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c h a p t e r 1

Introduction

1.1 Preposition placement in English

This book is about prepositions, and more specifically prepositions placed in stranded position at the end of a clause or sentence, a syntactic arrangement known as preposition stranding (henceforth P-stranding). It is about history, usage and precept: history in that it will trace the history of P-stranding over four centuries, from 1500 to 1900; usage in that it will analyse empirical data from two usage corpora; and precept in that it will assess the influence of normative comments on actual language use, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The starting point is the preposition itself. In present-day reference grammars, prepositions are described as a part of speech which expresses a relation between two entities; prepositions are links which, unlike adverbs or particles, govern another element in the clause with which they are syntactically and notionally related; and they correspond to case inflections in other languages such as German and Latin (see Quirk et al. 1985: §§9.1–3; Biber et al. 1999: §2.4.5; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 7.§4.1). One might think that the definition of preposition in early grammars would be broadly a matter of consensus, yet the following are some definitions from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammar books:

(1) A Preposition is a part of speech set before other parts; either in Apposition, or Composition. (Wharton 1654: 58)

(2) A Preposition (the third Kind of Particles) is a Word set before others; either to govern them; as Alexander travelled into Persia; or else in Composition with them; as, The Con-clusion will shew the Truth, &c. . . . Prepositions are so called, because they are put


2 Unless otherwise indicated, quotations are reproduced as in the original source. Emphasis is indicated with bold type.
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before other Parts of Speech, to describe their State, Place, Circumstances, Ends, or Ways of acting or suffering.

(Saxon 1737: 75–6)

(3) Prepositions are placed before other words, to express a certain connection, or relation; chiefly as to either their real, or ideal place; as, by him. They serve also to express those relations, which in the learned languages are called cases, as, of him, to him.

(Brittain 1788: 69)

In addition to the notional/semantic unity between the preposition and the word governed, early historical grammars often draw attention to the syntactic position of the preposition, even when it is discussed in sections on etymology/morphology. In An Essay towards Practical Grammar, for example, the grammarian James Greenwood (d. 1737) writes:

(4) Q: What is a preposition?
A: A Preposition is a Part of Speech, which being added to any other Part of Speech, serves to mark or signify their State or Reference to each other.

Q: Whence comes the Word Preposition?
A: From Præponere to set or put before. Because it is for the most Part set before Words, tho’ it sometimes is set after them.

(Greenwood 1711: 93)

Although a preposition in post-position is as much a preposition as one placed in front position (cf. Latin tenus, versus), the emphasis on placement is a natural consequence of harmonising the definition with the etymology of the term: from Latin prepositiōn, past participle of præponere, it literally means ‘placed in front’: pre/pre ‘before’ + positiōn/position ‘position’. In fact, prepositions were sometimes called ‘fore-placed words’ (Gildon and Brightland 1712: 62; Collyer 1735: 40). As the philologist Henry Sweet (1845–1912) observed, ‘[i]n some grammars the definitions of the parts of speech are literally nothing more than quibbling etymologies’ (1892: I.vii). Usually, the preposition is indeed placed before the word it governs, literally in pre-position, but it is one of the very oldest peculiarities of word order in the English language that prepositions may, and often do, occur in post-position, that is, after the governed word. This is in fact the usual word order in Old English with personal pronouns, as illustrated
The term *postposition* is often used by early and late Modern English grammarians to refer to the construction known in modern syntax as P-stranding, as epitomised in the passage from Guy Miège’s *English Grammar* in (6).

(5) Post-position in Old English

*þæt hi comon him to*, Ælfric’s *Homilies*

| him (…) to (…) com | pronoun (+ optional) + prep (+ optional) + V |
| com (…) him (…) to | V (+ optional) + pronoun (+ optional) + prep |
| him (…) com (…) to | pronoun (+ optional) + V (+ optional) + prep |

(adapted from Mitchell 1985: I.§§1077–8)

(6) Although the Prepositions took that Name from their being commonly placed before Nouns, yet in English they are often placed at the end of a Sentence; especially after these two Pronouns, *Who* and *What*. As, *who did you dine with? What place do you come from?* By which means the Preposition becomes, if I may say so, a Postposition. (Miège 1688: 80–1)

P-stranding is understood in this book as the syntactic construction where (a) a preposition is not immediately followed by its complement, but the prepositional complement can be recovered from somewhere earlier in the construction, and if not explicit it is understood; and (b) the preposition appears at some convenient place in the latter part of the sentence or clause, but not necessarily in final position. Under conditions (a) and (b) the preposition is said to be *stranded, deferred or detached*. Thus, the term *stranded* is used by Poutsma (1914–29: I.viii.§§86), Visser (1963–73: I.§§4.01–3), Denison (1998: 220), Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 7.§4.1) and Fischer and van der Wurff (2006: 195); *deferred* is used in Quirk

---

3 See Mitchell (1985: I.§§1077–8). I am taking here a broad approach to P-stranding in Old English in order to include this type of simple sentence, which is ‘impossible today’ (Hogg 2002: 93–4; Fischer and van der Wurff 2006: 195–6).

4 Note that the term prepositional complement is here used as a cover term for licensed prepositional objects and for optional adjuncts or adverbial objects (see Johansson and Geisler 1998: 69).

5 For instance, Huddleston and Pullum define stranded prepositions as ‘a transitive preposition with the complement missing but understood’, so that it can be recovered syntactically or semantically (2002: 12.§7.3(g)). In his comprehensive study on preposition placement, Hoffmann (2011: 1–2) describes P-stranding in *wh*-relative clauses as the construction in which the preposition ‘can appear without an adjacent NP complement in front of the relativized position ‘_i’’, e.g. ‘I want a data source [which] I can rely on _i’.

---
et al. (1985: §9.6) and Sundby et al. (1991: 426–8); and detached in Onions (1911: §112), Curme (1931–5: III.xxix.62) and Traugott (1992: 281). Stranded prepositions are also referred to variously as prepositions placed at the end, end-placed prepositions, final prepositions and prepositions placed last. Poutsma (1914–29: I.i.viii.§§86–93) also refers to P-stranding as ‘the shifting of the preposition’. The ability of a preposition to appear in stranded position is referred to as strandability; the terms strandable and unstrandable prepositions are likewise used in this sense (Takami 1988).

The following sentences illustrate the array of present-day English contexts in which we can find P-stranding; the stranded preposition is marked out in bold, and the type of clause is indicated on the right:6

(7) Preposition stranding

a. The evening course which I referred to earlier is no longer available. \(wh\)-relative

b. The bird that I was running after managed to escape. \(that\)-relative

c. The house I lived in last year has been sold to my neighbour. \(zero\)-relative

d. My mum found such books as I had been long looking for. \(as\)-relative

e. Paul was laughed at during the ceremony. prepositional passive

f. Who are you talking to on the phone? main interrogative

g. I don’t know where this drilling noise is coming from. subordinate interrogative

h. What a mess he has got himself into! exclamative

i. We know more than people give us credit for. comparative

j. I have no friends to rely on. infinitive

k. The new boss is tough to deal with. hollow

l. The police found new evidence worth looking into. non-finite -ing

m. There are two books on the shelf. One I will set fire to, the other one I will keep. topicalisation

Broadly speaking, there are two types of clause. First, in some contexts, the preposition is categorically stranded: non-\(wh\)-relative clauses, including

---

6 In the present study, \(it\)-cleft sentences of the type ‘It was John who I talked to’ would be classified within the group of \(wh\)-relatives, and the type ‘It was John that I talked to’ as instances of \(that\)-relatives.
that-relatives (7)b, zero-relatives (7)c, and as-relatives (7)d; prepositional passives (7)e; comparative structures (7)i; infinitive clauses with a non-overt pronoun (7)j or as adjective complementation (7)k, also known as easy-to-please constructions, tough-movement, or hollow clauses; and non-finite ing-clauses (7)l. Second, there are contexts in which, notwithstanding some constraints, there is syntactic variation, and instead of hanging in the air at the end of the clause, to use Visser’s (1963–73: I.§394) metaphor, the preposition can appear in front position, as illustrated in (8): wh-relative clauses (8)a, independent wh-interrogative clauses (8)f, subordinate wh-interrogative clauses (8)g, exclamative clauses (8)h, and instances of topicalisation (8)m, also referred to as preposing.\(^7\) The construction with the preposition before its complement is known in modern syntax as preposition pied piping (henceforth P-piping), a term coined by J.R. Ross within the generative-transformational model of grammar: ‘just as the children of Hamlin followed the Pied Piper out of the town’ in the fairy tale, so prepositions follow their complements to the front position of the clause after these have undergone movement (1986: 121, 126.n23). Pied-piped prepositions are also referred to as fronted prepositions.\(^8\)

\(^{(8)}\) Preposition pied piping

\begin{itemize}
  \item \(a'\) The evening course \textit{to which} I referred earlier is no longer available.
  \item \(f'\) \textit{To whom} are you talking on the phone?
  \item \(g'\) I don’t know \textit{from where} this drilling noise is coming.
  \item \(h'\) \textit{Into what a mess} has he got himself!
  \item \(m'\) There are two books on the shelf. \textit{To one} I will set fire, the other one I will keep.
\end{itemize}

The focus of this monograph is primarily on P-stranding, but P-piping is also discussed, given that the history of the two constructions usually goes hand in hand. It will offer a twofold approach: P-stranding overall, and P-stranding in contrast to P-piping. In terms of precept, my main concern is the conceptualisation of P-stranding in normative works and the attitudes towards prepositions in stranded position. P-piping will naturally be discussed as well, given that normative authors often refer to the end

\(^7\) I have taken the terms hollow clause and preposing from Hoffmann (2011: 35–6, ultimately from Huddleston and Pullum 2002).

\(^8\) I am aware that in the generative framework the pied piping transformation is not exclusive to prepositions. As my study is exclusively limited to preposition pied piping, pied piping and preposition pied piping are here treated as synonyms.
position in contrast to the front position, as when Benjamin Rhodes (1743–1816?) writes that ‘the preposition is sometimes placed after the relative; as, The man whom I spake to: but it is much more elegant to place it before the relative, as, the man to whom I spake’ (Rhodes 1795: 38). In some cases, though, a stated rule only makes explicit mention of P-piping, as in James Nicholson (fl. 1793): ‘The preposition should always be placed before the pronoun it governs; as, with whom do you live; to whom will you give that pen’ (1793: 60).

In terms of usage, I will examine the diachronic evolution of P-stranding in all linguistic contexts in which it may occur (see (7)a–m). The aim is to assess to what extent contexts with categorical and noncategorical P-stranding may have been affected by precept, and not only in contexts in which there is paradigmatic variation; such contexts provide a setting for a more conscious selection of one or the other construction and this may skew the findings. I will also trace the development of P-stranding alongside P-piping in contexts in which syntactic variation is a viable option (see (8)). Earlier work on preposition placement has focused on this latter approach, especially on wh-relative clauses, while knockout contexts with no paradigmatic variation have received less attention.9 In my view, if language users wished to avoid P-stranding because of the stigma attached to it, they would avoid it altogether by means of other strategies and not only in those contexts in which both constructions are possible. We will see later in this book how the writer John Dryden (1631–1700) resorted to a variety of strategies to avoid end-placed prepositions in all types of clauses (Section 5.3.1), and how the frequency of stranded prepositions in the correspondence of Elizabeth Montagu (c. 1718–1800) was notably low in all contexts, not only in those with syntactic variation (Section 6.3).

The following extract from the transcript of a trial shows that, even in contexts where priming would expectedly result in P-piping, the speaker chose P-stranding:

(9) [Sir Charles Russell] Yes. What were the symptoms of which he complained? . . . These were the symptoms of which he complained. I think you saw him, did you not, on the 19th, the 22nd, and the 26th November; the 5th December and the 10th December; and on the 7th March in the present year?

9 To give but one example, Johansson and Geisler (1998: 67) argue that ‘it is only in relative clauses involving which that there is a choice between pied piping and preposition stranding’; hence, their study is restricted to relativiser which, excluding other wh–pronouns (who/whom), that-relatives and zero-relatives.
[MR TIDY’S EVIDENCE] But the prominent symptoms which I should attach more importance to than anything else are those I have mentioned.

(Trials, Edwin Maybrick, 1870–1900, quoted in Johansson 2006: 139; italics in Johansson)

By the same token, I believe that users who are fond of stranding prepositions because, for instance, the construction is natural and idiomatic would strand prepositions in any context and not only when there is syntactic competition with P-piping. Guy and Bayley (1995: 156) argue that ‘preposition-fronting is itself optional’; in my view, so is P-stranding.\(^{10}\) By investigating all contexts, with categorical P-stranding and with variability, this monograph will offer a more complete account of the use of this construction, with the added perspective of a historical approach.\(^{11}\)

This is the first book to offer an account of P-stranding (and to some extent P-piping) during the early and late Modern English periods (1500–1900). Stranded prepositions have been discussed in histories of the English language but not over such a long and continuous period of time. For Curme, ‘for many centuries the position of a preposition at or near the end of a [sentence] has been one of the outstanding features of our language’ (1931–5: III.xxix.§62.4); in fact, he continues, ‘it is so natural to put the preposition at the end that we have extended this usage beyond its original boundaries’ (ibid.). Denison (1998: 220) quotes an example with stranded as which would previously have been resisted ‘even in informal speech’, but which has now become increasingly frequent in spoken language: ‘An ordinary genius is a fellow that you and I would be just as good as, if we were only many times better [1985]’. Studies of historical syntax have shown that the effects of changes in Middle English can be observed from about 1500 to 1700, that ‘at that time, the structure of the language was gradually established so that eighteenth-century standard written English closely resembles the present-day language’ (Rissanen 1999: 187), and that English at the start of the nineteenth century ‘was linguistically by no means the same as that of the present day’ (Denison 1998: 93). This book will thus investigate the diachronic evolution of P-stranding in the four centuries from 1500 to 1900, and will ask whether the well-attested spread in its use during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Görlach 1991: 107), and from 1776 to present-day English (Denison 1998: 220), has been

\(^{10}\) See Guy and Bayley (1995: 155–9).

\(^{11}\) Hoffmann (2011) presents a very sophisticated study of preposition placement in which all types of clauses are considered, but based on present-day English data. Hoffmann’s work is primarily concerned with the linguistic analysis of factors determining grammaticality and trends in usage; my study is largely descriptive and focuses on the relationship between precept and usage.
a steady one, or whether P-stranding has undergone change, and if so when and why such change occurred. Hence, this study examines the history of P-stranding from the end of the Middle Ages, during the Renaissance, the Restoration, and the Age of Reason and Enlightenment, through the Romantic period and into the Victorian age. The principal focus will be on the eighteenth century, a time of unstable and shifting attitudes to language, especially with regard to syntax composition and prose style. Eighteenth-century Britain was ‘fascinated’ by language, from universal grammarians to matters of elocution, from defenders of Latin to upholders of grammars and dictionaries. English, as never before, became subject to various kinds of scrutiny, the object of the gaze of science, literature, politics, and philosophy (Stalker 1985: 41, Crowley 1996: 54).

Preposition placement, in particular the relationship between P-stranding and P-piping, is one of the most intricate areas of syntactic variation in English, and has been studied from different theoretical approaches, mainly synchronic but also diachronic: the generative and transformational framework (Ross 1986), theories of movement and deletion (Grimshaw 1975, Allen 1980) and of reanalysis (Bresnan 1976, Hornstein and Weinberg 1981), optimality theory (Heck 2004), the syntax–semantics interface (Riddle et al. 1977; Couper-Kuhlen 1979; Ziv and Sheintuch 1981), the functional approach (Takami 1988), the lexical–functional framework (Tanaka 1999), typology (Maling 1977; Dekeyser 1990), dialectology (Seppänen 1999; Poussa 2006), psycholinguistics (Radford et al. 2012) and construction grammar (Hoffmann 2011). Attention has mostly been given to wh-relative clauses, one of the contexts which permit variation between P-stranding and P-piping. Bergh and Seppänen (2000) offer a historical overview of P-stranding based on a few selected studies. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003: 75–6) examine stranded prepositions as one among fourteen grammatical features under scrutiny in the Corpus of Early English Correspondence (1440–1681). A series of articles by Johansson and Geisler have shed light on both P-stranding and P-piping from a variety of perspectives, including nineteenth-century relative clauses (Geisler 2002, 2003; Johansson 2006) and twentieth-century spoken and written material (Johansson and Geisler 1998; Geisler and Johansson 2002); the scope

---

12 It has been argued that P-stranding is much more complex than P-piping from a language processing perspective, and that this could (at least partially) account for the fact that cross-linguistically P-piping is much more common than P-stranding (see a summary of the discussion on the literature in Hoffmann 2011: 56–9). Radford has hypothesised that P-piping ‘is obligatory in English (and universally)’ but also that ‘languages (and language varieties) may differ with regards to which link/s of a movement chain the preposition is spelled out on’ (2009: 236, quoted in Radford et al. 2012: 405).
Preposition placement in English


Attitudes to end-placed prepositions will be the principal theme of this book. The syntactic arrangement with P-stranding lends itself to criticism (partly) owing to implications arising from the etymology of the term, noted above. As Philip Withers (1790) firmly states towards the end of the eighteenth century: ‘A PREposition, as the Name implies, ought to precede in English the Object or it’s Representative. v.g. The Man TO WHOM you spoke’ (1789: 389). The rule ‘not to end sentences with prepositions’ has become one of the most enduring shibboleths in English, and indeed still tends to top those lists of ‘bad’ linguistic usage bemoaned by guardians of the language. Reports on these myths of prescriptivism can be found in Burchfield (1981: 30–1) and Ilson (1985: 177); they are also noted in Crystal (1995: 79, 194, 366), in the ‘language myths’ examined in Milroy (1998), and in folk surveys such as ‘20 examples of grammar misuse’ by the BBC (2008), ‘Top ten grammar myths’ by the Grammar Girl (2010), and The Guardian’s style guide (2013), amongst others. The stigma is seen to haunt news copy editors too (Radford et al. 2012: 403, n1). Present-day reference grammars still refer to this stigma; for instance, Quirk et al. (1985: §9.6) refer to P-piping as the ‘unmarked’ option, as it shows the preposition in its ‘natural’ place (i.e., preposed), while P-stranding is the ‘marked’ form, the preposition being ‘out-of-order’, separated from its object. Gérard points out that from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries ‘the preposition at the end of a sentence was a particularly controversial point with grammarians and literati’ (2001: 113). What stands between the natural use of stranded prepositions in present-day English (PDE) and the


14 On the other hand, some studies have claimed that P-piping ‘is not a natural option in English, but rather a prescriptive artefact probably picked up during schooling’ (McDaniel, McKee and Bernstein 1998: 309, quoted in Hoffmann 2011: 79), and that ‘the judgements of native speakers can be affected by explicit prescriptive rules inculcated during the formative years of their education’ (Radford et al. 2012: 407).
Introduction

early Modern English period (EModE) is the prescriptive movement of linguistic thought concerned with grammatical correctness and rhetorical propriety, reinforced through the codification of rules in grammars and dictionaries and through teaching practices (Blake 2002: 326). A necessary aim in this book is thus to explore the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century social, historical and cultural changes that led to the normative tradition. It has been repeatedly asserted in the literature that the rule against P-stranding was invented by John Dryden and that the grammarian Robert Lowth (1710–87) propagated the shibboleth in the eighteenth century. However, to the best of my knowledge, such claims have hitherto been based on the impressionistic interpretation of specific passages, and lack an empirical basis. I will argue here that the account in the literature hitherto represents neither the whole story, nor an accurate one.

This book will examine the whole issue of the stigmatisation of P-stranding, based on quantitative and qualitative analyses, looking at the history of the feature in the early and late Modern English periods in relation to prescriptivism in the tradition of English grammatical thought. The aim is to assess, or reassess, to what extent the (late) eighteenth-century normative tradition had an influence on the use of stranded prepositions, whether it triggered change, or whether it reinforced an existing trend. The methodology draws on the comparison of a precept database of metalinguistic comments from normative works with a usage corpus of actual language practice from collections of texts in a variety of registers. On the one hand, this will provide insightful observations into attitudes towards and the conceptualisation of end-placed prepositions during the course of the eighteenth century, evidence for which comes from a self-compiled database of precept works (1700–1800). On the other hand, it will trace the diachronic evolution of the use of P-stranding before, during and after the age of correctness, as collected in two historical corpora – the Helsinki Corpus (1500–1710) and A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers (1650–1900). The evaluation of the evidence from both precept and usage will help us unearth the origin of the stigmatisation of P-stranding and will shed new light on the influence of prescriptive and proscriptive norms on the history of this syntactic construction. Findings will ultimately contribute to our understanding of linguistic historiography, the study of grammaticology and historical sociolinguistics.

The remainder of this chapter sets out the framework for this monograph – normative linguistics – and notes the neighbouring disciplines to which it aims to contribute. Chapter 2 discusses the methodology, with regard to both the precept and the usage data. Chapter 3 is
devoted to the analysis of eighteenth-century precept data, including the distributional patterns of attitudes, semantic nuances of epithets used by normative authors, and the practice of (unacknowledged) borrowing and plagiarism; a brief note will also be given on the nineteenth-century context. Chapter 4 deals with the usage data. Language use will first be examined from a diachronic perspective, to be followed by a study of register variation. Chapter 5 aims to relate the results of the usage data to the diachronic evolution of precept norms. It opens with an overview of early Modern English grammars and then offers a thematic account of precept trends, which will include the influence of Latin and the ideal of grammatical correctness, differences in style and medium, and the role of rhetoric and stylistic propriety. Chapter 6 reflects further on the context in the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century. Finally, Chapter 7 offers concluding remarks.

