

- Baron, D., *Grammar and Gender*, Yale 1986.
- Bierce, A., *The Devil's Dictionary*, New York 1911, repr. 1943.
- Blaubergs, M., "Changing the Sexist Language: The Theory behind the Practice". *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 2, pp. 249-261.
- Braune, W., *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, Tübingen 1959 (Max Niemeyer).
- Brugmann, K., *The Nature and Origin of the Noun Genders in the Indo-European Languages*, transl. F.Y. Robbins, New York 1987 (Scribners).
- Campbell, A., *Old English Grammar*, Oxford 1959, 1971 (OUP).
- Chomsky, N., *Lectures in Government and Binding*, Dordrecht 1981 (Foris).
- *Knowledge of Language, Its Nature, Origin and Use*, New York 1986 (Praeger).
- "Some notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation", *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, 1989.
- Comrie, B., *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, Oxford 1989, repr. 1992 (Blackwell).
- Connolly, J.H., *Constituent Order in Functional Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*, Berlin-New York 1991 (Foris).
- Cruz, J.M. de la, *Origins and Development of the Phrasal Verb to the End of the Middle English Period*, Belfast 1969 (Ph.D. Dissertation available in microfilm).
- "The Latin Influence on the Germanic Development of the English Phrasal Verb", *English Philological Studies* 13, 1972, pp. 1-42.
- "The Origins of the Germanic Phrasal Verb", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 77, 1972, pp. 73-96.
- "Synchronic-Diachronic Remarks on the Nature of Prefixation", *Orbis* 26, 2, 1977, pp. 271-274.
- *La prosa de los anglosajones*, Málaga y Salamanca, 1983 (Univ. de Málaga y Salamanca).
- "Los Paradigmas verbales en la historia del inglés: más allá del epifenómeno", *Revista Española de Lingüística* 18, 1, 1988, pp. 47-91 (Summary in English: "Verb-paradigms in the History of English: Beyond their Epiphenomenal Nature, *ibid.*, p. 262).
- "A Game of a Lifetime in an old Curiosity Shop" *Estudios de Filología Inglesa, Anejos de Analecta Malacitana* 6, 1989.
- & Trainor, P., *Gramática inglesa*, Madrid 1989 (Cátedra).
- & Trainor, P., *Curso de sintaxis inglesa*, Madrid 1989, 1990 (Taurus).
- & Cañete, A., *Historia del inglés: Fundamentación e historímetro*, Málaga 1992 (Edinford).
- "The Modals Again in the Light of Historical and Cross-Linguistic Evidence",



- Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, 1992 (forthcoming).
- Ellegard, A., *The Auxiliary "Do": the Establishment and Regulation of its Use in English*. Stockholm 1953 (Almqvist and Wiksell).
- González Escribano, J.L., *Una teoría de la oración*, Oviedo 1991 (Univ. of Oviedo).
- "A Plea for INFL-less Syntax: Critical Remarks on Current GB Analyses of English Sentence Structure" (forthcoming).
- Haegeman, L., *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*, Oxford 1991 (Blackwell).
- Hausmann, R., "The Development of Periphrastic *Do* in English" in Anderson and Jones, C. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam 1974 (North-Holland).
- Howard, Ph., *The State of the Language*, London 1984 (Penguin).
- Jespersen, O., *Progress in Language with Special Reference to English*, London 1984 (Allen and Unwin). (Revised English version of Jespersen's Doctoral Dissertation).
- Lass, R. & Anderson, J.M., *Old English Phonology*, Cambridge 1975 (CUP).
- Lightfoot, D., *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, Cambridge 1979 (CUP).
- "The Child's Trigger Experience: Degree-0 Learnability", *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 2, pp. 321-334.
- *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*, Cambridge, Mass. 1991 (MIT).
- Lorenzo, E., *El español de hoy, lengua en ebullición*, 2º ed., Madrid 1971 (Gredos).
- Lühr, R., "Zu Veränderungen in System der Modalverben", *Althochdeutsch I*, Heidelberg 1987, pp. 262-289.
- Macrae-Gibson, O.D., *Learning Old English, A Progressive Course with Text, Tape and Exercises*, Aberdeen 1977.
- Matthews, P.H., *Morphology, An Introduction to the Theory of Word-Structure*, Cambridge 1974 (CUP).
- Milroy, J., *Linguistic Variation and Change*, Oxford 1992 (Blackwell).
- Mitchell, B., "F.Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*: Some Caveats Concerning Old English", *English Studies*, 60, 1979, pp. 537-542.
- *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols., Oxford 1985 (OUP).
- Ogura, M., "Periphrasis with OE and ME Verbs" *Chiba Review* 13, 1991, pp. 37-70.
- Phillips, K.C., "Review of F.Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language, Part III*", *English Studies* 51, 1970 pp. 344-349.
- Pyles, Th. & Algeo, J., *The Origins and Development of the English Language*, New York 1971 (Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovic).

- Rodríguez Adrados, F., *Lingüística estructural*, Madrid 1969 (Gredos).
- Ross, J.R., "Auxiliaries as Main Verbs", in Todd, W. (ed.) *Studies in Philosophical Linguistics*, Series I, Evanston 1969 (Great Expectations).
- Samuels, M.L., *Linguistic Evolution with Special Reference to English*, Cambridge 1972 (CUP).
- Steele, S. et al., *An Encyclopaedia of AUX*, Cambridge, Mass. 1981 (MIT).
- Steinmetz, S., "On Language: The De-sexing of English", *New York Times Magazine* 1982, 1 August, p. 6.
- Tschirch, F., *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, Berlin 1975 (Erich Schmidt).
- Visser, F.Th., *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 4 vols., Leiden 1963-1973 (Brill).
- Warner, A., "Review Article on Lightfoot 1979", *Journal of Linguistics* 19, 1983, pp. 187-209.