1.2 Framework

1.2.1 Standardisation and normative linguistics

In the late 1980s Charles Jones referred to the late Modern English period (1700–1900, LModE) as the ‘Cinderella of English historical linguistic study’ (1989: 279). Indeed, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had received little attention compared to earlier periods, mainly because scholars considered that there had been few changes worth noting (Bailey 1996: 1). The study of linguistic historiography was particularly overlooked because of both the broadly negative view of eighteenth-century grammar books and the ‘intimidating’ amount of nineteenth-century material to explore (see Görlach 1999: 7–8; Beal et al. 2012: 201–2). Over the last thirty years there has been a growing interest in late Modern English in historical linguistics in general (Bailey 1996; Görlach 1999, 2001; Dossena and Jones 2003; Pérez-Guerra et al. 2007; Tieken-Boon van Ostade and van der Wurff 2009), and also in English normative linguistics (Beal et al. 2008; Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008a; Hickey 2010; Percy and Davidson

---

15 Leonard’s pioneering work The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage 1700–1800 (1929) has been blamed for the modern prejudice against eighteenth-century normative grammars (Hodson 2006: 60). Pullum (1974: 66) summarises the ‘shortcomings’ of traditional grammar as criticised by structuralists as follows: ‘(a) a tendency to confuse the synchronic and the diachronic and to mistakenly offer historical explanations instead of the descriptions of the facts; (b) an almost exclusive concentration on written language to the exclusion of spoken; (c) an uncritical acceptance of Latin grammatical categories that are “not appropriate to English”; (d) a prescriptive, as opposed to descriptive, bias’. 
Regarding the latter, scholars such as Leitner call for ‘more teaching and research into “grammaticology”, the cross-disciplinary study of grammars’, which, he argues, is ‘more than desirable’ for the understanding of the history of linguistics (1986a: 1334). Pioneering work dates from the early twentieth century, with Kennedy’s (1927) bibliography, and the studies of Leonard (1929) and Poldauf (1948). Alston’s Bibliography (1965) and the English Linguistics facsimile series (1967–73) led to a change of outlook in the 1970s and 1980s. Michael’s (1970, 1987) and Vorlat’s (1975) monographs are arguably the most comprehensive studies of the development of linguistic thought during the early and late Modern English periods. On a smaller scale, early studies investigated grammar writers such as Robert Lowth (Pullum 1974) and William Ward (Subbiondo 1975) and linguistic features such as double negation (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1982), phrasal verbs (Hiltunen 1998 [1983]) and auxiliary do (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1987). In the 1990s, Sundby et al.’s Dictionary of English Normative Grammar (DENG; 1991) contributed an exhaustive analysis of the prescriptions laid down in two hundred eighteenth-century normative works, and a number of case studies on literary authors and social networks followed (e.g., Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1991; Wright 1994; Percy 1996). The account of normative linguistics in Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2000a) testifies to the development of this field. Easier access via online resources allowed a shift in research perspective and gave the field a boost (Early English Books Online, Eighteenth Century Collections Online, the Eighteenth-Century English Grammars database). Scholars have turned to the original materials and to the grammar writers and demonstrated that historical grammars are a source of evidence in their own right. A number of dissertations and monographs have focused on specific linguistic features such as preterite and past preterite forms (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002), the subjunctive (Auer 2009) and preposition stranding (Yáñez-Bouza 2007); others have focused on grammar writers, including Ann Fisher (Rodríguez-Gil 2002a), Joseph Priestley (Straaijer 2011), John Ash (Navest 2011) and Robert Lowth (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011). Mitchell (2001) and Dons (2004) offer a wider perspective on descriptive adequacy in EModE grammars and the ‘grammar wars’ in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Regular conference series (Perspectives on Prescriptivism 2003/2006/2009/2013) and large-scale projects (The Codifiers and the English Language, 2005–10, Leiden University) testify to the growing activity in normative linguistics. The focus has primarily been on the eighteenth century; the nineteenth century remains relatively underexplored, although interest is now
flourishing here too (Bailey 1996; Michael 1997; Görlach 1998; Anderwald 2012a, the Collection of Nineteenth-Century Grammar). One could safely argue, then, that nowadays it is possible to provide a more complete account of the process of standardisation of the English language in the Late Modern English period.

Indeed, the bigger picture of the standardisation of English constitutes the basis for how this book is framed. Following Milroy and Milroy (2012: 19), standardisation is understood as ‘an ideology’, that is, ‘a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent’. Ultimately, they argue, ‘the desideratum is that everyone should use and understand language in the same way with the minimum of misunderstanding and the maximum of efficiency’ (ibid.). There are two main sociolinguistic models that describe the stages of language standardisation. Haugen (1972) puts forward four stages that turn a ‘dialect’ into a ‘standard language’, namely selection of the norm, codification of the norm, elaboration of function, and acceptance by the speech community. This model has the advantage that ‘it is broad as well as detailed enough to function as the frame of reference for the description of highly varied standardization histories’ (Deumert and Vandenbussche 2003a: 4), and it has been adopted, for instance, by Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003b) and Auer (2009). The model I follow in the present study was proposed by Milroy and Milroy (2012 [1985]) and is also the model used in the account of standardisation given by Nevalainen and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2006). Milroy and Milroy propose seven stages, which they view as ‘stages of implementation of the standard rather than as aspects of standardisation itself’ (2012: 23). These stages are not necessarily sequential and do not affect written and spoken language to the same extent or at the same time; in fact it is argued that a standard can never be fully reached, and that we should see a standard ‘as an idea in the mind rather than a reality’ (2012: 19). The stages in this model are (i) selection of a variety, which will become the standard variety; (ii) acceptance of this variety by influential people; (iii) geographical and social diffusion through various channels, such as the educational system; (iv) maintenance, for instance through the printing press; (v) elaboration of function, whereby the selected variety is gradually used in all contexts and for all purposes, thereby acquiring prestige; and (vi) codification and (vii) prescription, so that codifiers establish rules in books and prescribers ‘put the legislation into effect’ (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 37; see Milroy and Milroy 1985: 18–23; Nevalainen and Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006: 274–87).
Bailey (1991: 74) notes that ‘[t]he notion of a “standard of propriety and correctness of speech” is very much an eighteenth-century idea’. The standardisation of English can be traced to the late Middle English period, but it was over the course of the eighteenth century that it gained momentum with the last stages in the model proposed by Milroy and Milroy – codification and prescription. As they put it, the eighteenth century is ‘a century of authoritarianism and prescriptivism’ (2012: 28). Its achievement, they continue, was ‘to establish, through codification, a much more widespread consciousness of a relatively uniform “correct” English than had been possible before’ (2012: 29). Codification is the phase when rules were laid down in grammars, dictionaries and other sorts of self-education handbooks which functioned as, or were seen as, authoritative manuals for their readers (Nevalainen and Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006: 283). These sources were ‘instruments of literacy’ that provided users with the key to social improvement; in other words, prescriptive works met the demands of the ambitious middle class in their quest for ‘politeness’, a key cultural ideal in the eighteenth century (McIntosh 1998). Once the language was codified, the prescription stage involved the implementation of the codified norms in written language. In the Milroys’ model, prescription ‘depends on an ideology (or set of beliefs) concerning language which requires that in language use, as in other matters, things shall be done in the “right” way’ (Milroy and Milroy 2012: 1). It is hard to pin down the precise moment of the shift from codification to prescription, but the two stages seem to have overlapped from around 1745 to the 1770s (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008b: 7–8).

Milroy and Milroy (1985: 11) argue that ‘when we view language as fundamentally a social phenomenon, we cannot then ignore prescription and its consequences’, and Leith (1983: 9) has likewise placed emphasis on the role of standardisation as ‘central’ to the sociolinguistic history and description of language. In recent socio-historical studies, prescriptivism emerges as a key factor in the standardisation of English, first because of the consequences that prescriptive judgements had, and still have, for individuals; and second, because of the social facet of standardisation as ‘a self-help for social climbers’, who tend to slant their language practice to the variety that carries social prestige (Watts 2002: 158). Normative linguistics as the study of linguistic authoritarianism, in the form of prescription, normalisation and standardisation, is thus ‘an important part of linguistics’ (Milroy and Milroy 1985: 11). The potential value to linguistics of investigating historical grammars has come to be recognised in terms of the insights that grammars can offer as supplementary evidence on early English and
'for the light they throw' on matters of present-day grammar, usage and style: ‘attitudes to correctness may both be elucidated by and help to put in proper perspective the findings of modern linguists’ (Sundby 1986: 397–8). Normative grammar has thus established itself as a serious field of study and normative works are now examined in their own right.

The approach to grammar writing has often been presented as a binary opposition: those who describe actual usage versus those who evaluate usage and prescribe recommendations about how language ought to be used; or, as Finegan put it: ‘[d]escriptive aims to characterise actual usage; prescriptive aims to evaluate actual usage and to make recommendations based on any of a number of possible criteria’ (1998: 545). Research in normative linguistics has challenged this binary approach, suggesting that we should rather consider attitudes along a descriptive–prescriptive continuum. Vorlat proposes a threefold distinction:

(1) descriptive registration of language, without value judgements and including ideally – as a very strong claim – all language varieties; (2) normative grammar, still based on language use, but favoring the language of one or more social or regional groups and more than once written with a pedagogical purpose; (3) prescriptive grammar, not based on usage but on a set of logical (and other) criteria. (Vorlat 1979: 129)

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the normative approach prevailed, leaning more or less towards the descriptive. The prescriptive approach was first made explicit in Christopher Cooper’s Grammatica Linguae Anglicana (1685), but at that time prescriptivism ‘is in the making, not yet made’ (Vorlat 1979: 137). The shift from normative to prescriptive grammar becomes apparent towards the mid eighteenth century, when usage was given more attention and the ideal of correctness ‘grew into a mania’: it was the beginning of the heyday of the prescriptive era, which extended well into the nineteenth century (Dekeyser 1975: 23; Vorlat 2007: 512). Furthermore, attitudes towards grammatical correctness and propriety ‘hardened into ideology’ during the Victorian period, in which it was said that ‘everyone ought to consult’ grammars and dictionaries (Bailey 1996: 215, 3). However, the nineteenth century might better be described as ‘a continual alternating between descriptivism and prescriptivism’ (Dekeyser

---

16 See, in particular, Rodríguez-Gil (2002b) and Beal (2004: 90, 122–3). Straaijer argues further that ‘prescriptivism and descriptivism can be seen as independent of each other’ and that ‘they can be represented in a two-dimensional continuum, rather than a unidimensional one’; in other words, when it comes to grammar books, prescriptivism and descriptivism ‘can be seen as independent variables’ (Straaijer 2011: 262, 274).
Prescriptivism came up against the New Philology, which introduced the "a posteriori" methods used by historical grammarians such as Robert Gordon Latham in *The English Language* (1841) and Henry Sweet in *A New English Grammar* (1892–8). The latter half of the nineteenth century, then, witnessed "the transition from old to new, from amateurism to linguistic professionalism" founded on a scientific basis and description (Dekeyser 1975: 24).

A fundamental aim in the study of the normative tradition is to assess the effect of precept on language use. Normative grammars, in particular eighteenth-century grammars, have often been seen as responsible for the stigmatisation of linguistic features or for imposing a specific variant as the "correct" form. Yet, until recently, the question of whether prescriptivism actually changed linguistic trends had not been investigated empirically: "the publication of grammars, dictionaries and prescriptive manuals only indicates the strong interest in the standardisation of the language" (Auer 2009: 5). Given that traditional accounts have often been put forward without any supporting empirical evidence, scholars have embarked on a reassessment of language myths through a close scrutiny of precept corpora and usage corpora. If we wish to understand the mechanisms of language variation and change, "we need not only an empirically based account of usage but also an analysis of ideas which rationalised the prescriptive selecting of variants" (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002: 17). Auer maps Konopka’s (1996) model of precept and practice as follows:  

\[
\text{Language usage 1} \rightarrow \text{Meta-linguistic comments by grammarians (descriptive & prescriptive)} \rightarrow \text{Effectiveness} \rightarrow \text{Language usage 2}
\]

She explains that "a close comparison between language usage 1, language usage 2 and meta-linguistic comments by grammarians should ideally show if prescriptivists had an influence on the development of the selected linguistic feature" (Auer 2009: 8–9). The periodisation of the corpora is crucial: the usage corpora should start before the precept data and should finish after them. This allows observation of whether precept is based on usage, or whether precept brings about change. (The time span of the present study is thus from 1500 to 1900.) We should also bear in mind that to demonstrate influence of prescription on usage there needs to be a time gap of several decades: if there were no temporal gap one could argue that usage led to precept and not vice versa (Auer 2009: 11).

---

17 Konopka’s (1996) model was originally applied to the standardisation of the German language. Auer (2009) follows this model in a comparative analysis of (Austrian) German and English.
The study of precept and practice has shed new light on the role of prescriptive norms in language change and has uncovered new facets of standardisation. Three main trends have been observed in the literature: precept triggering change in usage, precept reinforcing an existing trend in usage, precept having only a marginal influence on usage. The following is a brief survey of several relevant studies here; Appendix 1 complements these accounts with a more complete list of features (see also Yáñez-Bouza forthcoming a).

Large-scale studies have confirmed that some critical precepts of normative grammars have triggered language change, usually a decline in usage and the subsequent disappearance of the form (see Appendix 1–A, code TR). For instance, late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century usage showed morphological levelling in the preterite and participle forms of strong verbs such as *write*, with *wrote* as the most frequent variant in both functions (*write–wrote–wrote*); yet late eighteenth-century grammars criticised the lack of perspicuity in this paradigm and recommended the three form–function pattern modelled on Latin morphology (*write–wrote–written*) (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002). At times the impact of the given precept has only had a temporary effect. The seventeenth-century rule that in the first person *shall* indicates a prediction and *will* indicates a threat or promise was echoed throughout the eighteenth century and was complied with during the nineteenth century; however, this was ‘artificial’ and lasted only ‘until prescription ha[d] run its course and the proscribed feature re-emerge[d]’ (Arnovick 1997: 145; also Facchinetti 2000). The nineteenth century also witnessed a temporary increase in the use of the inflected subjunctive as the ‘polite’ form in response to favourable comments in late eighteenth-century grammar books, as in ‘*If* he *show* any Disposition to write me a penitential Letter, you may encourage it’ (quoted in Auer 2009: 1–2). This feature had been in decline since the seventeenth century and its decline would continue after the nineteenth century ‘blip’, being replaced by periphrastic forms, modal verbs or the indicative mood (Auer 2006: 47).

Scholars have also provided evidence that, rather than triggering stigmatisation, normative works reinforced an ongoing trend; in other words, grammarians took notice of language variation and change and with their prescriptive comments they contributed to the decline of particular variants (Appendix 1–A, code RE). The effect was permanent with regard to features such as double periphrastic comparatives (e.g., *more lovelier*, González-Díaz 2008) and multiple negation (e.g., *I don’t want no milk*, Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008c). In both studies usage had already decreased in the language of educated speakers by the end of the seventeenth century; the severe
criticism attested in eighteenth-century grammar books reinforced the
decline and contributed further to the social downgrading of these as
nonstandard features.

At times, linguistic authority has been proved marginal or ineffective
(Appendix 1–A, code NI). Dekeyser (1975) points out that nineteenth-
century metalinguistic comments on case agreement such as who versus
whom had only a moderate effect: while it is true that the prescribed
forms are more frequent overall, they did not show a notable increase over
time, and some proscribed forms (e.g., I wonder who you are talking to)
have not disappeared from the spoken stratum. In other words, precept
slowed linguistic change but did not succeed in stopping natural trends.
Wild (2010) argues that claims of influence of precept on phrasal verbs
are at best speculative, since despite a downturn in formal texts, their use
has increased from Old English to the present day. Another example is
the progressive passive (e.g., the book is being printed): in spite of vicious
attacks in nineteenth-century grammar books, it replaced the old passival
construction (e.g., the book is printing) and became accepted by the end of
the nineteenth century (Anderwald 2012a).

The effects of prescriptivism on individual authors have been demon-
strated in a number of microlinguistic studies (Appendix 1–B). William
Clift (1775–1849), of humble, provincial origin, dramatically changed his
grammar and spelling practices shortly after moving to London to work as
an amanuensis with the surgeon John Hunter (1728–93). Although there
is no evidence that Clift consulted grammar books, his letters (1792–1801)
show a conscious improvement towards the standard language of the day,
that is, the language of the educated élite of London. Dialect forms and
nonstandard features such as be-plural levelling and multiple negation were
dropped abruptly within two years of his arrival in the capital (Austin 1994).
While Clift was moved by intellectual aspirations, self-edited corrections
in the voyage journals of Captain James Cook (1728–79) came in response
to an increasing awareness that his work would be published: by the third
voyage (1776–9) his language had become ‘much more correct’, to the
extent that most marked variants, both morphological and orthographical,
had decreased or disappeared altogether (Percy 1996).

One of the consequences of the principle of suppression of optional
variability characteristic of the standardisation process is that ‘non-standard
varieties can be observed to permit more variability than standard ones’
(Milroy and Milroy 2012: 6). This can indeed be observed in the effect of
historical grammars (Appendix 1–A, code STE). The present-day standard
form you were replaced you was over the course of the eighteenth century,
but the latter has never disappeared from nonstandard speech (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2002; Laitinen 2009). Morphological levelling of the past tense form of verbs with /a/u alternation (e.g., sing–sang–sung) has resisted prescriptive forces trying to impose a formal distinction and is still attested in some British English dialects today; in fact, it seems to have ‘gained social ground, having become a frequent feature’ of London middle-class teenagers in the 1990s (Anderwald 2011: 103). Comparison between diachronic trends of precept evaluation and real-time language change has also offered new insights into grammarians’ reactions to natural language processes. In a study of verb tense and aspect in nineteenth-century English, Anderwald (2012a) examines precept in relation to four factors: the stage of the change in the S-curve (old/new), speed (slow/rapid), salience (noticeable/unnoticed) and text frequency (rare/frequent). She observes that rapid changes in new features tend to draw strong criticism, as with the progressive passive in the early nineteenth century. On the other hand, new variants which have developed gradually and represent changes which are almost complete are not typically opposed: in the case of variation in the be/have perfect with intransitive verbs, for example, auxiliary have is well accepted in the nineteenth century, while the old form be is considered obsolete and less proper. It has also been observed that slow changes usually go unnoticed in their incipient stages, such as the rise of the progressive, as do rare or infrequent constructions. Salience and text frequency seem to play a crucial role too.

1.2.2 Preposition stranding, normative linguistics and neighbouring disciplines

The present book will contribute to the body of work in the normative tradition with a new case study: preposition placement, with a special focus on preposition stranding. The stigma attached to ending sentences with prepositions stands out in the history of prescriptivism as a ‘once cherished superstition’ (Fowler 1965: 473), one of the don’ts with over three hundred years of prescriptive tradition behind them and one which ‘still raises its head today’ (Beal 2004: 84). And yet no thorough investigation has hitherto been carried out as a means of accounting for this long-existing myth in the history of the English language. My study will assess, or rather reassess, the effect and effectiveness of the normative tradition on the history of P-stranding, with a special focus on – though not limited to – eighteenth-century precept works. By also investigating the periods immediately before and after it, as well as primary sources other than grammar
books, it will be possible to unearth the origin of the stigmatisation of this construction. The underlying questions are as follows:

- To what extent did the eighteenth-century normative tradition have an influence on the actual use of stranded prepositions?
- Did the late eighteenth-century normative tradition trigger change in usage (that is, bring about a shift in usage trends) or did it reinforce an existing trend (that is, reflect language use)?
- How was preposition stranding conceptualised in eighteenth-century precept works, and what kind of attitudes are expressed in these works?
- What are the arguments behind the stigma attached to preposition stranding?

A few previous studies have touched on the topic but none has focused primarily on stranded prepositions; references in general are scarce, and those that we do find are limited to individual authors. For instance, ‘postplaced prepositions’ is one of the grammatical features listed in Leonard’s glossary (1929: 285), where only four critic authors and six advocate authors are listed; as will be shown in Chapter 3, Leonard’s list is neither complete nor accurate (see also Leonard 1929: 98, 154–5, 184–5, 188–90). Sundby et al.’s DENG also deals with stranded prepositions, if only from a negative point of view (1991: 426–8); the data in DENG are not fully accurate either, as will be discussed in Section 3.5. Elsewhere, research on P-stranding has been narrowed to individual authors. Bately (1964) identified Dryden’s explicit criticism of P-stranding, traced the author’s revisions and corrections in the two editions of Of Dramatick Poesie, An Essay (Dryden 1668a, 1684), and offered a thorough investigation of Dryden’s usage in other writings. Simon (1963) also examined Dryden’s revisions of the Essay, but on a smaller scale, whereas Söderlind (1951–8) was concerned with Dryden’s syntax in general rather than with his precept. (The role of Dryden will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.) Tieken-Boon van Ostade has looked into Robert Lowth’s practice of P–stranding and P–piping in his in- and out-correspondence, as one of those grammatical features that came under criticism during the eighteenth century; she paid attention to stylistic differences along the formal/informal continuum and how usage tallies (or not) with the precepts stated in Lowth’s grammar (see 2005: 149–50, 153; 2006a: 545–6, 550–1; 2011: 236–9; further in Section 5.4.2 here). Drawing on the findings reported in my early work (Yáñez-Bouza 2006, 2007), Sairio examined preposition placement in the correspondence of Elizabeth Montagu (1738–78), a leading figure in the Bluestocking circle during the middle and late eighteenth century (2009: 191–213; see Section 6.3 here). For his part, Straaijer (2011: 353–67) built on both my own and Sairio’s
work for the analysis of usage and precept in the correspondence of the grammarian Joseph Priestley (see Section 5.4.2). Note that Tieken-Boon van Ostade’s, Sairo’s and Straaijer’s analyses are restricted to certain types of clause and/or set lists of prepositions. Also drawing on my work (Y´a˜nez-Bouza 2006), Fairman (personal communication, 2007) conducted a pilot study of stranded prepositions in his corpus of English Pauper Letters written by the ‘lower orders’ in the early nineteenth century (1800–34). From a different perspective, that of the verb–preposition combination, Claridge (2000) offered interesting insights on the occurrence of P-stranding in nonliterary prose in the Lampeter Corpus (1640–1740), with a focus on multiword verb combinations.18

My study will improve on earlier work by offering a large-scale analysis of precept-usage corpus data. The eighteenth-century precept material consists of a self-compiled collection of metalinguistic comments on preposition placement, mostly on P-stranding but also on P-piping; the data have been drawn from 285 normative works written between 1700 and 1800. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries will also be examined through a selection of thirty-four representative grammars, including works on Latin. An in-depth analysis of attitudes in the nineteenth century would be beyond the scope of the present study, in that a new era was beginning at this time, one worth investigating in its own right; nonetheless, necessary contextualisation and a number of illustrative examples will be discussed in Section 3.4. It should be noted that the term precept here ‘embrace[s] all the varieties of prescriptive writing’, that is, metalinguistic comments in grammar books and also in treatises of rhetoric, education books, and a miscellany of other works in which explicit comment is made on language usage (see Oldireva Gustafsson 2002: 17). In particular, the field of rhetoric shows itself to be a rich source of such comments, a fact which hitherto seems to have passed unnoticed in the literature. The material pertaining to usage has been collected from two historical corpora which allow time and register continuity: the Early Modern English section of the Helsinki Corpus (1500–1710) and the British part of A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers (1650–1900). Their wide time span will enable us to observe the direction of change: from usage to precept or from precept to usage.

In normative linguistics the discipline of historical sociolinguistics is a leading trend, as it conflates history, linguistics and social sciences (Bergs

---

18 I am aware that Bengtsson (1996) examines prepositional relatives in George Bernard Shaw’s writings around 1900; unfortunately, I have not had access to this work.
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2005: 8), or, as Romaine and Traugott point out, it brings together ‘sociolinguists, historical linguists and historians’ and combines ‘the rich philological tradition with recent work on quantitative methods, discourse analysis, literacy, as well as with historical phonology, syntax, and pragmatics’ (1985: 5, quoted in Fanego 2012: xxvii). Historical sociolinguistics, or sociohistorical linguistics as it was first styled, has its roots in the groundbreaking work published by Suzanne Romaine in 1982, *Socio-Historical Linguistics*, soon followed by works such as Tieken-Boon van Ostade (1987), Milroy (1992), Raumolin-Brunberg (1996), Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003) and Bergs (2005). There are now specialised journals for this discipline (*Historical Sociolinguistics and Socio-Historical Linguistics, 2000–11*), book series (*Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics, John Benjamins; Historical Sociolinguistics. Studies on Language and Society in the Past, Peter Lang*), and an academic network, the *Historical Sociolinguistic Network* (2005–), concerned with English and other languages. The *Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, published in 2012, testifies to the growing activity in this discipline and to how the scope of research has gradually extended to include attitudes to language and standardisation processes (see Conde-Silvestre and Hernández-Campoy 2012a for a recent overview). A broader definition of current historical sociolinguistics, then, might be ‘the reconstruction of the history of a given language in its socio-cultural context’ (Conde-Silvestre and Hernández-Campoy 2012b: 1).

My study also follows the main principles of historical sociolinguistics. First, the historical linguist aims to ‘account for language stability and language change, i.e., continuity and discontinuity in language development, including for instance typology and directionality of change’ (Ryden 1984: 509). Second, social history plays an essential part because ‘it is social historians who can provide historical linguists with data that makes it possible to create the frameworks against which linguistic variation can be analysed’ (Raumolin-Brunberg 1996: 19). And third, for the sociolinguist ‘language use is socially embedded’ and ‘social evaluations like stigmatization can be recovered by sociolinguistic analysis’ (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003: 8). Assuming that social change can give impetus to language change (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1989: 70), one of the goals of this

19 The emphasis of sociohistorical linguistic studies lies in linguistic description, while historical sociolinguistic studies stress the importance of language use and language users to the historical linguist (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003: 2).

20 See, for instance, the wealth of studies carried out by the members of the Research Unit of Variation and Change in Helsinki (www.helsinki.fi/varieng/), including Rissanen et al. (1993, 1997), Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (1996, 2003), Nurmi et al. (2009), and Pahta et al. (2010).
book is to investigate variant usage between P-stranding and P-piping and the social values conveyed in the use of one or the other, that is, stigma versus prestige; it will thus describe socially motivated linguistic change derived from prescriptive forces imposed by the culture and society of eighteenth-century Britain. For reasons of space, given that the focus here is on the normative linguistic approach, this book will not deal with variation and change relating to linguistic factors such as the nature of the preposition, the type of clause or the prepositional phrase, and neither will it examine social factors such as rank, gender or age; all such considerations must be set aside for future work.\footnote{See early work in Yáñez-Bouza (2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2007).}

An associated area which will also receive attention in this monograph is historical register variation. The aim is to establish the relationship between linguistic variation and change according to different types of text, defined by situational rather than linguistic criteria (e.g., Biber \textit{et al.} 1998: 223–39; Biber and Conrad 2009: 143–76; also Rissanen \textit{et al.} 1997). In this respect, the study will contribute to the field of historical stylistics by examining ‘styles’ of particular registers and of individual authors, the assumption being that the ‘flux’ in attitudes towards good and proper English runs alongside the ‘flux’ in attitudes towards good and proper style (Finegan 1992). By a close investigation of P-stranding and P-piping in a variety of speech- and writing-related registers along the oral/literate continuum, light will be shed on how and why the use of these syntactic constructions varies in different situational contexts. Thus, functional (conscious and unconscious) changes determined by the social, historical and cultural background of the era will be under scrutiny (see Section 4.3).
An essential element in historical sociolinguistic studies nowadays is (large) computerised corpora, often compiled specifically to investigate the diverse social contexts of language variation and change. Corpus linguistics is very well suited to the purposes of a (sociohistorical) study such as the present one, in that it makes it relatively easy to gather linguistic evidence, provides a means of handling large amounts of data, allows keeping track of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, and, just as importantly, offers a common basis for comparative studies amongst scholars (see Rissanen et al. 1997: 3; Biber et al. 1998: 3). The emphasis now is on combining quantitative analysis with qualitative analysis: ‘[t]he goal of corpus-based investigations is not simply to report quantitative findings, but to explore the importance of these findings for learning about the patterns of language use’ (Biber et al. 1998: 5). This chapter explains the methodological procedure of my study and describes the primary sources on which it is based. Section 2.1 deals with the precept data sources, and Section 2.2 with the usage corpus.

2.1 Precept data sources

The ‘long’ eighteenth century, from the 1660s to 1800, was a period of complex, interwoven relations between language and social, cultural and economic changes, most notably seen in population growth, the rise of the middle classes, the expanding ‘urban renaissance’ (Borsay 1977), the rapid growth of the book trade, the increasing interest in literacy and improvements in literacy rates, and of course the Industrial Revolution. McIntosh (2008: 228) argues that the rise in language awareness was ‘accelerated by the enormous steps Britain took in this period towards becoming a fully literate print culture’. Historians of books, such as Raven (2009: 89), have noted that print was ‘a decisive conduit for the pursuit of politeness and social advancement fostered by the expanding economy’ and that the commodification of culture was dominated by the book trade. For Feather
The roots of the successful, expanding market for books lay in an educated readership, and for Holmes and Szechi (1993: 188–200), literacy and education were pivotal factors with respect to ‘the power of the pen’. Education itself was becoming a vital marker of social and economic status, ‘a badge of respectability’ not only for the social élite but also for the middling and lower middling orders (Holmes and Szechi 1993: 189). Grammars, along with dictionaries, newspapers and other works on language and style, were key ‘instruments of literacy’ and became a valuable commodity for the socially or economically ambitious (McIntosh 1998: 169). In Watts’ view, grammars were a combination of a commercial and a pedagogical project (2008: 49). There was a genuine interest in education across the social ranks, including women, children and foreigners. Readers created demand for self-help guides and grammars ‘as passports to politeness’ (Percy 2008: 130), especially the rising middle classes, as the correct use of language would be not only a key to upward social mobility but also a means of distancing themselves from their social inferiors; politeness ‘as embodied in a notion of correctness – was a commodity that could be bought’ (Fitzmaurice 2000a: 197–8). By the end of the eighteenth century, politeness was not only a matter of social behaviour, manners and birth, as in the early decades, but also of language – it was ‘polite learning’ (see Klein 1994; Watts 1999).

The production of grammars of English increased dramatically during the second half of the eighteenth century, as Figure 2.1 shows. Publication
Methodology

Table 2.1: Eighteenth-century precept database (1700–1800)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–1800</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates in the early eighteenth century were still modest, following a slow development during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, starting with William Bullokar’s *Bref Grammar for English* in 1586. According to Michael (1970: 151), by the end of the seventeenth century there were only twenty-one ‘explicitly English grammars’. John Wallis’ (1653) *Grammatica Linguæ Anglicane* marked a new era of interest in the vernacular language by pointing out the structural differences between English and Latin, thereby paving the way for a conscious movement of reform ‘which sought to give English a grammar in its own right’ (Michael 1970: 210). The rapid growth during the second half of the eighteenth century yielded over two hundred works, with remarkable peaks in the 1770s and 1790s. This was only a preamble to the ‘hyper-active production’ seen in the nineteenth century, when an average of eight or nine new works were produced each year: approximately 860 new grammars and over 3,600 printings in all, with notable peaks during the 1840s and 1870s–80s (Michael 1987: 8–13; Michael 1997).¹

The design of the precept database used in the present study naturally reflects general diachronic trends. Table 2.1 sets out the distribution of the data per decade in terms of authors (148), works (285) and comments on P-stranding (1,119). It has often been noted in the literature that the 1750s and particularly the 1760s were a turning point in the history of English grammar writing, the latter being described as a ‘busy’ period and ‘a veritable battle for the market’ (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008d: 108; 2008b:

¹ For the sake of consistency, the data in Figure 2.1 are based on Michael’s studies (1970, 1987, 1997). On the eighteenth century, see further Yáñez-Bouza and Rodríguez-Gil (2013).
2). In my precept data, the first five decades of the century are represented by a total of sixty-seven works, whereas in the latter half of the century the number of works increases threefold, to 218 (hence a split of 23.5% vs. 76.5%). The difference in the number of comments on stranded prepositions in the same periods is even more marked: 179 vs. 949 comments (13% vs. 87%). Materials for the present study were drawn largely from the *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* (*ECCO*), a comprehensive digital collection of texts published in England during the eighteenth century. In some cases I also consulted the printed book, and when access to the original work was not possible I took *DENG* (Sundby 1991: 426–8) as the reference.

As noted in the Introduction, the works examined include not only grammar books but also grammars attached to dictionaries and spelling books, letter-writing manuals, several books of exercises, and treatises on rhetoric as well, which turned out to be particularly relevant to this case study. Earlier scholars also noted that ‘we must be cautious about following the evidence of the grammars alone’ (Michael 1970: 197), in that ‘grammar’ and ‘grammar book’ are not the same and by conflating them ‘we lose sight of the innovations and advances grammarians made in the teaching of language and the separation of independent subjects from grammar itself’ (Mitchell 2001: 12). Yáñez-Bouza (forthcoming b) has shown that the growth in the production of works on grammar in the second half of the century is also evident in grammars that appear as paratexts, which suggests that not including a grammar in a normative work in the latter quarter of the century ‘could be seen as a shortcoming by potential customers’, as argued by Tyrkkö (2013: 189) regarding dictionaries. This in turn provides strong evidence for the increasing attention to and importance of correctness in the century. Periodical reviewers quickly became aware of the rising numbers of works, and often commented on this in print (Percy 2008: 125–6).

Most of the works in the precept data were written by male authors (87%, 248 works), with thirteen female authors (31 works) and six

---

2 The contrast between the early and late eighteenth century is also reported in Michael (1970: 277), Sundby *et al.* (1991: 14–15) and Yáñez-Bouza and Rodríguez-Gil (2013: 146–7), amongst others.

3 The list of bibliographic references was drawn from Leonard (1929), Michael (1970), Vorlat (1975), Michael (1987), Sundby *et al.* (1991) and Gorlach (2001). The consultation period was April–May 2005, before upgrades to *ECCO* in 2008. The *Eighteenth-Century English Grammars* database (*ECEG*) provides bibliographic details for most of these works, as well as biographical details for a large number of authors.

4 The majority of sources in the precept database are indeed grammar books, but given the variety of materials I will often use the general terms *authors, grammar writers or codifiers, and works.*
anonymous items (c. 2%). It should be noted that *A Plain, Rational Essay on English Grammar*, published in Boston in 1797, was written by Duncan Mackintosh and his two daughters, and that anonymous grammars could well have been written by women, for the eighteenth century often frowned on publications carrying the name of ‘the female sex’ (see, e.g., Percy 1994 and the recent case study by Navest and Sairio 2013). As often reported in the literature, the majority of writers are associated with the field of education, in particular as schoolmasters and ‘female teacher grammarians’, as Cajka (2008) refers to schoolmistresses. There are a substantial number of clergymen, from bishops to ministers or vicars, some professional authors and also scientists such as Joseph Priestley (1733–1804). In a study of explicit and implicit credentials, Chapman (2008) argues that, indeed, eighteenth-century grammar writers were not ‘language experts’ in our current understanding of the term, but were, rather, self-appointed grammarians, often ‘untrained observers’ and ‘little more than hack compilers or writer-booksellers with a quick appreciation of market potential’ (2008: 22, quoting from Mugglestone 2003: 77 and Raven 1992: 153). Nevertheless, Chapman also argues that ‘for their own day’ some do ‘come out well as experts, or at least as more expert than others’ (2008: 22).

The data sources are not limited geographically. Amongst the known authors, most were born in the British Isles, primarily in England (c. 40 authors); there are over ten writers from Scotland, fewer than five from Ireland and Wales, and around ten more from the American colonies. In line with earlier bibliographic sources, there is one foreign author considered a ‘naturalized’ English speaker, since he lived in England most of his life – Michael Maittaire (1668–1747) (see Sundby et al. 1991: 15). Similarly, by far the most frequent place of publication of the grammars is England, especially London (70%), although the English provinces are not unrepresented (18%). For historical reasons there are fewer sources published in Scotland, Ireland and the American colonies, and none in Wales (Yáñez-Bouza 2012; also Feather 2007).

Reprinting is considered by book historians as ‘key to [the] burgeoning supply of books’ and one of ‘the economic pillars of the British publishing industry’ (Bonnell 2009: 709, 699; also Michael 1997: 24). Michael explains that

---

5 See further in *ECEG* and Yáñez-Bouza and Rodríguez-Gil (2013: 152).

6 Studies of grammar writers have only recently started to thrive. The geographical patterns of the materials in the *ECEG* database are reported in Yáñez-Bouza (2011a).
The number of works published gives only a part of the picture. Equally important are the number of impressions and the number of copies sold. When the content of the books is being considered the number of editions and the changes made in them are critical for any account of developments in teaching. (Michael 1993: 7)

Thus the material in my precept data is not restricted to first editions (see Figure 2.2). If available, I have consulted various printings of the same work, on the assumption that different printings are likely to show modifications in the discussion of the same topic (Sundby et al. 1991: 14; some illustrative cases are discussed in Section 5.4.2). Changes are likely to occur either because a new audience is addressed, because some influential work has been published in the meantime, because of competition in the market, because of a change in the status of the author, or simply because the form of the book has been rearranged, such as acquiring new or replaced sections, shortening or enlargement. With this in mind, I have also looked at different works written by the same authors. Naturally, then, the precept database contains more works than authors (see Table 2.1).

Also, an author may have made more than one comment about P-stranding in his/her work, whether in the same passage or elsewhere in the same work. Previous studies have assessed the influence of prescriptivism by considering only the number of grammars. In my view, the nature and number of comments must be taken into account too: it is not the

---

7 Following Michael (1997: 25), the term printing is used here to refer to both new editions and reprintings. Unless some relevant modification has been noted, in this study I will be referring mainly to first editions.
same to describe P-stranding in one sentence as to elaborate further in two sentences or in two separate sections. Thus the analysis in this study will also quantify individual comments, which will shed light on the extent to which the construction was discussed, and hence the importance attributed to it. As indicated in Table 2.1, there are over 1,100 tokens in total.

A distinction is often drawn between prescriptive rules, which recommend usage considered acceptable (the *dos*) and proscriptive rules, which recommend usage to be avoided (the *don’ts*) (Crystal 1995: 366). Earlier work has often taken a negative approach by focusing on the criticism of linguistic features – the ‘Thou Shalt Not’ tradition (Crystal 1995: 194; also Sundby et al. 1991).  

With a view to unearthing what had actually been said about end-placed prepositions at the time, not only in criticism but elsewhere, in this study each work was examined for all comments on end-placed prepositions, taking into account passages which censured P-stranding and those which advocated its use, as well as when the construction was simply mentioned without any evaluative judgement. Comments were then classified according to the mutually exclusive values critic, advocate and neutral. The counting is sequential, with each comment defined as either critic, advocate or neutral. A given work is counted once under a particular heading if it contains one or more comments of that value, and in this way may figure in several categories if it contains different types of comment; if a given work figures in none of the three categories – i.e., it has no relevant comments at all – it is counted under the heading *none*. Finally, a given author is are counted just once under one of the categories critic, advocate or neutral if he or she has written at least one work with at least one comment of that type, and once under *none* if he or she has written at least one work with no relevant comment of any kind. Thus the percentages representing attitudes of authors and works in the figures and tables presented in this study do not together amount to 100 per cent, but rather indicate the relative distribution of the overall total. It follows that there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between works and attitudes: often the same author allows end-placed prepositions under certain circumstances (e.g., in poetry) but criticises their use in other contexts (e.g., in the solemn style). In such cases, the work is classified as both advocate and critic. At first sight, the category *none* may seem irrelevant and one could be tempted to discard these data from the analysis, but an absence of comments at a certain point in time might tell us as much

---

8 See, for instance, the discussion of the ‘complaint tradition’ in Milroy and Milroy (2012: 24–46) and Crowley (2012).
about the issue as those works in which the form was actually discussed (see Section 3.1). As the final methodological step, in order to examine the various ways in which end-placed prepositions were conceptualised in the normative tradition, every comment was coded for semantic nuances, using a labelling system of critic, advocate and neutral values partly inspired in Sundby et al. (1991: 44–53): it is not, then, the same to brand P-stranding as bad as to say it is inelegant, vulgar, or imprecise (see Section 3.2).

2.2 Usage corpus

2.2.1 Corpora

The usage data have been drawn from two major diachronic corpora of English: the Helsinki Corpus (HC) and A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers (ARCHER). Developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s, these corpora were designed as tools for the analysis of language change and variation in a range of written and speech-based registers, and have been widely used in historical linguistics for morphological, syntactic, lexical and stylistic research. Because of their time span and their multigenre design, they together provide continuity over time and, to a great extent, register continuity. From HC I have selected the Early Modern English section (1500–1710) and from ARCHER, version 3.1, the Early and Late Modern English centuries (1650–1900). The focus is on British English. HC offers three seventy-year subperiods (1500–1570, 1570–1640, 1640–1710), each of which is represented by two samples per register, except in law, which consists of individual legal statutes, and private letters, which include a large number of correspondents. ARCHER is divided into five fifty-year subperiods (1650–99, 1700–49, 1750–99, 1800–49, 1850–99), each of which is represented by an average of ten samples per register, letters being an exception. The earliest subperiod of ARCHER (1650–99) falls wholly within the last subperiod of HC (1640–1710). Rather than disposing of the data from one corpus, I have combined them in a single subperiod (1640–1700) on the grounds that there are no duplicate samples, only three samples

---

9 A different approach is usually taken in the study of dictionaries, where the omission of a word may be seen as ‘also exercis[ing] a restrictive function’ (Card et al. 1984: 38; see also Wild 2010).

10 For a description of HC, see, in particular, Rissanen et al. (1993) and Kytö (1996), and see Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (1989) for the EModE part. On ARCHER, see Biber et al. (1994) and Yáñez-Bouza (2011b). Both corpora are described in CoRD (www.helsinki.fi/varieng/CoRD/).

11 The subperiod division in ARCHER ends in 1899; for convenience it has been rounded here to 1900.
from the HC are dated within the time span 1700–10, and the frequency differences across the two corpora are statistically not significant. 

HC and ARCHER contain a variety of registers, some of which coincide. The selection of texts in this study aims to facilitate the analysis of register variation over time and to have a representative corpus of speech- and writing-related texts and of informal and formal registers. Thus the usage corpus consists of comedies, diaries, private letters, sermons, science – with some medical texts – and legal statutes from HC; and from ARCHER we have drama, diaries/journals, personal letters, sermons, science and medicine. Two methodological decisions were made about the diachronic analysis of registers (Section 4.3). First, for the sake of simplicity, the comedies in HC and drama in ARCHER, the latter including both tragedy and comedy, will often be referred to as plays. Second, in ARCHER, scientific and medical texts have been compiled as separate registers, whereas in HC, there is a single register science, which includes texts classified as science-other and those classified as science-medicine. The science data in HC have then been split so that science-other can be compared with science in ARCHER, and science-medicine can be compared with medicine in ARCHER. Also, the register diaries/journals in ARCHER has been divided into diaries and journals, so that the former can be compared diachronically with the diaries of HC. Diaries and journals are usually seen as related registers, but Yáñez-Bouza (forthcoming c) shows that, as far as ARCHER is concerned, differences in the topic and purpose of the text, participants involved, setting and production circumstances account for a distinction between the two sets of data. The reclassification is based on the topic and communicative purpose of the text of the sample: diaries tend to reflect on private matters, domestic affairs, everyday activities and routines, whereas journals narrate or report on a journey or a task associated with

12 The terms genre, register and text type have been widely used in text linguistics, stylistics, sociohistorical linguistics and corpus linguistics, although the exact conceptualisation of what these terms convey varies depending on the theoretical approach. Here I follow Biber’s approach to register variation, where registers are defined ‘on the basis of situational characteristics’ and text types are defined ‘on the basis of [strictly] linguistic criteria’ (Biber 1995: 17). More recently, according to Biber and Conrad (2009: x), the distinction between register and genre (and style) has come to be seen as a matter of perspective. Here I will use the term register: The register perspective combines an analysis of linguistic characteristics that are common in a text variety with analysis of the situation of use of the variety. The underlying assumption of the register perspective is that core linguistic features like pronouns and verbs are functional, and, as a result, particular features are commonly used in association with the communicative purposes and situational context of texts. The genre perspective . . . its linguistic analysis contrasts with the register perspective by focusing on the conventional structures used to construct a complete text within the variety, for example, the conventional way in which a letter begins and ends. (Biber and Conrad 2009: 2)
Table 2.2: Registers according to medium and setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech-related</td>
<td>speech-like</td>
<td>letters-private</td>
<td>letters-official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speech-purposed</td>
<td>plays</td>
<td>sermons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing-related</td>
<td></td>
<td>journals</td>
<td>science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legal texts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

travel, including sea travel and war campaigns. Appendix 2 provides details of the design and size of the usage corpora, including the reclassification of the original sources. In total, there are approximately 800,000 words and 460 texts. Quoted illustrative examples will be identified here by the filename as in the original corpus: name code in upper case letters plus year in HC, as in CEPLAY3A 1697, and lower case code in the form of year+name+extension in ARCHER, as in 1874lass.s6b.

The level of formality is generally considered a determining factor in the use of P-stranding and P-piping: P-stranding is often associated with informal and P-piping with formal language. Likewise, P-stranding is often associated with spoken and P-piping with written language. Given that there is no one-to-one correspondence between speech-related modes and informality, or between writing-based modes and formality, the usage corpora will be examined from the two perspectives, here understood as points on a continuum rather than as a binary distinction. The consideration of both parameters in the study of P-stranding has also been shown to be crucial elsewhere (Hoffmann 2011: 83–4). As set out in Table 2.2, there are (a) writing- and speech-related registers, in terms of medium; and (b) formal and informal registers, in terms of setting. With regard to the former parameter, the materials in the usage corpora can be classified into three categories following the illustration of interrelations between writing- and speech-related genres in Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 16–18): (i) writing-related registers, represented by science, medicine, legal texts and journals; (ii) speech-purposed registers, such as plays and sermons; and (iii) speech-like registers, such as diaries, private and official letters. The difference between (ii) and (iii) lies in the fact that speech-purposed texts are designed ‘to be articulated orally’, whether ‘read out’ or ‘performed’, whereas speech-like texts are understood as ‘scalar and consisting of
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features of “communicative immediacy” (Culpepper and Kytö 2010: 17). Regarding the formal–informal continuum, at the formal end are official letters and sermons as speech-related registers, and science, medicine and legal texts as writing-related registers. At the informal end are three speech-related registers: private letters, diaries and plays. Journals, meanwhile, stand between the two poles on the continuum in this respect.

In this study all instances of P-stranding and P-piping were coded for a total of seventeen parameters. These include bibliographic information, linguistic and extralinguistic factors, and sociolinguistic data where available. The analysis of extralinguistic factors will only be concerned with register variation (Section 4.3); the study of parameters such as social rank, gender and age goes beyond the scope of this study. Syntactic variation will be examined according to preposition placement, stranded and pied-piped prepositions; a multivariate analysis of other linguistic factors also goes beyond the scope of the present work, since the focus here is on diachronic change in relation to the prescriptive moment, rather than internal forces of language change. The role of the preposition, the syntactic function of the prepositional phrase (PP) and the type of clause will be examined in future work with a view to complementing the sophisticated study of present-day data by Hoffmann (2011). In the present study, the PP-function and the clause type will be taken into account for the analysis of paradigmatic variation in Chapter 4, as explained below. Prepositions were not considered for this purpose, following Hoffmann, who argues that the strandability of prepositions is largely dependent on the function of the PP in which they appear; certain prepositions tend to occur in functions which are bound to either stranding or piping, and it is the PP-function that ultimately favours or inhibits stranding (Hoffmann 2011: 73, see below). It should also be noted that I do not follow any specific theoretical framework in trying to explain why P-stranding is used in certain linguistic contexts regarding movement, transformation, deletion or construction relations; my approach is fundamentally surface-based.

The search for P-stranding and P-piping was carried out manually, that is, by reading the texts in the usage corpora, rather than through the use of concordance programs and automatic searches. In my view

---

13 Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 17) propose a third type of speech-related registers, namely ‘speech-based’ registers, to refer to texts ‘that are based on an actual “real life” speech event’, such as trial proceedings. I am grateful to Paula Rodríguez-Puente for drawing my attention to Culpeper and Kytö’s work.

14 Official letters are not mentioned in Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 17–18). The classification as a register representative of formal, speech-related language has been endorsed by Merja Kytö (personal communication, May 2013).
the essence of a historical study such as this is to examine P-stranding in any context in which it may occur, without presupposing that the syntactic arrangements that we find in PDE mirror exactly the language of the past; thus, I refrained from working on a fixed list of clauses or of prepositions. Other scholars have narrowed the scope of their studies to a fixed set because P-stranding was just one of a number of features in their investigations. For instance, Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg selected eight prepositions which ‘did not undergo major semantic or pragmatic changes in Early Modern English’, namely *about, after, by, on, to, unto, upon, with* (2003: 75). Modelled on this study, Tieken-Boon van Ostade looked at the same eight prepositions in Robert Lowth’s correspondence, but observed that the number of stranded prepositions in the grammarian’s letters ‘can be augmented by many instances’ if other prepositions are considered (2005: 150; also 2011: 236). Sairio (2009: 198) examined ‘eleven high-frequency’ prepositions: *at, by, for, from, in, into, of, on, to, upon, with*. In this monograph all prepositions have been considered.

The corpus search yielded fifty-two different prepositions in stranded and/or pied-piped position. Nine of these are often described in the literature as short and common prepositions, here listed in (10); these are attested in both constructions. This list includes an isolated instance of *fro* for *from* in a sixteenth-century diary in (13) (see Mustanoja 1960: I.385–6) and four pairs of prepositions which bear many similarities in use and meaning: *in/into, on/upon, to/unto, with/withal* (see *OED* s.v. *into, upon, unto, withal*; Jespersen 1909–49: III.§§13.5.1–4, VII.§2.3.5; Mustanoja 1960: I.352, I.415–18, see (14)). It should be noted that *withal* and *unto* fell into disuse during the Modern English period and are nowadays regarded obsolete, archaic or biblical, a fact which, with regard to *withal*, did not escape grammarians’ attention in the eighteenth century (see Section 3.2.2.2). Amongst the remaining prepositions, some are attested in both stranded and pied-piped position (11), but some have only been found with P-piping or with P-stranding (12).

(10) at, by, for, fro, from, in, into, of, on, upon, to, unto, with, withal

(11) about, after, against, among(st), behind, out of, over, through, under

(12) above, according to, amid, before, below, beneath, between/betwixt, beyond, by means of, close to, concerning, during, in accordance with, in consequence of, in contact with, in order to, in reference to, in viewing of, instead of, near/nigh,
notwithstanding,\textsuperscript{15} opposite to, since, toward(s), up, within, without; like, in search of

(13) and so they wher condemnyd to be had to the place that thay cam fro, and from thens to be drane through London onto Tyburne. (CEDIAR\textsc{t}A 1553–9)

(14) a. which I found to be yet more considerable in an Emrald of my own, whose colour was so excellent, that by skilful persons twas look\’d on as a rarity. (CESCIE\textsc{3}B 1675–6)

b. For the main reason why it was looked upon as impossible was, because it was contrary to the course of nature that there should be any return from a perfect privation to a habit. (16xxtill.h2b [1650–99])

These general observations seem to support the claim that certain prepositions are more prone to stranding than others. For instance, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 12.§7.3, (g)) note that ‘instrumental with strands easily, whereas until is fairly resistant to stranding, and with despite it is excluded’. In my data, prepositions such as of, for and on strand frequently, and withal and like only occur with P-stranding, but at, by and from are less frequently attested in P-stranding position, and from the list in (11) some prepositions were only attested as stranded once. Attention in the literature has often been given to those prepositions that seem to trigger P-piping. Jespersen (1909–49: III.§10.4.1) noted this in his historical grammar, remarking that it is ‘particularly true of those prepositions which are still felt as formed from other parts of speech’, such as according to, concerning, notwithstanding. Complex prepositions have also been discussed in this respect: in accordance with, in consequence of, in reference to, etc.\textsuperscript{16} Hoffmann (2011: 72–3), on the basis of earlier work, associates certain prepositions with semantic fields: temporal (e.g., during), location (e.g., beyond, under, underneath), means (by means of), contingency (because of, due to, owing to, in spite of). We might thus argue that certain prepositions have ‘idiosyncratic lexical effects’ (2011: 72). Biber \textit{et al.}, to give another example, observe that ‘the potential for stranding broadly correlates with the distinction between free and bound prepositions’, so that bound prepositions are strongly associated with P-stranding, whereas free or complex prepositions do not ‘normally’ appear in close relation with a verb, and hence they are less likely to be

\textsuperscript{15} On the status of notwithstanding, see in particular Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 7.§4.2).

stranded (1999: §§2.7.5.4, §§2.4.5.1–2). I concur with Hoffmann (2011: 73) that a ‘leading’ factor triggering P-piping is the prototypical function of the PP which the preposition heads. Prepositions such as near, beyond, between, and above and especially complex prepositions typically introduce sentence adjuncts, and sentence adjuncts usually co-occur with P-piping (15). The type of clause also plays a role: in some cases the ‘unexpected’ instances of P-stranding are attested in clause types that make P-stranding obligatory, as has been documented in my data for behind, in search of, out of and over. Since corpus evidence confirms that P-stranding is possible with these types of preposition, as in (16), we should view strandability as a continuum with more or less ‘strandable’ prepositions.

(15) who divided the Diameter into 300. partes and the Semidiameter into 150. and every of those parts into 6’o. and so forth as before, according to which computation they made their Tables:  
(CESCIE2B 1597)

(16) By your master – Have you never a back stair-case, never an old screen to stand behind?  
(1776fran.d4b)

As a final methodological note in this section, two potential ‘problems’ in historical linguistics need to be mentioned. First, the ‘bad-data’ problem, that is, the fact that we are dealing with the written material which has survived, and that at times is isolated from its social and communicative background, means that ‘making the best use of bad data’ is sometimes all that historical (socio)linguists can do (Labov 1994: 11; Nevalainen 1999). The second problem is ‘negative data’, also referred to by Rissanen (1989: 17) as a ‘God’s truth fallacy’: the lack of data does not necessarily imply that a form did not exist, or that it was ungrammatical; it may well be an accidental gap in the selected corpora. We can briefly identify some scenarios relevant to the present study. First, there are some prepositions which in the current corpora appear in P-piping position only, yet elsewhere have also been documented in P-stranding position, such as without in ‘bookcases filled with books that no gentleman’s library should be without’ (Jespersen 1909–49: III.§8.5.4). Second, some prepositions have not been documented in the selected corpora, but their use in stranded and pied-piped constructions was grammatical at the time, for instance as in John Evelyn’s Memoirs from the early eighteenth century: ‘has necessitated me to cancel all my former wills and to make a new one, and by a new settlement...at last so to settle it as, by his approbation’ (1704, letters and memoirs, Century of Prose Corpus B). And third, there is one particular type of clause which is
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not found in my corpus and which is barely mentioned in the literature, namely but-relative clauses, as in ‘By jingo, there’s not a pond within five miles of the place but they can tell the taste of’, by Oliver Goldsmith (1773) (quoted in Jespersen 1909–49: III.§9.7.2; see OED s.v. but adv. B.12.b).

2.2.2 Analysis of linguistic variation

From a variationist perspective, preposition placement is viewed as the dependent variable, where the choice of variants – P-stranding or P-piping in this study – can be influenced by several factors, understood as independent variables. These factors can be categorical, resulting in the obligatory use of a particular variant, or noncategorical, which may favour or inhibit the user’s choice. Since categorical factors delimit the range of variation, the instances of P-stranding and P-piping have been tagged for (a) the type of phrase in which the PP is embedded/contained, (b) the PP-function, and (c) the clause type; in PDE these are amongst the most significant factors influencing preposition placement (Hoffmann 2011).

In terms of clause, the scope has been narrowed to four types: wh-relatives, independent wh-interrogatives, subordinate wh-interrogatives, and exclamatives (see 7a–8a, 7f–8f, 7g–8g, 7h–8h in Section 1.1). Topicalised constructions (7l–8l) have been excluded because the fronting of the PP involves issues related to thematic structure, semantics and pragmatics, and ‘there do not appear to be functional factors that favour’ either P-stranding or P-piping (Hoffmann 2011: 55). The fronting of a prepositional complement is indeed of interest to this study, as it results in a stranded preposition, for example ‘me...of’ in (17)a, and, accordingly, this type of clause will be taken into account for the analysis of overall trends. Jespersen (1909–49: III.§13.9.5) in fact notes that ‘it is not infrequent for a speaker or writer to place a particle (prep.) at the end which “governs” a word placed first for emphasis’. Other than emphasis, Jespersen also suggests that ‘pretty often’ when writers/speakers began the sentence they ‘probably had not yet made up [their] mind what construction to use’, and hence ended up stranding a preposition, as in the remarkably long sequence quoted in (17)b. On the other hand, in some cases the

17 Other factors mentioned in the literature concerning wh-relative clauses include the type of relativiser (wh-pronouns, that, zero), the antecedent (human/nonhuman), the type of relative clause (restrictive/nonrestrictive), the nature of the preposition, the level of formality of the context, register category, and processing complexity (‘the distance between landing and extraction site’, Trotta 2000: 187). See Hoffmann (2011: 35–112) for an exhaustive analysis of potential influential factors.
emphasis is placed on the entire PP and not only on the prepositional complement, so that topicalisation involves the fronting of the preposition too, as illustrated in (17)c. The analysis of the latter instances with thematic PP-fronting goes beyond the scope of my investigation, as in most cases the fronted PP occurs in an unmarked sequence, such as (17)d. I believe that should topicalised PPs be included in the overall counts for my data, findings on other variables would be distorted.

(17)  

a. she hears at the other end of the town how bad our office is spoken of by the King and Prince and Duke of Albemarle; and that there is not a good word said of any of us but of me, and me they do all speak mightily of – (CEDIAR3A 1666–7)  

b. Curse on my stars, and curst be all, but love! That dear, that charming sin, though ’t have pulled Innumerable mischiefs on my head, I have not, nor I cannot find repentance for. No, let me die despised, upbraided, poor: (1686behn.d2b)  

c. Blessed be the Lord for the continuance of my health. & of all his mercies, hitherto hast thou brought me, To Thee alone be the acknowledgements from my Soule & all that is within me, which thou has[t] preserved. (CEDIAR3B 1688–90)  

d. is made a marvelous net or caule, in the which caule is inclosed the Brayne, and in that place is layde the spirite of feeling; from that place hath the spirite of feeling his first creation, and from thence passeth to other members, &c. (CESCIE1A 1548)  

The prepositional phrases considered for the analysis of syntactic variation are all VP-embedded PPs, and include instances of (a) obligatory complements in idiomatic constructions (e.g., get rid of), prepositional verbs (e.g., rely on), and phrasal-prepositional verbs (e.g., put up with); and (b) optional complements which add thematic information and have a semantic relation to the verb, although the preposition may not be licensed (e.g., talk of/about, settle within). Sentence adjuncts have been excluded on the grounds that P-stranding is almost categorically avoided in these contexts. In the following paragraphs the syntactic classification of PPs will be explained in more detail.

Following Hoffmann (2005, 2011),18 I have deviated from the traditional dichotomy of complement-PPs versus adjunct-PPs, which contends that

---

18 I wish to express my gratitude to Thomas Hoffmann for his generous advice at an early stage of my investigation, and for providing me with a copy of his monograph during the preparation of the present book. In Yáñez-Bouza (2007) I followed Hoffmann (2005, 2006); in this monograph I quote mainly from Hoffmann (2011).
P-stranding is only possible with complements while adjunct-PPs yield categorical P-piping (e.g., Hornstein and Weinberg 1981). While there is a certain correlation between these variants and the function of the PP, the distribution is by no means categorical: some complement-PPs occur with P-piping and, conversely, some adjunct-PPs strand easily (see Johansson and Geisler 1998; Trotta 2000; Hoffmann 2011: 65–72). We should see this as a ‘scalar rather than simply binary’ distinction (Trotta 2000: 59, quoted in Hoffmann 2011: 66). A more fine-grained categorisation of PPs, then, is necessary to capture different degrees of strandability. I have thus classified the data according to the type of phrase in which the PP is embedded, a factor often overlooked in the literature. Each token has been tagged for two parameters:

- The type of ‘XP-embedded’: whether the PP is embedded in a verb phrase (VP-embedded), noun phrase (NP-embedded), or adjective phrase (AP-embedded).
- The type of ‘X–PP relationship’ in terms of dependency: to what extent the PP is required by, or dependent on, the X-head word to which the PP relates, and to what extent the PP is required to be explicitly expressed; thus, obligatory or optional.

The classification is based on four main syntactic–semantic criteria:

- **Obligatoriness.** A PP is obligatory, that is, it cannot be omitted without loss of grammaticality (e.g., ‘It consists of six chapters’ vs. ‘It consists’), and/or without unsystematic change of meaning (e.g., ‘She laughed at me’ vs. ‘She laughed’). Obligatory PPs are identified as complements (e.g., Hoffmann 2011: 66).
- **Licensing/Subcategorisation (I).** A PP is licensed when it is syntactically determined by another element in the clause (e.g., verb, adjective), that is, it allows the type of complementation in the form of a PP (e.g., ‘It depends on the weather’ vs. ‘It depends the weather’). Some verbs allow more than one pattern of complementation, as in ‘He lived in France’ (PP) and ‘He lived a happy life’ (transitive).
- **Licensing/Subcategorisation (II).** A preposition is licensed if it is selected by the word on which it is dependent so that a change of preposition would result in ungrammaticality (e.g., ‘It consists of six chapters’ vs. ‘It consists with six chapters’), or would result in a change of meaning (e.g., ‘I am looking at my father’s cat’ vs. ‘I am looking for my father’s cat’). The prototypical case of licensed (or specified) prepositions involves prepositional verbs and phrasal-prepositional verbs. The verb and the PP form a single semantic unit whose meaning cannot be derived
Usage corpus

---

**obligatory PPs in VPs**

- subcategorised P
  - rely on, account for

- subcategorised PP
  - put sth. in/on
    - be near the house
  - live near my parents

- multi-word expressions
  - look up to, get rid of,
    - cast doubt on

---

**Figure 2.3** VP-embedded PPs: obligatory.

---

**optional PPs in VPs**

- complement
  - talk to, dream of

- mixed
  - location
    - sit on a chair
  - run to school

- accompanying
  - settle with a partner

- means, agent
  - kill with a knife
    - killed by the police

- sentence adjuncts
  - location
    - eat at a restaurant
  - temporal
    - drink for 2 hours
  - manner
    - the way in which
  - respect
    - the sense in which
  - degree
    - the extent to which
  - contingency
    - blame for,
      - because of which, etc.

---

**Figure 2.4** VP-embedded PPs: optional.

---

completely from the individual parts and which can often be replaced by a transitive verb, as in look at ~ observe, look for ~ search, put up with ~ stand. Note that a licensed preposition is not necessarily overt (e.g., ‘reply (to my question)’); likewise, a nonlicensed preposition cannot always be optionally left out (e.g., ‘to stay at home/stay in the car’).

- Argumenthood/thematic role. A complement-PP is an argument if it is specified in the lexical entry of the word on which it depends, it represents an entity involved in the semantic predicate, and it completes its thematic meaning with an assigned role (e.g., ‘She put my money in her box’ <location>.

The trees in Figures 2.3–2.6 illustrate the types of X–PP relationship in this study (adapted from Hoffmann 2005: 265–6, 2011: 116).

---

19 The subtle differences between ‘licensing’ and ‘obligatoriness’ are discussed in Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 4.§1.2(b)); for instance, licensing is ‘a matter of allowing a certain pattern of complementation’ whereas obligatoriness is about ‘the verb requiring it’ (emphasis in original).
2.2.2.1 VP-embedded PPs

Obligatory Multiword Expressions. The PP is part of an idiomatic expression made up of at least three components whose meaning has been fossilised (i.e., lexicalised); the preposition is licensed. There are various patterns depending on the intervening word class: a particle, which makes up phrasal-prepositional verbs (put up with, look forward to); a verb (get rid of, lay hold of); an adjective (make light of, make merry with); a noun or noun phrase (cast doubt on, make a fuss of). Although the degree of syntactic obligatoriness in the last subgroup is sometimes looser, and some of these combinations allow modification of the noun (pay little attention to, make good use of), the primary criterion is semantic: ‘somehow verb and noun, plus perhaps a preposition, coalesce with each other to form a unit’ (Claridge 2000: 71). If the PP is omitted it is implicit in the meaning of the expression (e.g., ‘He didn’t take notice’ ~ ‘He didn’t take notice of my presence in the room’), and the majority of combinations are highly fossilised in the lexicon so that they would not admit any alteration in their form/structure (make a fuss of vs. *make fuss of). Indeed, it is because of to their closely tied semantic–syntactic relationship that idiomatic expressions

---

20 These combinations have also been treated as lexicalised semantic units in Jespersen (1909–49: III.§§10.2.2–5), Ross (1986: 135), Quirk et al. (1985: §§16.7–8), and Claridge (2000: 70–6, 163–4).

(18) a. Such is the grasping tendency of the human heart, that it must have a something to lay hold of. (\(18xxchal.h5b\ [1800–49]\))

b. in spite of reason telling one that this is better than pain, the imagination not the less shrinks from it in association with a friend whom one once looked up to with reverence. (\(1873elio.x6b\))

c. Their neglected children and friends will witness that either Christ, or their children’s souls, or both, were made light of. (\(16xxbaxt.h2b\ [1650–99]\))

Obligatory Subcategorised Preposition. The PP is an obligatory complement required by the verb and adds thematic information, the PP-form is required by the verb, and the preposition is licensed by the verb, too. Thus the PP is syntactically and semantically associated with the verb, and this close connection results in natural and frequent P-stranding. Prepositional verbs are the prototypical category of this function, as with rely on, account for, belong to.

(19) I then instantly returned to the company I belonged to, which was posted at the head of the column ready to proceed. (\(1812simm.j5b\))

Obligatory Subcategorised Prepositional Phrase. The PP is an obligatory complement required by the verb, it adds thematic information, the PP-form is not required but is one of its realisations, and the preposition is not licensed by the verb. Two subgroups can be distinguished, depending on the main verb class. On the one hand, there are constructions with copula be and other copular verbs such as turn into and seem; the principle of end-weight may play a role in their strong tendency to co-occur with P-stranding, as they are perceived to be ‘unfitted to bear end-position’

\(^{22}\) The strandability of idiomatic expressions is controversial in the literature. Whereas Quirk et al. (1985: §§16.7–9) cast some doubt on the acceptability of prepositional passives with some combinations (e.g., ‘Has inflation been made allowance for?’), Johansson and Geisler (1998: 68, 75) argue that multiword expressions obligatorily strand prepositions. For his part, Ross (1986: 134–7) concludes that ‘for some reason which I do not understand, there are [verbs] of exactly the same syntactic type for which [P-stranding is] permissible’. Examples are cited in Ross (1986) and Hoffmann (2005: 28), and some have also been found in my data.
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(Poutsma 1914–29: I.i.chVIII.§87c; Johansson and Geisler 1998: 77; Hoffmann 2011: 74–5). On the other hand, there are non-copular verbs: intransitive verbs such as live, come, go, and transitive verbs such as put, place.

(20) a. crying peere-out, peere-out, that any madnesse I euer yet beheld, seem’d but tamenesse, ciuility, and patience to this his distemper he is in now: (CEPLAY2A 1623 [1597])

b. and at last it gradually becomes of a deep sea-green colour, instead of the purple or violet it would otherwise have turned into. (1735monr.m3b)

c. having added to some bottles of water, as much Sal Martis as had been found to make it of the same taste... I corked some carefully up, others I put bad corks into, and a third sort I left open. (1735monr.m3b)

Complement-like Prepositional Phrases. The PP is an optional complement; if it occurs it adds thematic information and has a semantic role assigned by the verb. The preposition is licensed by the verb too, and in some cases there is a certain degree of fluctuation between prepositions that carry similar meanings, e.g., talk about/of, dream about/of.

(21) (Y. Fash.) Your Servant, Madam, I’m glad to find you alone, for I have something of Importance to speak to you about.

(Miss.) Sir, (my Lord, I meant) you may speak to me about what you please, I shall give you a Civil Answer. (CEPLAY3A 1697)

Mixed Adjuncts; Optional Predication Adjuncts. The PP is optional but still holds a semantic relationship with the predicate and adds thematic information to the event. The preposition is not licensed by the verb, but plays a crucial part in that it assigns ‘specifiable semantic roles’ to its prepositional complement (Hoffmann 2011: 65). We can consider here several semantic groups: locative, which can indicate direction, goal, source, position, or affected location; accompaniment; and means, including instrument PPs and by-agent PPs, such as ‘killed by the police’. This ‘mixed’ function epitomises the scalar nature of the continuum between adjuncts and complements: although there is a tendency for PPs in these contexts to behave as adjuncts and appear in P-piping position, the possibility of P-stranding is not categorically discounted.
(22) a. The veriest wretch the sun e’er shone upon! When you shall learn – pray pardon me – proceed.  
(1819phil.d5b)
b. [Mr Henley] gave me leave to tell them so, adding that he would confirm it to them, himself: Lord Talbot, I was to settle with, when I saw him in Dorsetshire,  
(1749dodi.j3b)
c. though I am apt to think, that if I had had a sufficient quantity of leaf-silver to have made the experiment with, I should after some time have produced an Incalescence,  
(1675br–.s2b)

Sentence Adjuncts. The PP is an optional expression which generally does not add thematic information, but it keeps the meaning of the verb constant and independent; that is, it modifies the entire event and not only the predicate. The preposition is not licensed by the verb, and hence the semantic role of the prepositional complement in these PPs is ‘exclusively determined by the preposition’ (Hoffmann 2011: 70). The following semantic subgroups can be distinguished: locative; temporal, which can indicate position in time (e.g., ‘He died at 5 pm’) or frequency/duration (e.g., ‘He kept drinking during the entire evening’); manner; respect/domain, which identifies ‘a relevant point of reference in respect of which the clause concerned derives its truth value’ (Quirk et al. 1985: §8.6); degree; and contingency, which includes adjuncts of reason, result, purpose and concession.

(23) a. They have a Catalogue, not, as others, ordine alpha-betico, but according to the order they were gifted in.  
(1667laud.j2b)
b. The Duke, in a speech acknowledging a vote of thanks, claimed at least one qualification for the position, namely, that he was an inveterate smoker; in which respect two, at any rate, of the Prime Ministers under whom he had served could not compete with him.  
(1899fitz.j6b)
c. This was the center in which they all met: this the point toward which they had tended and verged, throughout the course of so many generations.  
(1781blai.h4b)
d. For the Air in that bladder is like the bubble, more or less compressed, according to the depth the fish swims at, and takes up more or less space;  
(1675ai–.s2b)
e. I pray send me word whether Bishoppe hath payde the monye or no. I would not have that mony payde which Kinge writ for vntill I knowe whether it be due or on [sic].  
(CEPRIV2 1623)
As noted above, sentence adjuncts have been excluded from the analysis of syntactic variation because of their (largely) categorical position in P-piping. Earlier studies have contended that adjunct-PPs of respect, manner, frequency/duration and degree have a categorical effect on preposition placement: leaving a preposition stranded is generally impossible, they would argue. The reason behind this ‘idiosyncratic pied piping effect’ lies in the semantic constraint that ‘a preposition can only be stranded if it heads a PP that contributes interpretable thematic information to the predicate’ (Hoffmann 2011: 182; also Takami 1988: 314–16). Although it has been acknowledged that negative data do not automatically mean ungrammaticality (Hoffmann 2011: 163), and my findings from early and late Modern English give evidence that this is not a fully categorical restriction, the fact remains that sentence adjuncts are extremely resistant to P-stranding. Overall in my data they amount to less than five per cent of the instances with P-stranding and its acceptability is mostly limited to locative PPs; in this latter context the frequency is remarkably low (less than one per cent), and all instances in locative PPs and other sentence adjuncts appear in clauses which require obligatory P-stranding, such as zero- and that-relatives. As Hoffmann (2005: 274) explains, ‘the actual area of variation of preposition placement . . . is constrained by large areas of categorical environment’. On the one hand, Hoffmann concedes to a cline of strandability where stranded prepositions in locative and temporal adjunct-PPs ‘are judged better than the manner/frequency adjunct tokens’ (Hoffmann 2011: 182). Thus, categorical P-piping in a corpus-based analysis may result from an accidental gap, but P-stranding is not ungrammatical – see for instance the locative-direction PP and the temporal PP in (24). On the other hand, Hoffmann still argues that in PPs of respect, manner, degree and temporal-duration adjuncts there is ‘something like amounting negative data evidence . . . which supports the claim that stranding is impossible with these PP types’ (2011: 160); those few instances of P-stranding in his data are accounted for by Hoffmann as the result of ‘lexically idiosyncratic effects’ (e.g., 2011: 144). For example, respect adjuncts with the preposition under stranded as in (25) are interpreted as ‘resembl[ing] location adjunct-PPs in that they place an event in a certain situation that can be perceived as an “abstract location”’, and the

locative PPs we have seen do not resist P-stranding categorically (2005: 268, 293.n11).

(24)  a. you lookt as if you belong’d to a Cellar, in some of the Allies you were hunted through, and had been caterwawling in all the kennels in Town.  
   (1692soth.d2b)

   b. it hath been the practice of kings to tell Parliaments what he hath for them to do, and give them so long time to do it in, and no longer.  
   (CEDIJAR3A 1666–7)

(25) for no one can be just to his family that runs such dangers without consideration, which barely could not move me to run such a course, but that I hope in God I may be an instrument in his hands, to free the lady from those distempers which she labors under.  
   (1665gtrk.x2b)

It has also been argued that certain antecedent nouns in these types of adjunct-PP yield categorical P-piping when they appear in wh-relative clauses, such as way, manner, extent, degree, sense, point, time, moment, as in ‘the extent to which’, ‘the way in which’ (Johansson and Geisler 1998: 74; Hoffmann 2011: 75). 23 Hofmann points to the possibility that some of these expressions may be lexically fossilised (2011: 75), but Johansson allows a ‘more or less’ status of obligatoriness (2006: 181.n8). The following shows P-piping (26), which contrasts with P-stranding in (24).

(26) They that will go to heaven they must run for it; because, as the way is long, so the time in which they are to get to the end of it is very uncertain;  
   (16xxbuny.h2b [1650–99])

2.2.2.2 NP-embedded PPs

NP-embedded PPs can be of two types: obligatory or optional.

Obligatory Prepositional Phrases. The PP is an obligatory complement without which the meaning of the noun is incomplete, and the preposition is licensed by the noun, for instance aversion to. Huddleston and Pullum emphasise that ‘the noun can be found quite naturally without the complement’, but it is implicit (2002: 4.§6.4). In my corpus there is only one

---

23 Hoffmann judges the following ungrammatical: ‘there is *a point which, you know, he’s always trying to evade sanctions at*’, ‘The degree which a school does or doesn’t have immigrants to is irrelevant’ (2011: 75, emphasis in original). Likewise, ‘we were anxious about the way which we would make a living in’ (Hoffmann 2005: 258, emphasis in original).
instance of this function, with P-piping (27); absence of P-stranding can be regarded as an accidental gap.

(27) September 7. Our Viccar & Curate still on the same Text: The holy Sacrament followed of which I was partaker, the Lord make me thankfull: 

(CEDIAR3B 1688–90)

Optional Prepositional Phrases. The PP is optional, but if explicit it adds thematic information, and the preposition is licensed. There are two different groups according to the nature of the NP-head: (i) when the head is a noun, as in relief from, consequence of; and (ii) when the head is a partitive/quantifier expression, such as one of, all of, many of.

Optional PPs embedded in NPs can be further examined in terms of the position of the constituents of the PP and in terms of the function of the NP. Regarding preposition placement, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 10.§§7.9–10, 12.§3.2) speak metaphorically of ‘upward percolation’: the relative or interrogative feature of the wh-word percolates upwards from the wh-word to the phrase in which it is embedded, as from which to the PP behind which in ‘The curtain behind which Kim was hiding’. Percolation can be recursive: from the wh-word to the PP in which it is embedded to the higher NP in which the PP is contained, for instance ‘problems the answers to which he already knows’. Johansson (1997: 51–2) describes the patterns in terms of positional variation depending on whether the relative element occurs before or after the head of the mother-NP, thus in pre-position or in post-position. There are four potential scenarios, illustrated in (28) for noun-headed NPs and in (29) for partitive-headed NPs. In pattern (a) there is no percolation, as only the wh-word has been fronted before the head of the NP (results in (28), five in (29)); the preposition is stranded. In patterns (b) and (c) there is upward percolation to the PP, which appears before the NP-head with P-piping. In pattern (d), there are two steps of percolation – to the PP and to the mother-NP – and the PP is placed after the NP-head; these post-head PPs always exhibit P-piping.  

24 For reasons of space, these examples only illustrate percolation in wh-relative clauses; Huddleston and Pullum also discuss interrogative clauses (2002: 10.§§7.9–10). See also the discussion in Ross (1986: 121–47) and Hoffmann (2011: 89–98).

25 Subtle semantic differences between types (a), (c) and (d) have been noted by Jespersen (1909–49: III.§10.3.3) and Johansson (1997: 58–9).
(28) Positional variation in noun-headed NPs:
He already knows the results of the exam.
   a. the exam which he already knows the results of.
   b. the exam of which he already knows the results.
   c. the exam of which the results he already knows.
   d. the exam the results of which he already knows.

(29) Positional variation in partitive-headed NPs:
He had already answered five of her letters.
   a. *letters which he had already answered five of.\(^{26}\)
   b. letters of which he had already answered five.
   c. letters of which five he had already answered.
   d. letters five of which he had already answered.

(Illustrative examples adapted from Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 12.§3.2.2, e.g., 13, 14, 15.)

With regard to the function of the mother NP, we can distinguish four types: subject, object of a verb, predicate of a copular verb, and object of a mother PP. Examples with noun-headed NPs are provided in (30), and with partitive-headed NPs in (31).

(30) a. I like your Railery, Beaumine, since I don’t doubt but your serious Thoughts are to make me that in earnest, which the Name of serves you for a Jest. \(^{(1701trot.d3b)}\)
   b. There was not any thing in Chronologie, Historie, Geographie, The several systemes of Astronomers, Courses of the starrs, Longitudes, Latitudes, . . . which he did not readily resolve & demonstrate his knowledge of, readily drawing out, with his pen any thing that he would describe. \(^{(CEDIAR3B 1688–90)}\)
   c. and at the end of his communication, M. BESSEL proposes a method of finding the zenith point of an instrument, of which the following is a translation. \(^{(1825kate.s5b)}\)
   d. Have we not seen men, for the sake of some petty employment, give up the very natural rights and liberties of their country and of mankind, in the ruin of which themselves must at last be involved? \(^{(1724swif.h3b)}\)

\(^{26}\) Starred according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 12.§3.2.2, e.g., 15).
(31) a. the General Officers took great care to prevent them, by continually patrouling with their serjeants, and sending them on board their ships, and punishing the marines; one of which was hanged, after he had threw dice with a Dutchman, (1704poco.j3b)
b. A small Party of Dragoons, commanded by Quarter-Master Topham, met with a detach’d Party of the Rebels, under the Command of Captain Bourke; of which they slew five, and an Ensign, the rest betaking themselves to their heels. (1691gink.j2b)
c. A committee was in consequence appointed, of which number I was one, to consider of a proper hill whereon to try the experiment, (1775mask.s4b)
d. He had lived in the principal countries of Europe long enough to become a master of their languages, in every one of which he printed a work which he conceived might be useful to the inhabitants. (1788youn.j4b)

In these syntactic contexts with NP-embedded PPs, P-stranding is generally considered the ‘least natural and least common’ of the alternatives, sometimes even ‘impracticable’ and ‘harsh’ to Jespersen’s ears (Poutsma 1914–29: I.i.VIII.§87.d; Jespersen 1909–49: III.§10.2.5, III.§10.2.2; Quirk et al. 1985: §11.18; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 12.§7.3). These claims are borne out in my corpus: less than three per cent of all stranded prepositions head NP-embedded PPs. Furthermore, in partitive NP-embedded PPs, P-stranding is categorically excluded. For Jespersen, it is certainly ‘not usual to say, or at any rate to write’ stranded prepositions in this context (1909–49: III.§10.3.2); for Quirk et al. (1985: §6.4.8ff, §17.24) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 12.§3.2.2) it is starred as ungrammatical (see (20)a). Johansson (2006: 143) observes that P-stranding with NP-embedded PPs is ‘rare’ in her nineteenth-century data (Corpus of Nineteenth-Century English), and that in her present-day material it has been found ‘neither with genitive constructions with of which, nor with other of which-constructions’, in both spoken and written registers (Johansson 1997: 62). Regarding the acceptability of P-piping, the dominant pattern in my data is (d) in (28) and (29), that is, P-piping with fronting of the entire mother-NP and the PP in post-head position; in the case of the combination of which, this has been the dominant trend since the early seventeenth century (Johansson 1997: 61). Some differences emerge depending on the head of the NP. In partitive expressions, the post-head P-piping type is the most frequent alternative (c. 80% in my data; see also Jespersen 1909–49: III.§10.3.3), while in noun-headed NPs the (d) type competes with the patterns (b) and (c), that is, P-piping with the
PP in pre-head position. In the particular case of partitive NPs the pre-head position is regarded as ‘marked’ (Bailey 1986: 170, quoted in Johansson 1997: 61).

The function of the NP in the clause also imposes restrictions on preposition placement, with some functions having been observed to be more resistant to P-stranding than others, with statistical significance (e.g., Johansson 1997; Johansson and Geisler 1998; Hoffmann 2011: 86). For instance, P-stranding is said to be ‘almost wholly excluded from occurring within a subject’ (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 12.§3.2.2, e.g., (14), 12.§7.3(j); Quirk et al. 1985: §17.24), and indeed there is only one instance in my data. Stranded prepositions in NPs embedded in PPs and with copular be are exceptional, too; I found only two instances, both in clauses that demand obligatory P-stranding. The principle of end-focus and end-weight can account for the absence of P-stranding in the latter context, as explained above (Johansson 1997: 56; Johansson and Geisler 1998: 77). Semantic factors, complexity and prosodic cues have also been considered as determining factors (Hoffmann 2011: 84–98). Given the scarcity of data, it seems appropriate to exclude NP-embedded PPs altogether from the examination of syntactic variation (see also Schneider 1992: 450.n11).

2.2.2.3 AP-embedded PPs

The third XP-embedded PP type is headed by an adjective. The PP can be obligatory or optional.

**Obligatory Prepositional Phrases.** The PP is obligatory and explicitly required for the meaning of the construction to be complete; the preposition is licensed by the adjective, too; for instance, mindful of, loath to, prone to, liable to.

(32) and dipping his shirt among the water for a bath over night, was, from the worst degree of eruption he had been liable to, brought, almost incredibly, to a perfect cure. (1735thom.m3b)

**Optional Prepositional Phrases.** The PP is optional but adds thematic information when it occurs; the preposition is licensed by the adjective, as in worried about, grateful for, glad of. Some adjectives may license more

---

27 Johansson (1997: 52) notes that the function of the mother-NP in the relative clause ‘is more important’ than the complexity of the structure of the NP and/or the relative clause itself.

28 Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 6.§3.1) observe that ‘a large number of adjectives do not license a complement of any kind’.
than one preposition, thereby conveying a different meaning, for instance *angry at* vs. *angry with*.

(33)  I did get him to sign me a note for the 100l, to pay for the plate he doth present me with, which I am very glad of.

(CEDIAR3A 1666–7)

In my data the two functions of the AP-embedded PPs show a rather balanced distribution of the variants P-stranding and P-Piping. It seems then that there is ‘nothing ungrammatical about a stranded preposition’ in this context (Trotta 2000: 184, quoted in Hoffmann 2011: 88). Nonetheless, this type of PP has also been excluded from the analysis of syntactic variation for two reasons. First, a focus on a single XP-embedded group (VP) will provide more consistent/coherent results given that NP-embedded PPs have been justifiably excluded. And second, the study of VP-embedded PPs only will also facilitate comparison with other work in the field which has been primarily, if not exclusively, focused on VP-embedded PPs (see discussion in Hoffmann 2011: 84–93; see also Schneider 1992: 450.n11). As we can see in Figure 2.7, the data from AP and NP-embedded PPs are a minority compared with VP-embedded NPs, with regard to both P-stranding and P-piping.
2.2.3 Other prepositional constructions

This book is about preposition placement, with a focus on P-stranding and with special attention also given to P-piping. Prepositions can be arranged in other positions in the sentence which, for reasons of space, cannot be discussed here. One of these is the ‘splitting’ of the sequence preposition + noun due to the insertion of one or more intermediate elements, as in ‘Candidates should have skills in either project management or team leadership’, or when two prepositions happen to govern the same object, such as ‘I have found a collection of letters written by and to Lady Mary Hamilton’. The ‘disjunction’ of prepositions in such contexts is understood here as a splitting of prepositions, not as an instance of P-stranding. (It will be briefly brought into the discussion in Section 5.5.4.2.)

The constructions known as double prepositions and preposition pruning will also not be considered; see (c) and (d) in (34). Preposition pruning (d) involves the ellipsis of the preposition so that it is not overtly spelled out. It has been shown that this omission usually creates processing difficulties and thus it is often judged unacceptable and ungrammatical (Radford et al. 2012). Double prepositions (c) – also known by the misnomer preposition copying – are a hybrid construction which shows both a fronted preposition and a stranded preposition, usually with the same preposition but not necessarily so. Double prepositions were not uncommon in the late Middle English period and seem to have increased in frequency in the sixteenth century, after which they are rarely found. It has been suggested that they originated as ‘a sort of intermediate stage’ between obligatory P-piping in Old English and the incipient stages of P-stranding in Middle English, as they appeared first in wh-relative and wh-interrogative clauses, the so-called ‘transitional wh-effect’ (Bergh 1998: 5–8). In transformational grammar the stranded preposition is understood as a ‘copy’ of the fronted preposition (Allen 1980: 229–30), but Bergh and Seppänen (2000: 303.n9) have rightly disputed that claim: ‘such a simple copying rule is not applicable to all examples of the construction, because the would-be copy is not always identical with the moved preposition’ (see also Nykiel 2010). Bergh (1998) argues instead for both syntactic and semantic factors being at play; the former seem to have a stronger influence. From the present-day perspective, double prepositions are regarded as anomalous, as speech errors, or ‘as an occasional pattern in non-standard usage’ (Bergh and Seppänen 2000: 303; see also Riley and Parker 1986). Yet they are still attested (see Language Log), and acceptability tests for processing complexity have indicated that they are seen as redundant rather than ungrammatical (Radford et al. 2012).
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(34) Preposition placement in English
a. The world [in which we are living] is changing.
b. The world [which we are living in] is changing.
c. *The world [in which we are living in] is changing.
d. *The world [which we are living] is changing.

(from Radford et al. 2012: 405)

Another type of arrangement which must be left for investigation elsewhere concerns relative compound adverbs which combine where and a preposition, such as wherein, whereto, wherefrom, whereat (see (35); Yáñez-Bouza ms.). Where+p compounds emerged in the thirteenth century, at the time when P-stranding first appeared in wh-clauses, a ‘striking’ coincidence in Allen’s view (1980: 220). Over the course of the late Middle English period where+p compounds became more common and during the seventeenth century it was still productive (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003: 75–6). By the mid eighteenth century the construction was censured as obsolete (e.g., Anonymous 1752; Johnson 1755), and nowadays its use is restricted to a few forms, to formal writing, religious discourse and formulaic legal language (36) (see also Sundby et al. 1991: 208; Denison 1998: 283–7; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 12.§3.5.3). The importance of these hybrids lies mainly in their function as a stylistic device to avoid, on the one hand, the formality conveyed in the P-piping variant and, on the other, the informal nature of P-stranding. In other words, I see where+p compounds as the bridge between the two poles on the formal/informal continuum (Yáñez-Bouza 2004: 30–59). Anecdotally, where+p compound constructions may appear in combination with the double prepositions construction, as in (37).

(35) by knowing the Diameter to finde out the length of any Chorde . . . and finding that the more parts wherein the Diameter was diuided, the nearer they approched to the truth.

(CESCIE2B 1597)

(36) a. Here, there, and where, for this, these; that, those, or it, them; and which, made formerly a sort of compound pronouns with subjoined prepositions: hereof, therein, whereto, or solemnly whereunto, &c. of which preposterous and pleonastical combinations scarce any thing remains, beside the familiar hereabouts, thereabouts, whereabouts, with a adscititious . . .

(Elphinston 1765: I.367)
b. Hence the absurdity of . . . \textit{wherein} equal to \textquoteleft\textit{in which}', \textit{hereof} equal to \textquoteleft\textit{of in this}', \textit{thereby} equal to \textquoteleft\textit{by in that}'.

(Elphinston 1765: II.471)

(37) But if ye will sel it, send word to your son what ye will doe, for I know nothing els \textit{wherewith} to help you \textit{with}.

(CEPRIV1 1500–70)
This chapter presents a fine-grained study of eighteenth-century attitudes towards P-stranding in order to shed light on what was actually said at the time about this construction, both in criticism and otherwise. Section 3.1 offers a quantitative and qualitative analysis of authors, works and comments. Special attention is then drawn to the labels used by normative writers to refer to end-placed prepositions and the semantic nuances these labels convey (Section 3.2). This is followed by a brief account of the practice of borrowing identified in the sources, looking in particular at the wording of quotations and illustrative examples provided (Section 3.3). The focus of this chapter, and indeed the book as a whole, is the eighteenth century, and thus a close study of nineteenth-century attitudes is not possible; yet it seems necessary to provide at least an overview of the context during this century, and this is done in Section 3.4.¹

3.1 Attitudes to preposition stranding

Eighteenth-century grammarians and rhetoricians based their pedagogical methods on ‘giving illustrative examples of impurity, imprecision and lack of clarity’ in the works of the ‘best writers’, as Sundby et al. explain (1991: 2); in other words, ‘the bad forms are in focus, not the “good” usage itself’ (ibid.). This negative perspective with regard to original works is partly responsible for the negative view of the prescriptive era that is often presented in present-day studies. The focus is often on exploring the negative influence of prescriptivism, asking what grammatical features were stigmatised and/or fell into disuse because of prescriptive and proscriptive strictures. With regard to P-stranding this is indeed the traditional account found in the literature: the complaint has always been paraphrased negatively in terms of the stigmatisation of the form, and hence falls into

¹ Some data reported in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 here have been discussed in Yáñez-Bouza (2008a).
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Figure 3.1 Attitudes to preposition stranding in the eighteenth century: authors, works, comments (percentages).

what Crystal calls the ‘Thou Shalt Not’ tradition (1995: 194). In this chapter I take a broader perspective, in the belief that attitudes stand on a descriptive–prescriptive continuum, and not on a binary opposition. I will show that P-stranding was not only condemned, as the literature reports, but was often simply mentioned, and sometimes even advocated and/or defended.

Figure 3.1 shows the overall trends in attitudes towards P-stranding in the precept database distributed across authors (148), works (285) and comments (1,119). As described in Section 2.1, there are four categories: none, if P-stranding is not discussed; neutral, if the syntactic arrangement is simply mentioned, with no evaluative judgement stated or a neutral attitude implied; critic, if end-placed prepositions are criticised/censured or a negative attitude is implied in the passage; and advocate, if P-stranding is advocated or defended or a positive/favourable attitude is expressed. A glance at the figures reveals that the data for authors and works follow similar trends and that these trends to a great extent resemble patterns in the types of comments documented. It should be recalled that there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between authors, works and attitudes, since (a) the same author may have written more than one work and expressed different attitudes in these, and (b) the same work may contain different attitudes in different passages. For instance, in
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Figure 3.1 the percentage values for works are fifty-eight, thirty-three, thirty-four and ten, which entails that 34 per cent of the 285 works (96 works) have at least one negative comment on P-stranding, while only 10 per cent (29 works) make positive comments, and so on.

The data here suggest that this syntactic feature found little favour amongst eighteenth-century codifiers: forty-three per cent of authors, thirty-four per cent of works, and forty-five per cent of comments fall under the heading critic. First, the numbers for the value critic overall are higher than those for the value neutral (40% authors, 33% works, 44% comments), suggesting that those authors who did devote time to discussing P-stranding did so in order to criticise the construction, and that this is consistently the case across authors, works and comments. Second, only a few authors expressed favourable attitudes towards the use of this construction, and they did not advocate it very extensively or enthusiastically: the relative proportions of advocate are twelve per cent of authors, ten per cent of works, and eleven per cent of comments. We can also observe that in many works nothing was said on P-stranding, especially in the early part of the century. The reason for the absence of any discussion may well have been the nature of early works, since, on the one hand, they were mainly concerned with morphological categories rather than with syntax, and P-stranding is a syntactic construction; and, on the other hand, they were based to a great extent on Latin works, and in Latin syntax there is no P-stranding. Hiltunen (1998: 436) also suggested that with regard to the seventeenth century ‘the Latin tradition must have impeded many [authors] from taking up constructions so alien to Latin in their accounts of English’.

For a better understanding of eighteenth-century attitudes towards P-stranding, Table 3.1 sets out the data on comments (minus the category none) and Figure 3.2 illustrates the diachronic development in works. These allow us to observe which attitudes have been documented in each decade and in how many works, and which attitude is the most frequent at a particular point in time; also, by comparing their relative frequencies in different decades, we can infer which attitude dominates at which point in time.

The first observation we can make concerns the scant evidence of positive attitudes: the category advocate lags behind throughout the century, remarkably so in the second half. This implies that there were always more critics than advocates, with the exception of the very first decade in which no explicit criticism is observed. In fact, in some decades favourable comments are attested in just a single work, and there are never more than thirty positive comments in the same decade. The favourable view found in An
Table 3.1: *Attitudes to preposition stranding during the eighteenth century: comments (absolute figures and row percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th></th>
<th>Critic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–1800</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2 Attitudes to preposition stranding in the eighteenth century: works (raw figures by decade).

*Essay towards a Practical English Grammar* by James Greenwood (1711) in the early part of the century should not be overlooked, as this is the earliest explicit discussion of end-placed prepositions in the precept database, and one which was borrowed, sometimes unacknowledged, in numerous works throughout the century (see Section 5.5.3.1). The writer traditionally seen as a firm advocate of the form is the Dissenter Joseph Priestley
Eighteenth-century precept

(1733–1804), born in West Yorkshire and tutor at the Warrington Academy (his *The Rudiments of English Grammar* was published in 1761). Another Dissenter schoolmaster from the north, John Fell (1735–97), expressed very positive attitudes in *An Essay towards an English Grammar* (1784). Also quoted frequently in the literature is the Scottish rhetorician George Campbell (1719–96), a passionate advocate of the construction, primarily in terms of its idiomaticity and its effect on the harmony of the period, but also highlighting stylistic differences between the P-stranding and the P-piping variants (see (38)). James Elphinston’s (1765) advocate discussion of P-stranding is also very extensive and detailed, dealing with *wh*-relative clauses, *that*-relatives, interrogatives and passives; his subtle observations concern grammatical issues as well as stylistic preferences and prosodic effects. Another point worth making is that the large majority of works which *advocate* the form are also *critics* of it in some sense; that is, P-stranding is favoured under certain circumstances (e.g., harmony) but also criticised for some other reason or in other contexts (e.g., in the solemn style). This is particularly the case in passages where stranded prepositions are discussed in terms of ‘transposition’, as in Ann Fisher’s (1753) and Daniel Farro’s (1754a) grammars. Among those who comment on the end position of prepositions in a neutral way and then advocate the form are Hugh Jones (1724), William Ward (1765) and Anselm Bayly (1772).

(38) Vivacity requires sometimes, as hath been shown above, that even the governed part, if it be that which fixes the attention of the speaker, should stand foremost in the sentence. Let the following serve as an example: “The man whom you were so anxious to discover, I have at length got information of.” We have here indeed a considerable hyperbaton, as grammarians term it; there being no less than thirteen words interposed between the noun and the preposition. Yet whether the expression can be altered for the better, will perhaps be questioned. Shall we say, “Of the man whom you were so anxious to discover, I have at length got information?” Who sees not that by this small alteration, not only is the vivacity destroyed, but the expression is rendered stiff and formal, and therefore ill adapted to the style of conversation? Shall we then restore what is called the grammatical, because the most common order, and say, “I have at length gotten information of the man whom you were so anxious to discover?” The arrangement here is unexceptionable, but the expression is unanimated. There is in the first manner something
that displays an ardour in the speaker to be the messenger of good news. Of this character there are no traces in the last; and in the second there is a cold and studied formality which would make it appear intolerable. So much is the power merely of arrangement. (Campbell 1776: II.iii.IV.402–3)

Overall, when something was said about P-stranding in the first half of the century the general tendency was simply to mention the usage, thus confirming the largely descriptive nature of early eighteenth-century works. Although with a lower frequency, the second part of the century continues to see a large number of authors commenting on the use of stranded prepositions as part of the grammar of the English language without judging whether it was good or bad usage, this being especially the case in the 1760s and 1770s. Neutral attitudes are thus found from A. Lane’s *Key to the Arts of Letters* (1705 [1700]) to Jane Gardiner’s *The Young Ladies’ English Grammar* (1799). Usually, authors tend to mention the end position of prepositions and then give their opinion as to whether they advocate or criticise the usage, but there are some authors who simply describe the construction with no value judgement at all, such as William Turner (1710), Michael Maittaire (1712) and Daniel Fenning (1771). A quotation from the Londoner Charles Coote (1788) serves to illustrate this neutral attitude:

(39)  
[The preposition] is generally placed before the noun or pronoun which it governs, except when a relative depends on it, in which case it frequently succeeds the word governed by it; as, “the house *that* (or *which*) he was speaking of is in ruins; they are the persons *whom* (or *that*) I wrote to.” . . . Prepositions are sometimes placed after participles passive, when the word governed by them is understood; as, “the subjects *treated of* are abstruse; the person *applied to* was his friend; the business *spoken of* by him is important.” (Coote 1788: 247–8)

Nonetheless, opinions which were explicitly stated were mainly negative. Indeed, the increase in the critic attitude was such that it became predominant in the middle and late decades of the century. As McIntosh notes, ‘earlier grammars tend to be less peremptory and detailed in their recommendations; later grammars repeat and refine these rules’ (1998: 173). The trends start to change in the 1750s, and the 1760s stand out for various reasons: (i) the number of works with no comments on P-stranding drops sharply (from 76% to 46%); (ii) the ratio of evaluative comments is higher than in earlier decades and includes positive and negative evaluations;
(iii) this decade witnesses the publication of crucial works on the conceptualisation of P-stranding, such as Joseph Priestley’s *The Rudiments of English Grammar* (1761a), Robert Lowth’s *A Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762), Lord Kames’ *Elements of Criticism* (1762), James Elphinston’s *The Principles of the English Language Digested* (1765), William Ward’s *An Essay on Grammar* (1765) and James Buchanan’s *The Regular Syntax* (1767). P-stranding became something to talk about, and more extensively so, in more works; to quote from McIntosh again, ‘it is in the 1750s and early 1760s that heavy artillery of the learned world begins to rumble on topics related to correctness’ (1998: 172, citing McIntosh 1986: 47). The last twenty years of the century (1780–1800) provide the largest numbers of authors, works and comments, to the extent that the percentage of comments here (i.e., 551) approaches half of the total documented in the entire century (49%).

Critic attitudes in these decades are by far the most frequent, in that among the works which discuss the end position of prepositions the majority do so in order to censure the usage, and they do so in greater and greater detail. The negative attitudes are apparent from James Greenwood’s (1711) early grammar until the year 1800, a year in which three out of the six works in the corpus expressed proscriptive comments, such as in Daniel Staniford’s *A Short but Comprehensive Grammar* (1800). The year 1762 was a crucial year, with the publication of two influential works: Lowth’s grammar and Kames’ rhetoric treatise. Some authors, such as William Angus (1800), John Bell (1769) and Hugh Blair (1771, 1783) only make negative comments, and Blair (1718–1800) is in fact the most condemning author in the precept database. He criticises the construction extensively, alluding to a variety of rhetorical, stylistic and grammatical principles collected from his years lecturing at the University of Edinburgh (see quotation [40]). Besides Blair, other strongly proscriptive authors in the precept data include Noah Webster (1784), Philip Withers (1789), Lindley Murray (1795, 1797), and the female grammarian Lady Ellenor Fenn (1798a). In other works criticism appears by the side of neutral and/or positive comments, as in Matthew Raine’s grammar (1771).

(40) A fifth rule for the strength of the sentences; which is, to avoid concluding them with an adverb, a preposition, or any inconsiderable word. Such conclusions are always enfeebling and degrading. . . . Agreeably to this rule, we should always avoid concluding with any of those particles, which mark the cases of nouns, – of, to, from, with, by. For instance, it is a great deal better to say, “Avarice is a crime of which wise men are often
“guilty,” than to say, “Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of.” This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun; and with reason. For, besides the want of dignity which arises from those monosyllables at the end, the imagination cannot avoid resting, for a little, on the import of the word which closes the sentence. And, as those prepositions have no import of their own, but only serve to point out the relations of other words, it is disagreeable for the mind to be left pausing on a word, which does not, by itself, produce any idea, nor form any picture in the fancy. (Blair 1783: I.xii.285–7)

Another interesting pattern in the data concerns female authors. As noted in Section 2.1, the majority of the precept works examined were written by men, which is not surprising if we bear in mind the low levels of literacy among women (Stone 1969; Cressy 1980: 176–8); the neglect of women’s education in the eighteenth century, which was essentially ‘restricted to moral and social education within a domestic environment’ (Rodríguez-Gil 2002a: 120.n); and the general ‘distrust of clever and learned women’ writing for publication (McIntosh 1998: 180). That women did write grammars and other education books ‘is significant in its own right’ (Michael 1970: 517). Most female grammar writers are teachers, and in this professional role they enjoy a certain authority and reputation. They also try to gain respect and authority for their works by mentioning linguistic authorities in the title-pages or prefaces, like Jane Gardiner, who acknowledges that her grammar is ‘a select compendium of the most approved English Grammars’ (1799: iii). Another common strategy is to present their works as elementary versions of Robert Lowth (1762) and Lindley Murray (1795), the most successful publications of their type in the late eighteenth-century market. The aim of these female grammar writers is to make the subject less difficult for both children and women, by producing simple, brief and practical grammars. They are also well aware of the importance of language correctness as a social marker. This is best exemplified in Mrs. Eves’ prefatory dialogue, when the teacher warns the pupil Miss Henrietta that she would be ‘thought a vulgar untaught young lady; inferior to all [her] friends and companions’ if she did not ‘speak elegantly’, if she did not learn grammar (1800: xi; see also Cajka 2008: 206–8).

If Lowth and Murray were the inspirational sources and both Lowth and Murray criticised P-stranding, it comes as no surprise that female grammar writers criticised the end position of prepositions too.³ Five female authors discuss stranded prepositions in their grammars, and at least two of them (Ellis Devis and Ellenor Fenn) do so following the critical strictures of male grammarians.⁴ Lady Ellenor Fenn (1744–1813) acknowledged that her *The Mother’s Grammar* was ‘professedly borrowed . . . from the works of our best writers upon English Grammar’ in order to assist teachers, one of the ‘high author[ies]’ being Robert Lowth (Fenn 1798a: A2[iii], v). Her works, anonymously published under the penname *Mrs. Lovechild*, were very popular, and her grammars were frequently reprinted in the early nineteenth century too (Alston 1965: 104–5). In the first pages of the preface to her *Accidence*, Ellin Devis (1746–1820) also acknowledges Lowth as one of ‘our best grammarians’ from whose work she has made a selection (1775: v–vi). She repeatedly refers to pages from Lowth’s grammar, and she uses his examples and attitudes throughout. Devis’ grammar was very popular, as evinced by the fact that Alston documented an eighteenth edition in 1827 (1965: 60–1). P-stranding is not discussed in the first edition of her grammar, but Devis subsequently adds a section of ‘Incidental Remarks’ in the third edition which includes a passage borrowed from Lowth; furthermore, in the fourth and fifth editions she adds illustrative examples with the prescribed front position of the preposition, thereby putting more emphasis on her criticism (see 1777: 83, enlarged in 1782a: 82, 1786: 83).

³ Murray’s passage on P-stranding was essentially a plagiarised version of Lowth’s (see Section 5.4.2.).

⁴ Blanch Mercy’s grammar published in 1799 still ‘bears the same title as Lowth’s’ (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000b), and censures stranded prepositions, yet the reference source in Sundby et al. (1991: 427) does not provide sufficient context to assess Lowth’s or Murray’s influence. Mrs. M.C. Edwards’ grammar appeared in 1796 as ‘an elementary version of the popular eclectic Murray (1799)’ (Smith 1999: 212, in Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000b), but she does not discuss P-stranding. In *The Grammatical Play Thing* (1800) Mrs. Eves names Ellin Devis alongside Robert Lowth, the latter said to be one of ‘our best grammarians’, on whose work she based her grammar (1800: x, xiii); yet Mrs. Eves’ brief grammar does not discuss end-placed prepositions.
And the Preposition is often separated from the Relative which it
governs, and joined to the Verb at the end of the Sentence; as
That is the book which I am pleased with; Johnson is an author
whom I am much delighted with; but the placing of the
Preposition before the Relative is more elegant, as well as more
perspicuous; as, That is the book with which I am pleased;
Johnson is an author with whom I am much delighted.

(Devis 1782a: 82)

Following the general trend reported above, in general when female gram-
marians discuss this particular construction they criticise the usage (29 com-
ments, 43%). Only Jane Gardiner (1758–1840) takes a neutral attitude by
simply referring to word order. Ann Fisher (1719–78) and Ellin Devis
also make some neutral comments, but these are followed by proscriptive
remarks. Fisher is the only female author who makes positive comments
on the transposition of prepositions if ‘placed in the manner most graceful
to the Ear’ but only ‘provided the Sense be no way hurt by it’ (1753: 122).

3.2 Connotations

The practice of qualifying words or senses of a word in prescriptive –
and proscriptive – terms is not new to the eighteenth century; it can
be seen, for example, in seventeenth-century dictionaries such as Edward
Phillips’ New World of English Words (1658), mainly in relation to hard and
technical words, and in early eighteenth-century dictionaries such as John
Kersey’s A New English Dictionary (1702), where words are occasionally
branded low, dialectal or obsolete (Card et al. 1984: 57). Samuel Johnson’s A
Dictionary of the English Language, published in the mid eighteenth century
(1755), is infamous for including many subjective remarks on language use
and marking forms with restrictive labels, from spelling preferences to
morphological and syntactic matters, such as ‘a barbarous contraction’, ‘a
colloquial abuse of the word’, ‘this sense is somewhat low’, or ‘a word that
has crept into conversation and low writing but ought not to be admitted
into the language’ (quoted from Card et al. 1984: 57; see also Wild 2010:
192–212). Grammars, like dictionaries, make use of labels or epithets to
comment on the use of orthographical, morphological and syntactic forms.
The previous section has shown that attitudes to language embrace more
than a simple binary opposition between critics and advocates, and stand
rather on the continuum critic–neutral–advocate. Similarly, strictures are
more than simple binary distinctions between correct and incorrect usage. P-stranding can be discussed neutrally in terms of frequency or order, it can be advocated as elegant or harmonious, and it can be criticised as imprecise or bad English, amongst others. Furthermore, it is not the same to criticise stranded prepositions as familiar forms as to call them harsh to the ear; the prescriptive tone differs. As Card et al. (1984: 58) argue, ‘usage varies in many dimensions, and not simply between “good” and “bad” or along a single scale of excellence’, and it is the label chosen by the author of the passage that ‘indicates the place the particular item has in the dimension with which the person interested in this item is most frequently concerned’.

A further step in this study has thus been taken in order to describe the ways in which P-stranding was conceptualised in the eighteenth century. I have made use of a labelling system so that each comment has been coded with a label that grasps the semantic nuance conveyed in the passage documented. This approach will offer new insights into whether P-stranding is severely attacked or mildly criticised, whether or not it is enthusiastically advocated, and, through the number of labels, whether it is simply mentioned or is extensively described. I have drawn on the fine-grained coding system in Sundby et al.’s DENG (1991) and have further elaborated on it using Card et al.’s (1984) dimensions of usage and dictionary labelling. In addition, since the connotations of the epithets used in the eighteenth century might have changed over time, I have resorted to Samuel Johnson’s dictionary (1755) for clarification, Johnson’s being the standard reference source in the late part of the century and on into the nineteenth century. DENG’s list has been enlarged to account for positive and neutral attitudes, since Sundby et al.’s work was limited to comments ‘that did not find favour in eighteenth-century English grammarians’ (1991: 2). I have also added some negative labels which were not listed in their illustrative passages of P-stranding, and the tag ‘–’ has been used to indicate that the stricture or passage has been taken from Sundby et al. (1991: 426–8) but no explicit label is provided in their notes.

3.2.1 Labelling epithets

In total the labelling system in the database of precepts on P-stranding consists of thirty labels; if these are all counted as separate labels when occurring in different subgroups, this total rises to forty-three (see Table 3.2). Some labels naturally occur more often than others: order is the most frequent tag, with 265 tokens (24%), and can be found in all three attitudinal categories; frequency is second, with 133 tokens (12%), and is again found in
Table 3.2: *Labels for preposition stranding in the eighteenth century*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critic</td>
<td>bad, barbarous, censurable, colloquial, corrupt, custom, erroneous, frequency, genre-poetry, genre-prose, harsh, idiomatic, imprecise, improper, inaccurate, inelegant, obsolete, offensive, order, prosody, style-familiar/conversation, style-solemn/writing, ungrammatical, vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>custom, elegant, frequency, genre-poetry, genre-prose, good, grammatical, harmonious, idiomatic, order, precise, prosody, style-familiar/conversation, style-solemn/writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>custom, frequency, genre-poetry, grammatical, idiomatic, order, style-familiar/conversation, style-solemn/writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all three attitudes; *idiomatic* is also highly frequent, with about 90 tokens (8%), and *inelegant* and *grammatical* are documented in more than 70 passages (7% each). In contrast, *barbarous*, *vulgar* and *corrupt* are attested only once each, and in fact the first two are based on the classification in *DENG*. A number of terms can be related as pairs of antonyms: *bad* vs. *good*, *harsh* vs. *harmonious*, *imprecise* vs. *precise*, *inelegant* vs. *elegant*, *ungrammatical* vs. *grammatical*. Note, however, that there is *improper* but not *proper*, and *inaccurate* but not *accurate*. Some labels belong uniquely to the *advocate* attitude (e.g., *elegant*, *harmonious*) or to the *critic* attitude (e.g., *bad*, *harsh*), but some tags may convey different attitudes depending on the connotations implied in a particular passage; for instance, *frequency*, *idiomatic*, *order* and *custom* may represent a neutral, negative or positive attitude. The diachronic distribution of the epithets sheds light on the conceptualisation of P-stranding over the course of the century, and it further hints at how works/authors relate to each other (same label with the same attitude) and when attitudes change (change of connotation of the same label). For instance, the negative connotation of the tag *custom* can be found from early in the century (James Greenwood 1711) to the late decades of the century (Noah Webster 1787); however, with a neutral connotation it is restricted to the second half of the century (Daniel Farro 1754a and George Campbell 1776), and the positive nuance is only found in John Fell’s and George Ussher’s works in the 1780s and 1790s.

Amongst the neutral labels, word order is by far the most frequent comment made in the precept sources, as authors note the fact that prepositions can be ‘set’ or ‘placed after the verb’, that they ‘happen to be separated’ from their object, or that they appear ‘at the end’ of the sentence (205 comments, 42%). The *frequency* of the end position is also mentioned very
often, whether as ‘occasionally’, ‘sometimes’ or ‘for the most part’ (23%). Many authors point out that the syntactic construction with P-stranding is idiomatic and grammatical (c. 70 comments, 14%), with neutral comments such as ‘undoubtedly idiomatic’, ‘not observed in any other language’ or that English ‘will admit the preposition after [its object]’. On the other hand, neutral comments in terms of style are less frequent. The chronology of the neutral tags does not indicate any outstanding use of a particular label at a particular point in time, and most of them are attested from the early century. William Turner (1710) describes stranded prepositions as ‘grammatical’, and James Greenwood (1711) refers to their idiomatic nature and variation in use between poetry and prose. The 1760s introduces matters of style – style-familiar/conversation and style-solemn/writing – in the grammars by James Elphinston (1765) and Caleb Fleming (1766). Elphinston seems to relate preposition placement to style and also register:

(43) The monosyllables are as apt to follow in the familiar, as the disyllables in the sublime. Common stile says therefore, what does this amount to? whom do you aim at? what is he proud of? &c. and the precise, To what does it amount? at whom do you aim? of what is he proud? . . . While however the monosyllable prepositions become thus postpositive chiefly in the familiar, the disyllables claim the power of subjunction only in the sublime, and that the sublime of poetry. As extremes always meet, the very familiar can indeed ask, Whom for? what about? &c. instead of, for whom? about what? &c.

(Elphinston 1765: II.146–8)

The view that stranded prepositions are good usage is limited in the number of comments, but there is a fair variety of positive nuances in the passages documented, from elegance and stylistic preferences to harmony and precision, including notes on idiomaticity. When stranded prepositions are advocated, the ‘peculiar harmony’ which the end position of the preposition gives to the sentence is the most frequent argument in favour: it ‘gives an ardour’ to the period, whereas the front position is considered ‘unanimated’ (harmonious: 21%; prosody: 10%). The favourable prosodic effect is highlighted especially in treatises of rhetoric and with regard to poetry, where the effect of P-stranding is ‘sweeter and more agreeable’, and it ‘gives variety’ to the rhyme (genre-poetry: 12%). In prose it is positively accepted only when it renders the sound more harmonious and agreeable to the ear. The idiomatic nature of the construction is the second most frequent argument to advocate the construction (14.2%), as in the famous
Among the nearly fifteen advocate labels, some can only have a positive value (e.g., elegant, harmonious, precise), while others may also have a neutral and/or negative connotation depending on the passage in question (e.g., frequency, idiomatic, prosody). It is interesting to note that whereas inelegant is the most frequent criticism documented in the precept data (15.5%; see below), the positive counterpart elegant is attested in less than ten comments (5%). Diachronically, the 1760s stand out with new labels conveying positive nuances. Joseph Priestley’s ‘Observations on Style’ provides the first passages in my data in which end-placed prepositions are advocated in matters of style, and he is also the first author to defend the use of end-placed prepositions as a vernacular idiom. It is worth pointing out that the same semantic connotations are conveyed in the treatise Philosophy of Rhetoric by George Campbell (1776), and that these same labels form the basis of Robert Lowth’s discussion in his 1762 grammar, yet with a different connotation (see Section 5.4.2). The following passage from Priestley illustrates his positive attitude, discussing the issue through its relation to style and the harmony and prosody of the period:

(44) With respect to real harmony, it is absolutely indifferent whether a period close with a monosyllable, or otherwise, provided the monosyllable, considered as connected with the words adjacent, have no disagreeable cadence; for it is not the ear, but the understanding, that perceives the distinction and interval between words in the same clause of a sentence, when they are regularly pronounced. It is often really diverting to see with what extreme caution words of such frequent occurrence as of and to are prevented from fixing themselves in the close of a sentence; though that be a situation they naturally incline to, where they favour the easy fall of the voice, in a familiar cadence; and from which nothing but the solemnity of an address from the pulpit ought to dislodge them; as in any other place they often give too great a stiffness and formality to a sentence. (Priestley 1761b: 50–1)

Criticism against stranded prepositions is very common throughout the century, as we have seen in Section 3.1. Furthermore, this category comprises the largest number and most varied array of labels (24 labels, Table 3.3). In terms of frequency, the most recurrent label is inelegant (15.5%), whether because the author overtly brands P-stranding as the construction ‘with
Table 3.3: *Labels for critic attitudes towards preposition stranding in the eighteenth century*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>00s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>20s</th>
<th>30s</th>
<th>40s</th>
<th>50s</th>
<th>60s</th>
<th>70s</th>
<th>80s</th>
<th>90s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbarous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censurable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrupt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erroneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre-poetry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre-prose</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprecise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inelegant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style-familiar/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style-solemn/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungrammatical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less elegance’ or because P-piping is preferred as the construction which is ‘certainly more elegant’ and appropriate ‘in order to give proper correctness and polish to our Language’ (for instance, Buchanan 1767: 98; Blair 1783: II.xxi.91–2). Perspicuity plays a major role in both grammars and rhetoric treatises, and stranded prepositions are often criticised for creating obscurity or degrading the sense, as Blair states in the passage quoted in (40); accordingly, fronted prepositions are often favoured as more perspicuous (12%). The label *bad* is frequently attested, too (11%), usually in
passages where the author considers that it is ‘a great deal better to say’ the sentence with a pied-piped preposition (Hornsey 1793: 100–1). Closely behind is criticism in terms of style, where end-placed prepositions are associated with familiar, informal style and fronted prepositions are associated with solemn, formal style (9.5%, respectively). From a diachronic perspective, in addition to the increasing numbers, we can also observe a change in tone. Critical comments in early eighteenth-century works are mild, with terms such as custom, frequency and order, and some hints at stranded prepositions being imprecise. Terms with a more proscriptive tone such as bad, censurable and inelegant do not occur before the treatise An Essay on the Power and Harmony of Prosaic Numbers (1749) by John Mason (1706–63). In the mid century the semantic nuances became more critical, or, as McIntosh (1998: 179) observes, not only did the number of grammars increase ‘tremendously’, but ‘the messages that grammars were sending to their readers changed’ too. In the 1760s there are new labels such as harsh in Lord Kames (1762), offensive in James Elphinston (1765), and improper and ungrammatical in James Buchanan (1767). In this decade, we also have Robert Lowth’s (1762) observations on matters of style. If passages in the middle decades suggest a more aggressive attitude, in the late decades of the century these become fiercer, both in number and in the semantic connotations conveyed in the epithets. In addition to the high frequency of bad, erroneous, harsh, imprecise, improper and inelegant, we find corrupt (Webster 1784), barbarous and vulgar (Story 1783, according to DENG). The fiercer negative approach is particularly evident in matters of rhetoric (see Sections 5.5.3–4). To illustrate the variety of semantic nuances that can be implied in the same passage I have chosen James Buchanan’s (1767) Regular English Syntax, in which he censures end-placed prepositions: it is not only a matter of order or custom, not even a matter of style or inelegance, P-stranding is bad, erroneous and improper – see (45).

(45) The Preposition is frequently separated from the Relative which it governs, and is placed after the Verb at the End of the Sentence; as whom do you dine with? for with whom do you dine? Is that the Book which I spoke of, for, of which I spoke? George is a Monarch whom his Subjects delight in, for, in whom his Subjects delight. This Form prevails in common Discourse, and in the familiar Style; but it is certainly more elegant to place the Preposition immediately before the Relative, especially in the solemn Style. “It is the God of the Universe whom we worship,
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*whom* there is none like *to*, and *whom* we live, move, and have our Being *in*.” Here the Inelegance of the Sentence is glaring: it ought to be *to whom* there is none like, and *in whom* we live, move &c. (Buchanan 1767: 98)

3.2.1.1 Exercises of bad English

As mentioned above, the label *bad* is attested at a notably high frequency amongst critical comments. This is mainly due to the popularity of the ‘exercises of bad English’, a pedagogical method in which pupils were given exercises of incorrect usage in order first to identify the ‘error’, the *bad* usage, and then to provide the ‘correct’, *good* usage. (They are also known as ‘lists of solecisms’, ‘promiscuous exercises’, ‘mistakes in English grammar’, ‘false syntax’, ‘improper grammar’.) Exercises of bad English became a staple in grammar books during the eighteenth century and well into the mid nineteenth century (see Görlach 2003). In the *ECEG* database, for instance, which consists of around 320 grammars, nearly one hundred items contain such exercises, mainly to do with syntax and spelling, but sometimes including punctuation and less frequently figurative language (see also Michael 1987: 326). This sort of exercises can be found already in the seventeenth century, but with a focus on errors of pronunciation rather than on ‘faulty’ syntax (Michael 1970: 196). As a teaching method applied to the English language and to syntax, they were introduced by Ann Fisher in her mid eighteenth-century grammar book (1750 [?1745]), modelled on the practice of Latin grammars and intended to serve ‘as tools of testing and developing the learner’s command of English’ (Sundby et al. 1991: 8). These exercises became extremely popular shortly after the publication of Fisher’s work, and towards the end of the century they had ‘reached a high level of sophistication’ (*ibid.*). In 1795 Lindley Murray could still argue that ‘a proper selection of faulty composition is more instructive to the young grammarian, than any rules and examples of propriety that can be given’ (1795: iv), and a year later the section ‘Of Verbal Criticism’ in John Knowles’ *Principles of English Grammar: with Exercises of False Construction* includes approximately 460 *improper* sentences presented in alphabetic order with the *proper* form displayed on the right-hand side of the page (1796: 65–79). The most common method of indicating the *bad* form was by means of italics or ‘crotchets’, as explained by Lewis Brittain in the preface to his grammar:

(46) Examples, *decently* chosen will help to explain each rule; and a few errors, as far as known rules may seem to guide, will be
rectified. The words supplied, to correct such errors, will
commonly be placed within a crotchet or parenthesis, thus: You
was (were) there. . . . But the faulty sentence should first be read
uninterruptedly, omitting the correction, within the crotchet;
and then repeated, supplying the corrected words, written in
*Italics*, by the right ones, written in Roman characters.

(Brittain 1788: A2[iii])

One recurrent feature of *bad* and *false* syntax was the construction with
end-placed prepositions, the implication being that the correct, better form
was a fronted preposition. In the precept data under study one can read-
ily trace authors who condemn P-stranding in the main text and then
resort to ‘lists of examples’ and ‘exercises of bad English’ in which the
pupil would be expected to correct the *bad/wrong/ungrammatical* stranded
preposition – for instance, in exercises of ‘bad English’ in George Ussher
(1785), John Hornsey (1793), Joshua Story (1793) and Benjamin Rhodes
(1795); exercises of ‘false syntax’ in James Buchanan (1767) and Lind-
ley Murray (1797); ‘promiscuous exercises’ in Alexander Murray (1787);
‘faulty passages’ in John Burn (1778); ‘errors to be corrected’ in Benjamin
Dearborn (1795); parsing exercises in Matthew Raine (1771); and a ‘criti-
cical examination’ in Hugh Blair (1783). Such was the popularity of this
pedagogical method that it may well have influenced contemporary adult
writers of this subperiod; that is, in terms of its effect on published writing
it may not be necessary to look a generation hence, for the time when
schoolchildren had learned the rules and were putting them into prac-
tice in their adult writings. Dearborn’s ‘error[s]’ in his section about the
‘just arrangement’ of the syntax of prepositions will serve here as a good
example:

(47) **Rule 2.** A preposition should not close a sentence which admits
of any other arrangement. . . .

*Examples of Errors in the use of the Preposition.* The words in
*italick* are to be corrected by the rules. By Rule 2. This rule I am
not much pleased *with*; for prepositions are very convenient to
close sentences *with*. It is a rule but few person will care *for*,
attend to, confide *in*, or lay any stress *on*. (Dearborn 1795: 117)

---

It should be acknowledged, too, that some writers criticised stranded prepositions in the main text
of the grammar but did not include examples of *bad* P-stranding in the exercises of *bad* English,
such as John Seally (1788).
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Table 3.4: *Dimensions of usage and associated labels (adapted from Card et al. 1984)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Labels in Card et al. 1984</th>
<th>Labels for P-stranding in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 History</td>
<td>obsolete, archaic, old-fashioned</td>
<td>obsolete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maturity</td>
<td>juvenile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Association</td>
<td>technical, argot, slang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Relationship to reader or hearer</td>
<td>colloquial, informal, jocular</td>
<td>style-familiar/conversation, style-solemn/writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Medium</td>
<td>writing, speech</td>
<td>genre-poetry, genre-prose style-familiar/conversation, style-solemn/writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Attitude</td>
<td>derogatory, offensive, crude/vulgar/restricted, euphemism</td>
<td>barbarous, censurable, corrupt, harsh, offensive, prosody, (vulgar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Territory</td>
<td>local/regional, eye dialect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Social Position</td>
<td>nonstandard, popular</td>
<td>(vulgar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Responsibility</td>
<td>decorum (careless, precise), literary</td>
<td>imprecise, improper, inaccurate, inelegant, (colloquial) bad, erroneous, ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Semantic nuances

As we can infer from the discussion in the previous section, there is no homogeneous set of attitudes towards P-stranding, not even within the negative precepts. Given the salience of the negative attitudes, this section looks more closely into the prescriptive labels documented and offers a complementary description of their semantic nuances. Card *et al.* argue that ‘*t*he label employed in a dictionary normally indicates the place the particular item has in the dimension with which the person interested in this item is most frequently concerned’ (1984: 58–9). The same premise is adopted here as far as the use of labels in other normative works is concerned. Table 3.4 lists the critic labels found in my data of eighteenth-century critic passages in relation to the nine dimensions and the associated labels proposed by Card *et al.* (1984: 59–67). As we can see, the epithets related to P-stranding are associated mainly with four dimensions of usage: Dimension 4 ‘Relationship to Reader and Hearer’, Dimension 5 ‘Medium’, Dimension 6 ‘Attitude’.

---

6 If we were to consider positive attitudes, the labels elegant, good, grammatical and precise would belong to Dimension 9 ‘Responsibility’, and the label harmonious to Dimension 6 ‘Attitude’.
Dimension 6 ‘Attitude’ and Dimension 9 ‘Responsibility’. Dimension 1 ‘History’ concerns only one peculiar use of P-stranding. Dimension 8 ‘Social Position’ also concerns just one use, with certain ambiguity. There are three dimensions to which P–stranding does not seem to be related: Dimension 2 ‘Maturity’, Dimension 3 ‘Association’ and Dimension 7 ‘Territory’.7

Dimension 9 ‘Responsibility’ is described by Card et al. as ‘possibly one of the most important dimensions of usage but one of the most difficult to measure’, as it deals with the general principle of decorum – ‘of conformity to the expectations that a particular situation creates’ (1984: 67). This is the most salient dimension in the data for stranded prepositions with labels such as bad, erroneous, imprecise, improper, inaccurate, inelegant and ungrammatical. Together they comprise fifty-four per cent of the negative tags in the precept data, which clearly suggests a strong link between the conceptualisation of P-stranding and the scale of responsibility.

In her study of Lindley Murray’s grammar (1795), Vorlat observes that ‘[m]ore than in other rules, the subjective element inherent in the prescriptive attitude comes to the fore in the rules that bear on aesthetics’, rules that usually ‘constitute a secondary criterion of grammaticality’ (1996: 176). The inelegance of an expression and the lack of dignity and strength are thus significant issues for grammar writers. Forms that did not meet the standards would be proscribed as ‘wanting in grace of form and manner, ungraceful; unrefined; clumsy; coarse; unpolished’ (see Wild 2010: 200), as John Hornsey (d. 1820) writes in A Short English Grammar in Two Parts: ‘The Preposition is frequently, but, at the same time, ungracefully separated from the relative which it governs, and joined to the verb at the end of the sentence, or of some member of it’ (1793: 100.n). In the eighteenth century, the term inelegant meant not only ‘not elegant’; it could also carry the stronger connotation ‘mean; despicable; contemptible’ (Johnson 1755: s.v. inelegant sense 2). References to the imprecision of a sentence when the preposition is stranded are very frequent, sometimes combined with references to inaccuracy; that is, the end position of prepositions results in a lack of clearness and in obscurity in the sense of the sentence. Precision was ‘the main criterion of good style in rhetoric of the time’ (Adamson 1999: 599–601), and it was also of vital importance for normative writers: ‘confronted with two syntactic variants they were bound to treat one as more precise, perspicuous, or pure than the other’ (Sundby 1986: 402).

---

7 On the application of Card et al.’s dimension analysis to double comparatives, see González-Díaz (2008).
Imprecision and inaccuracy can be avoided through word order by placing the preposition in front of the governed element, as Hugh Blair explains in passage (48). (This topic is further discussed in Section 5.5.3.)

(48) The same holds in melody, that I observed to take place with respect to significancy; that a falling off at the end, always hurts greatly. For this reason, particles, pronouns, and little words, are as ungracious to the ear, at the conclusion, as I formerly shewed they were inconsistent with strength of expression. It is more than probable, that the sense and the sound have here a mutual influence on each other. That which hurts the ear, seems to mar the strength of the meaning; and that which really degrades the sense, in consequence of this primary effect, appears also to have a bad sound. How disagreeable is the following sentence of an Author, speaking of the Trinity! “It is a mystery which we firmly believe the truth of, and humbly adore the depth of.” And how easily could it have been mended by this transposition! “It is a mystery, the truth of which we firmly believe, and the depth of which we humbly adore.” In general, it seems to hold, that a musical close, in our language, requires either the last syllable, or the penult, that is, the last but one, to be a long syllable.

(Blair 1783: I.xiii.309–10)

The definitions in Johnson’s (1755) dictionary give an indication of the semantic relation between imprecision and inaccuracy, as well as the similarities to the label improper: s.v. precisely ‘exactly; nicely; accurately’ (sense 1); s.v. accurate ‘exact, without defect or failure’ (sense 1); s.v. improper ‘not just; not accurate’ (sense 3). Improper is generally ‘one of the basic terms used by the eighteenth-century grammarians’ (Sundby et al. 1991: 40) and features very frequently in the criticism of linguistic features, such as double comparatives (González-Díaz 2008: 295); but when it comes to stranded prepositions it only represents five per cent of the prescriptive comments in my data. Given the vagueness of the term (Vorlat 1996: 166), the impropriety of the end position of prepositions may well have been expressed by other terms such as erroneous. Besides, in the passages on P-stranding, the emphasis of ‘propriety’ seems to be on the proper place of the preposition with P-piping, often prescribing P-piping as ‘more proper’ or ‘a propriety’ rather than proscribing P-stranding. See Thomas Coar’s passage for an example:
The preposition should always precede the relative pronoun which it governs, as _To whom does it belong? With whom does he go? To whom dost thou speak?_ and not, _whom dost thou speak to?_ [note*] This latter way is used in common conversation, but the placing of the preposition before the relative is more proper and clear. (Coar 1796: 179)

A number of precepts on P-stranding can be associated with Dimension 6 ‘Attitude’, that is, attitudes ‘on the part of the speaker or hearer or both’ (Card _et al._ 1984: 64), and attitudes which respond to ‘strongly critical judgments that might have earned them the name of “proscriptive labels”’ (Sundby _et al._ 1991: 42). The term _offensive_ is used to describe the hearer’s or reader’s resentment at a particular linguistic form, as inferred from Johnson’s definition (1755: sense 1, ‘causing anger; displeasing; disgusting’; see Card _et al._ 1984: 64). The labels _barbarous_ and _corrupt_ are charged with a moral value on the part of the speaker, expressing a ‘bluntness of attitude’ (e.g., ‘ignorant’ in Johnson s.v. _barbarous_ sense 2; ‘without integrity’ s.v. _corrupt_). The label _censurable_ falls into this group too, since it is the speaker’s attitude that determines what is censured and to what extent. These terms, with such a strongly negative attitude, are rare in my data overall. Strongly attitudinal yet higher in frequency are the labels _harsh_ and more generally _prosody_. As with _offensive_, there is some kind of resentment on the part of the hearer: a certain form or construction ‘sounds’ _harsh_, it is ‘rough to the ear’, it is ‘unpleasing’ or ‘rigorous’ (Johnson 1755: s.v. _harsh_, sense 2 and 5). As Blair claimed, the construction with P-stranding is ‘injurious to melody’ and the expression is ‘enfeebling and degrading’ (1784: 100, 1783: I.xii.285). This is again a matter of aesthetic refinement, applied to spoken and written language.

The dimension ‘Attitude’ in Card _et al._’s classification also includes the label _vulgar_. The connotation of the term can be ambiguous, since it underwent semantic change during the period that we are concerned with here. Wild (2010: 155) explains that there are two relevant senses: the sense ‘coarse, unrefined’ (OED s.v. _vulgar_ II.13.d) or ‘mean; low’ in Johnson’s definition (1755: sense 2); and the sense ‘commonly or customarily used by the people of a country; ordinary, vernacular’, which is nowadays ‘archaic’ (OED s.v. _vulgar_ I.3.a). Etymologically the latter sense had a neutral connotation, but in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the language of ‘the common people’, meaning ‘the low social ranks’, was often despised. That is clearly the connotation in Mrs. Eves’ dialogue with
a young pupil who found it hard to learn grammar: ‘Every well educated person is a good grammarian; people will judge of your abilities in other respects by the purity of your language. Would you like to be thought of a vulgar untaught young lady; inferior to all your friends and companions?’ (Eves 1800: xi). Whereas the meaning ‘coarse’ is associated with Dimension 6 ‘Attitude’, the meaning ‘common, low’ is associated with Dimension 8 ‘Social Position’, which describes social differences amongst speakers. In the precept data of P-stranding, there is only one comment assigned with the label vulgar, from a passage in Joshua Story’s grammar (1783: 47, 47n). Given that this is the only explicit criticism of P-stranding as vulgar and that the term appears in the same passage as barbarisms and ungrammatical, it seems safe to conclude that as far as this construction is concerned vulgar is not related to social downgrading, as was clearly the case, for instance, with double comparatives (González-Díaz 2008). Besides, there are no instances of criticism of the form as a nonstandard feature elsewhere in my precept data, and neither is it advocated as a politeness marker (cp. the inflected subjunctive in Auer 2004: 27–8).

Dimension 4 ‘Relationship to reader or hearer’ and Dimension 5 ‘Medium’ are closely related in the study of P-stranding. Dimension 4 refers to the ‘several shades of formality, depending on the subject matter, the number of people participating, and the degree to which the participants know each other’ (Card et al. 1984: 63); the related labels are familiar, colloquial or informal versus solemn or formal. Dimension 5 shows differences of usage in speech versus writing (1984: 64), the related labels being conversation or spoken language versus writing. Johnson (1755) defines familiar as ‘not formal; easy in conversation’ (sense 2) and solemn as ‘striking with seriousness’ (sense 3), ‘grave; affectedly serious’ (sense 4); the link with the term formal becomes evident in the definition, too, as ‘ceremonious; solemn; precise; exact to affectation’ (s.v. formal sense 1). The passages on stranded prepositions often combine both the level of formality and the medium in expressions such as ‘in the familiar style of writing’. Vorlat also observes the unsystematic treatment of setting and medium in Lindley Murray’s (1795) grammar, but likewise highlights the grammarian’s ‘considerable awareness’ of subtle differences which ‘all affect the grammaticality of certain instances of language use’ (1996: 178). In my labelling system, the two parameters have been combined as style-familiar/conversation versus style-solemn/writing. Together they total approximately sixty comments, fifty of which are proscriptive. The following quotations from Robert Lowth (1762) and George Ussher (1785) illustrate these two dimensions:
The Preposition is often separated from the Relative which it governs, and joined to the Verb at the end of the Sentence, or of some member of it: as, “Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with.” “The world is too well bred to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of.” This is an Idiom, which our language is strongly inclined to; it prevails in common conversation, and suits very well with the familiar style in writing; but the placing of a Preposition before the Relative is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous; and agrees much better with the solemn and elevated Style. (Lowth 1762: 127–8).

Prepositions may be placed either before the relative they govern, or after the Verb which they belong to, or the Adjective which they connect to the relative; as, What can this be good for? or, For what can this be good? Whom did people laugh at? or, At whom did people laugh? Whom shall I give this to? or, To whom shall I give this? In compositions of a grave kind the Preposition is generally placed before the relative, but in conversation and writings of a familiar turn it may follow the Verb. (Ussher 1785: 80)

The term familiar was often used with a neutral connotation to refer to informal usage or ‘common, frequent’ use (Johnson 1755 s.v. familiar sense 6), but given that the focus during the second half of the eighteenth century was on a standard for written prose, informal language soon came to be regarded as inappropriate and the term began to be used in a pejorative way. Noah Webster, for instance, gives ‘a specifically stylistic sense of the word’ and equates ‘informality with inelegance’ (Wild 2010: 196–7), when he states: ‘Grammarians seem to allow of this mode of expression in conversation and familiar writings; but it is generally inelegant, and in the grave and sublime styles, is certainly inadmissible’ (Webster 1784: 79).

The term colloquial also underwent semantic change during this crucial period of prescriptivism, acquiring a more derogatory connotation. Originally, colloquial was used in a similar way to familiar and informal to refer to casual speech forms, contrasted with writing, as Straaijer notes in Priestley’s grammar (2011: 198). The term did not convey a negative connotation and ‘did not mean that forms so labeled were inferior to those unlabeled’ (Card et al. 1984: 63). Colloquial forms were occasionally used, too, to indicate ‘cultural level (substandard language)’, and eventually the term colloquial was ‘misunderstood’ as ‘low’ rather than ‘spoken’ (Wild 2010: 155). It seems that this derogative connotation emerged from Samuel
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Johnson (1709–84), who also used *colloquial* ‘to refer to illogical, unetymological, and imprecise senses’, and who aimed to ‘clear [the language] from colloquial barbarisms’ (Wild 2010: 195). In eighteenth-century discussions of stranded prepositions the preferred term is *familiar*, as in (50) above. The reference to *colloquial* meaning ‘low’ is found, for instance, in Benjamin H. Smart’s criticism of P-stranding in the nineteenth century: he argues that ‘a polysyllable is preferable in any style “at all raised above the colloquial”’ (Smart 1848: 39, quoted in Wild 2010: 155). In my labelling system, references to P-stranding as *familiar*, *informal* and *colloquial* are coded as *style-familiar/conversation*; the two tokens coded with the tag *colloquial* in Table 3.3 are taken literally from DENG for Philip Withers’ description of P-stranding as a ‘careless’ expression (1790: 389); in Card *et al.*’s (1984) system this connotation would rather fall into Dimension 9 ‘Responsibility’.

A final note regarding Dimension 5 ‘Medium’. In addition to the subtle distinction between speech and writing, the discussion of P-stranding often touches on the distinction between poetry and prose, coded in the precept database as *genre-poetry* and *genre-prose*. Words and constructions were often ‘transposed’ for aesthetic, prosodic or metrical purposes. In the case of transposed (i.e., stranded) prepositions, precept authors tend to allow the usage in poetry but not in prose, and only under certain circumstances, as explained in Daniel Farro’s passage (52) (this matter will be discussed further in Section 5.5.3.1).

(52) Particles of the second Sort are frequently transplaced; as, *Whom do you dine with?* for, *With whom do you dine?* *What city came you from?* *From what city &c. came you?* . . . And further; One Thing ought to be observed, which is, that the best and clearest Writers have the fewest Transpositions in their Discourses; and, that they are more allowable in Poetry than in Prose; because it is generally sweeter, and more agreeable to the Ear.

(Farro 1754a: 334–5)

Dimension 1 ‘History’ is ‘related to the development of the language’ (Card *et al.* 1984: 59–60), the prototypical labels being *obsolete, archaic* and *old-fashioned*. P-stranding is clearly not an archaic construction, except for the use of one particular preposition, namely *withal*. According to the *OED*, this is ‘properly two words, originally with al(le)’, of which the spelling

---

8 Oldireva Gustafsson (2002: 190–1) noticed similar trends with regard to spelling variants in preterite and past participle verb forms.
withall ‘continued till nearly 1800’ (s.v. withal etymology). The OED adds the relevant remark that withal ‘substituted for with prep. in postposition’ (s.v. withal prep. B.a). This observation is also made by Blake in his study of Shakespeare’s language, where he describes withal as one of the prepositions which ‘regularly come at the end’ of the clause, and more specifically as ‘an emphatic form of with used when the preposition follows the noun group, often at the end of a relative clause’ (2002: 178; see also Schneider 1992: 445). The OED notes, too, that withal appears ‘esp[ecially] at the end of a relative clause’, with the relative expressed or not expressed, as is frequently the case in infinitive constructions, e.g., ‘a rod to be beaten withal = a rod with which to be beaten’ (OED s.v. withal prep. B.a). All instances of withal in my usage corpora are stranded prepositions, and they appear in either relative or infinitive clauses (1500–1900). Eighteenth-century grammarians also draw attention to this peculiarity. In the early part of the century, William Turner (d. 1727?) mentions that the preposition with ‘may have all added to it’ when it is ‘transplaced’, that is stranded, as in: ‘The Sword, which he is girded withal’ (1710: 41). Michael Maittaire (1712: 182) builds on Turner’s observation, claiming that ‘the Particle withal, taken as one word, when it is a Preposition (p. 126.), ever goes at a distance from the Article Relative’, for which he gives the example ‘the girdle, that he is always girded withal’ and adds other alternatives that have with in front position: ‘with which or wherewith he is girded’. Later in the century, James Buchanan makes a succinct remark about the ‘right’ use of withal for with, the use of withal as an adverb, and the improper use of withal at the time of writing (1767), implying that the usage is obsolete (see passage (53)). That withal is considered obsolete in the mid eighteenth century is borne out in my usage data: there is only one instance after 1700, and that dates from 1706, here quoted in (54).

(53) [note*] I’ll tell you who Time ambles withal, &c. With, in my Opinion, is understood throughout this Sentence – right, thus; I’ll tell you with whom Time ambles withal, with whom he trots withal, with whom Time gallops withal, and with whom he stands still withal. I pray thee, with whom doth he trot withal? Withal, I think, is not put for with here; but in the first three Members signifies along or likewise; and in the fourth Member likewise, as, likewise with whom he (Time) stands still. But if I be mistaken, then with is superfluous. Withal, ’tis true, is used by some Writers where we now use with, but improperly.

(Buchanan 1767: 139.n, my emphasis)
(54) A Vow, Sir, that her own Honour, and your Carriage oblige her to dispense withal. (1706estc.d3b)

The last dimension to discuss is Dimension 7 ‘Territory’, which represents ‘local and regional usage’ of English (Card et al. 1984: 65–6). As indicated in Table 3.4, there is no explicit comment on P-stranding as ‘dialectal’, ‘provincial’, ‘Scotticism’ or ‘Irishism’; neither is it classified in these terms in Sundby et al. (1991: 426–8). Yáñez-Bouza (2011c) observes that a number of the precept writers that were born or lived in northern England showed negative attitudes towards this usage and rarely made positive comments, such as John Binns (1788) and John Hornsey (1793). It is also observed in that study that Scottish authors were substantially more prescriptive than English-born authors, both in quantity and quality. Nonetheless, they did not brand P-stranding as a salient regional feature. There is indeed mention of P-stranding as an idiomatic construction, but the criticism lies primarily in the mismatch with Latin rules rather than in its being a provincial or Scottish feature. For instance, in his Philosophy of Rhetoric the Scot George Campbell defines standard usage as ‘reputable, national, and present’ (1776: I.366), where the implication of national excludes both foreign and provincial use, including Scotticisms. The fact that Campbell discusses P-stranding at length but makes no criticism in these terms suggests that P-stranding was not a notorious provincial feature; Campbell, rather, defends the use of stranded prepositions in opposition to the pompous and ‘unanimated’ Latinate construction with fronted prepositions (see passage (38) above).9

3.3 Prescriptive repertoire

The previous sections have given evidence of the variety of strictures on P-stranding in terms of attitudes and semantic labels. While there is variety, there is also a good deal of sharing and repetition. In Watts’ view, eighteenth-century grammar writers constitute a ‘discourse community’: consciously or unconsciously, they have ‘common interests, goals and beliefs’ and their ‘oral and written discourse practices’ show a notable ‘degree of institutionalisation’ (Watts 2008: 41). Codifiers have a common

9 Studies on PDE dialects of British English have likewise concluded that P-stranding is not significantly frequent in any region in particular (e.g., Shorrocks 1982; Hermann 2003; Szmrecsanyi 2013). However, it is interesting to note that in the Freiburg Corpus of English Dialects the use of stranded prepositions is ‘particularly frequent in Scotland and northern England’ (Szmrecsanyi 2013: 47). It remains to be tested whether this was the case too in the eighteenth century, which might have raised awareness in Scottish and English northern authors.
enterprise and they are ‘commonly engaged’ in establishing the norms of standard English (2008: 54). Finegan had portrayed the codification of English as falling into the hands of ‘independent entrepreneurs’, of writers ‘operating in a market-place unfettered by guidelines, unsanctioned by imprimatur, and unencumbered by official meddling’ (1998: 540). While many authors acted independently and publishers saw grammar production as a source of commodity and private enterprises (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006b: 242), geographical or temporal proximity is not a prerequisite for constituting a community (Wenger 1998: 74, quoted in Watts 2008: 43).

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there was a fine line between sharing a common repertoire and plagiarism. From the modern perspective, eighteenth-century authors are often seen as blatant plagiarists, frequently copying passages verbatim ‘without any mention of their sources’ (Vorlat 1959: 125); at the time, unacknowledged borrowing was viewed ‘with less censure than today’ (ibid.). The OED nowadays defines plagiarism as ‘[t]he action or practice of taking someone else’s work, idea, etc., and passing it off as one’s own’, especially ‘literary theft’ (OED s.v. plagiarism 1a). The original meaning in the seventeenth century was that of ‘kidnapping, abduction’ (OED s.v. plagiary B.4†); see, for instance, Thomas Blount’s Glossographia (1656 s.v. plagiary). But as early as the mid seventeenth century Edward Phillips (1658) included both meanings in his dictionary: ‘he that steals people out of one countrey, and sells them into another; also a stealer of other men’s works, or writings’ (s.v. plagiary). According to Tieken-Boon van Ostade (1996: 86–7), the concept of plagiarism underwent change during the eighteenth century so that the connotation of theft gradually became the primary meaning, and by the end of the century, authors such as Lindley Murray (1795) were severely criticised for not acknowledging – or inappropriately acknowledging – their sources. Copying from other people’s works was common practice in lexicography: ‘lexicography progressed by plagiarism’, said Starnes and Noyes, so that ‘the best lexicographer was often the most discriminating plagiarist’ (1991: 183). Likewise, in grammar writing the ‘interdependence of grammars and the force of tradition’ raised the danger of plagiarism (Sundby et al. 1991: 13). Smith (1998: 435) argues that copying was ‘the rule rather than the exception’ because ‘the prime moving force’ in grammar writing was not to develop new rules or theories, but rather ‘new, better, and simpler methods of teaching the basic principles’; in other words, ‘the rules of grammar were a given factor’, and, as in lexicography, the best grammarian would be the best compiler of earlier works ‘making the best use of the most up to date conceptions of the rules’.
Indeed, many grammar writers presented their works as compilations, with some name-dropping in the preface in order to confer authority on their work: ‘a grammar by any known name will smell as sweet and sell as well’ (Smith 1998: 439). This was sufficient acknowledgement in the eyes of some authors, including Joseph Priestley (1761a), Lady Fenn (1798a) and Lindley Murray (1795), who resorted to mentioning writers ‘in general terms’ rather than cluttering the grammar with superfluous references (Murray 1798: 6–7). In Tieken-Boon van Oostade’s view, Murray and others who acknowledged their sources in that way were acting ‘in good faith’ (1996: 83, 89; also Navest 2008: 233–4). Samuel Johnson had also been defensive about the charge of plagiarism; in his view, although plagiarism was ‘one of the most reproachful’ crimes, it was ‘not the most atrocious of literary crimes’ (1753, Adventurer no. 95).

The study of plagiarism and borrowing can help to shed light on which grammars were popular and influential, which authors were regarded as authorities, and also – though more speculatively – which authors were personally acquainted with one another. For instance, Navest (2008: 238–9) speculates that Lady Fenn and Henry St. John Bullen might have known each other, and it has also been noted in Section 3.1 that female grammarians would mention Lowth’s and Murray’s grammars in order to add credibility to their work. Meanwhile, analysis of the passages on P-stranding provides abundant evidence of the practice of borrowing from other works as far back as the late sixteenth century, in both grammar books and treatises of rhetoric, sometimes verbatim, sometimes slightly reworded. We will see more examples of these in Chapter 5. In this section I reflect on the type of copying that Michael labels ‘customary appropriation’, that is, the borrowing of examples and quotations that illustrate the rules of grammar (Michael 1970: 316, also 311–12).

### 3.3.1 Illustrative quotations

Sundby et al. (1991: 8–9) distinguish two main groups of illustrative quotations: ‘quotations’ (type 1), which ‘reproduce, or were intended to reproduce, the texts from which the grammarians drew their examples’, and ‘non-quotations’ (type 2), which are not marked by quotation marks or for which a reference to the original source is not provided. Type 1 ‘quotations’ can be either ‘authentic’ (1a) or ‘corrupt’ (1b), if the grammarian makes use of a literary source but marks errors of his own. For their part, type 2 ‘non-quotations’ can be ‘authentic’ (2a) or ‘made-up’ (2b), these often being
difficult to distinguish. In her study of Robert Lowth’s grammar, Tieken-Boon van Ostade (1990) builds on this and proposes a classification into four categories:

(a) examples that have obviously been made up by the author; (b) examples that have been translated from those traditionally found in Latin grammars; (c) examples that have been copied, or translated from grammars published previously; and (d) examples that are quotations, (1) literary, (2) biblical, (3) sayings, maxims, proverbs. (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1990: 483)

An in-depth analysis of the origin of the illustrative quotations with P-stranding in the precept data goes beyond the scope of my investigation. Here I have examined the prepositional verbs cited in the passages documented. With regard to made-up quotations (DENG’s type 2b, Tieken-Boon van Ostade’s type (a)), my analysis has identified a number of combinations which look original, or at least are original in my data in that they are only mentioned in one work. For instance, proud of, sensible of, amount to, minister to, object to and baptised with are only found in James Elphinston (1765), and bargain for, hear from, hear of; sit on, talk to and view with are only found in William Ward (1765). John Fell (1784), in particular, seems to have made an effort to provide a large number of original examples in his late eighteenth-century grammar, many of which I have not come across elsewhere, including point at, hope for, speak for, believe in, prevailed upon, seize upon, contend with and deal with. Tieken-Boon van Ostade’s group (b) on Latin grammars is represented in a large number of passages with the prepositional verb speak of, which could have been translated from Christopher Cooper’s illustrative example in Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae: ‘The man, whom I spake of; vel elliptice, the man I spake of is dead; homo de quo locutus sui, mortuus est’ (1685: 177). Examples of category (c), taken from previously published works, are abundant. From Guy Miège’s English Grammar in the seventeenth century (1688), we can trace the combination speak to in Turner (1710), Lowth (1762) and Raine (1771); be indebted to in Coote (1788) and Murray (1795); and dine with and come from in Greenwood (1711), from which grammar they were borrowed throughout the century: ‘Who did you Dine with?, ‘What Place do you come from?’ (see Section 5.5.3.1). Examples with give to, be good for and tell of date back to Joshua Poole’s English Accidence published in 1646;

10 Speak of is also found in William Bullokar’s earlier grammar, written in English (1586: 47). Naturally, unless William Bullokar or Christopher Cooper is explicitly acknowledged, it is impossible to say on which grammar the eighteenth-century passage was based.
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give to was also popularised by James Greenwood (1711). Other combinations frequently given in illustrative examples include talk of (Kirkby 1746; Fisher 1753; Fleming 1766), belong to (Buchanan 1767; Story 1793; Brittain 1788), delight with (Lowth 1762; Bayly 1772; Devis 1777; Bullen 1797), and please with (Priestley 1761a; Raine 1771; Devis 1777; Bullen 1797). Many combinations are in fact semantically related: delighted with – pleased with; delighted with – delighted in; talk with – converse with – speak with; talk to – speak to; speak of – talk of – tell of; depend on – rely on; ask for – inquire for; tell of – say of – speak of; go with – ride with – travel with – walk with; dine with – sup with; live with – lodge with; be good for – is for; etc. Occasionally, the illustrative quotation appears first in relation to features such as pronominal case with no comment on preposition placement, and is subsequently taken up by a grammar writer who draws attention to the variation between P-stranding and P-piping. For instance, Lowth’s (1762) citation from John Locke’s belong to comments on the wrong use of who instead of whom after prepositions; Buchanan (1767) then quotes this same example in order to point out both the ungrammatical case of who and the improper use of the stranded preposition. The same applies to the quotation with serve under from Shakespeare, first documented in Lowth (1763), and to the example of in love with from Joseph Addison, not criticised in Lowth (1763) or in Priestley (1768) but drawn attention to by Wood (1777). In another instance, ride upon is not discussed by Ash (1761) or Shaw (1785) with regard to P-stranding, but is mentioned in this respect in Coote (1788).

Authentic literary quotations are in general scarce; for the most part ‘quotations are presented without indication of source’, as Sundby et al. (1991: 35) pointed out. Table 3.5 lists the few sources I have been able to identify in my data, and the passage in (55) illustrates overt criticism of Joseph Addison’s end-placed prepositions.

(55) A Stock of Goods ON Hand is properly contrasted by – a Stock of Goods OFF Hand; hence f and f are proper after the Word DISPOSE, if proper with any Word in our Language – to dispose OFF – that is, to put off. Yet Mr Addison wrote, Our great Modellers of Gardens have their Magazines of Plants to dispose OF. And I call upon Mr Tooke to produce an Instance where Off may not be exchanged for – of – with equal Propriety.

It may be deemed Presumption to arraign the Style of Addison, yet I must caution you against separating the “Preposition” and
it’s Object. Even when there is an Ellipsis of a “Noun” or whole Sentence it may be frequently avoided. v.g. He was thrown, when riding, is better than – he was thrown OFF when riding. Modellers of Gardens must SELL their Magazines of Plants, or DISPOSE of their Magazines of Plants, is as much superior to Modellers have their Magazines of Plants to DISPOSE of – as Analogy and Nature are superior to DISTORTION. (Withers 1789: 390–1)

Only ten per cent of the precept writers examined acknowledge quotations, and these concern just ten different sources: seven literary authors, one citation from the Bible, one Italian proverb, and one periodical. Consistency was not always achieved: for example, the quotations from Joseph Addison (1672–1719) and the Spectator, the periodical which he and Richard Steele (1672–1729) ran from 1711 to 1712, are sometimes ascribed to Addison and sometimes to the periodical. Following the criterion adopted in DENG, ‘if a quotation is attributed to the Spectator by one grammarian and to Addison by another grammarian, it is marked accordingly’. Some of the acknowledged quotations in my data are among the most frequent sources cited in DENG too, including David Hume (1711–76), Alexander

---

Table 3.5: Authentic quotations in the precept data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>Blair (1783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>Withers (1789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Carter (1773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Coote (1788)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Fenning (1771)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Maittaire (1712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Priestley (1768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian proverb</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Turner (1710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke, Hervey, Shakespeare</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>Mennye (1785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>neutral, critic</td>
<td>Lowth (1762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>Lowth (1762)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare, Locke</td>
<td>critic</td>
<td>Buchanan (1767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare, Locke</td>
<td>neutral, critic</td>
<td>Brittain (1788)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>advocate, neutral, critic</td>
<td>Campbell (1776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>advocate, neutral, critic</td>
<td>Carter (1773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>Walker (1781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>neutral, critic</td>
<td>Burn (1778)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 Cf. the quotation ‘It’s not me who you are in love with’, attributed to the Spectator No 290 in Lowth’s grammar (1763: 81.15) but to Addison in Priestley’s (1768: 104).
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Pope (1688–1744), William Shakespeare (1564–1616), John Locke (1632–1709) and Anthony Ashley Cooper Shaftesbury (1671–1713). According to Raybould (1998: 191), Locke and Pope are frequent stranders; it seems that eighteenth-century authors all picked this up. Other frequent users of stranded prepositions such as George Berkeley (1685–1753), Thomas Gray (1716–71) and Horace Walpole (1717–97), however, are not censured in my sources (cf. Raybould 1998: 191). John Dryden (1631–1700) and Edward Gibbon (1737–94) are well known for their aversion to end-placed prepositions; they are not cited in my data on P-stranding. Dryden self-edited end-placed prepositions in his works, and Gibbon is said to have been so ‘overpowered by the notions of correctness derived from Latin standards’ that he ‘kept on the safe side’ and even avoided placing adverbs at the end of a clause for fear of making the mistake (Fowler 1965: 473–5, Raybould 1998: 191). According to DENG, the Bible was often subject to criticism in their data, but, as noted above, it is only acknowledged once in my sources, and with particular reference to the obsolete use of withal (see Section 3.2.2). The author most often criticised in DENG, Jonathan Swift (1667–1745), is not listed in my data either.

In addition to ‘overt authentic quotations’, the precept database of P-stranding also contains instances of ‘covert authentic quotations’, that is, quotations which are not explicitly acknowledged but where the source can easily be traced to the original text, either because it is well known or because it has been identified in some other work, from which it has probably been borrowed (Sundby et al. 1991: 9). For instance, Shakespeare’s ‘Who servest thou under?’ and ‘I’ll tell you who Time ambles withal, who Time trots withal, who Time gallops withal, and who he stands still withal’ are repeatedly cited in many works, but the playwright himself is acknowledged only three times. The same happens with Locke’s ‘We are still much at a loss, who Civil Power belongs to’, and Pope’s ‘The world is too well bred to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of’.

Another relevant observation is that these literary sources do not necessarily represent contemporary language use, but rather they represent an earlier period. The two early eighteenth-century works listed in Table 3.5, William Turner (1710) and Michael Maittaire (1712), quote from old sources: an Italian proverb and the Bible. All the other works belong to the second half of the eighteenth century, but the authors and the periodical in question date from the late sixteenth century to the early eighteenth century, with only one author alive after the 1760s. This also seems to be the general practice with other grammatical features, as observed in
previous studies on the use of *shall/will*, auxiliary *do*, double negation, relative markers and the inflected subjunctive (see Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1990; Wright 1994; Auer 2004). However, there are also some exceptions to this general trend. Priestley explains in the preface to his grammar that he prefers to quote from contemporary writers rather than from classical sources because his aim is to describe contemporary usage (1768 [1761]: xi–xiv). Tieken-Boon van Ostade (1990: 487–8) observes that in the particular case of auxiliary *do*, Peter W. Fogg (1765–1824) in *Elementa Anglicana* (1792–6) is ‘apparently exceptional’ because he cites authors from the second half of the eighteenth century, such as John Mason (1706–63), John Wesley (1733–91) and Joseph Priestley (1733–1804). Nevertheless, Fogg’s work was published in the 1790s, so in fact he still follows the custom of using language from some fifty years earlier. A peculiar case in the data on P-stranding is Henry St. John Bullen (1772/3–1836), assistant master at the Grammar School in Bury St. Edmund’s. In *The Rudiments of English Grammar* (1797) Bullen overtly criticises end-placed prepositions as ‘a most inelegant construction’ and justifies this judgement with reference to a contemporary, the renowned rhetorician Hugh Blair (1718–1800), Church of Scotland minister and university professor. Bullen then adds a subtle remark to point out Blair’s own fault of ending sentences with prepositions, which Bullen himself takes great care to avoid in the same passage by fronting the preposition (‘to which the idiom of our Language seems strongly addicted’). As we can see in (56), Bullen’s comment is especially interesting not only because of the reference to a contemporary author, but also because Blair was strongly critical of stranded prepositions in his treatises on rhetoric (see Section 3.1 and Section 5.5.3).

(56) This is a most inelegant construction, to which the idiom of our Language seems strongly addicted; for the correct Blair himself (p. 305) gives a positive caution against setting the Preposition at the end of the sentence, and (p. 313) he without ceremony breaks his own rule – What shall we say? “Monitor tu monitoris eges,” or, “Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.” (Bullen 1797: 132)

Another peculiar case can be found in John Hornsey’s *A Short English Grammar* (1793). Hornsey, a schoolmaster at Scarborough, borrows the criticism on ‘the wrong position of a preposition’ from Blair’s treatises, quoting, as does Blair, illustrative examples from Joseph Addison. In addition, Hornsey also borrows from Lowth’s discussion, but playfully replaces the original name in Lowth’s illustrative quotation – Horace – with Blair’s name:
The wrong position of a preposition*. – “Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of.” It is a great deal better to say, “Avarice is a crime of which wise men are guilty.” [note*] The preposition is frequently, but, at the same time, ungracefully separated from the relative which it governs, and joined to the verb at the end of the sentence, or of some member of it; as, “Blair is an author whom I am much delighted with.” “Jesus is a king whom Christian soldiers fight for.” But to place the preposition before the relative is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous, and agrees much better with the solemn and lofty style; thus, “Blair is an author with whom I am much delighted.” “Jesus is a king for whom Christian soldiers fight.” (Hornsey 1793: 100–1)

3.4 Nineteenth-century context

While a close examination of attitudes towards P-stranding in the nineteenth century goes beyond the scope of this monograph, some background knowledge is needed for a better contextualisation of the usage trends examined in Chapter 4. This section will outline the trends of the normative tradition in the nineteenth century in general, complemented by a few illustrative quotations of attitudes towards end-placed prepositions. The following studies provide further background on the normative tradition during the nineteenth century. Michael (1991, 1997) focuses on the ‘hyperactive’ production of grammar. Aarsleff (1967), Leitner (1986b) and Crowley (1991, 1996) explore the history of grammaticology and the theory of language thought. Finegan (1998: 540–77) offers an account of the changing trends along the descriptive–prescriptive continuum. Bailey (1996), görlich (1999) and Mugglestone (2006) discuss the normative tradition as part of their approach to nineteenth-century language usage. Nist (1966: 102–29) and Baugh and Cable (2002: 296–350) offer a textbook account, albeit couched in the old, nonempirical view of prescriptivism. Case studies of linguistic variation and change, though not all related to prescriptivism, can be found in Kytö et al. (2006), based on the Corpus of Nineteenth-Century English. On the relation between precept and usage, Dekeyser (1975) presents a comprehensive study regarding number and case relations, Facchinetti (2000) looks into shall versus will, and Anderwald’s recent work on verb-related constructions offers an insightful analysis of language usage and precept in relation to internal linguistic change phenomena, such as the S-curve, speed of change and salience (see for instance...

3.4.1 Attitudes to grammar writing

It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that the second half of the eighteenth century witnessed a dramatic increase in book production in general, and in grammar production in particular. The number of English grammars published during the nineteenth century is even more ‘astonishing’, with peaks in the 1800s, 1840s and 1850s (Michael 1997: 23). If language became a social weapon in the eighteenth century, especially for the rising middle classes, in the nineteenth century knowledge of grammar was not only a tool for social advancement but also a political weapon, and a gateway to learning (Crowley 1996: 78–9). This is apparent in the grammar written by William Cobbett (1762–1835) at the start of the period. For Cobbett, grammar in itself is insignificant, but is necessary and useful to fight against social and political oppression; linguistic education of the labouring classes is ‘a means to their liberation and eventual enfranchisement’ (Beal 2004: 94). Cobbett’s grammar is intended ‘for the Use of Schools and of Young Persons in general; but, more especially for the Use of Soldiers, Sailors, Apprentices and Plough-boys’ (1823 [1818]: title-page). Later in the century, Henry Alford (1810–71) portrays the link between linguistic purity and national purity with the metaphor of the Queen’s English: ‘The national mind is reflected in the national speech’ (1864: 5). Although described as usage which is ‘the general property of our country’, it is usage that must be governed; it is, in Crowley’s words, ‘prescription in the guise of description’ (1991: 172, see 171–80). Late Modern English grammars also convey a close link between language usage and morality. Bailey (1996: 10) notes that ‘schoolteaching was driven by high moral purpose’, with religious themes pervading the reading texts, illustrative examples and exercises of bad English, mainly because many schoolteachers and grammarians were members of the clergy (20% in the ECEG database). Language becomes ‘a moral barometer’ and the history of language is to be seen as the moral history of the nation, in Richard Trench’s (1807–86) view. Learning and virtue are thus intertwined in nineteenth-century normative books, with the implicit message that the speech of the lower classes (who lack education) is guilty of linguistic and moral faults (see Aarsleff 1967: 240–1, Finegan 1998: 552–3).

The nineteenth century epitomises the descriptive–prescriptive continuum, the age of a ‘continual alternating between descriptivism and
prescriptivism’ (Dekeyser 1975: 34). Dekeyser fairly summarises the context thus:

The 19th century may be characterized as the age in which purism grew to unprecedented proportions. It is also the age in which the fallacious notions about language, inherited from the previous centuries, were very gradually replaced by an English philology that was grounded on a scientific basis... the transition from old to new, from amateurism to linguistic professionalism, produced, in the long run, some beneficial effects in the field of grammar books and other critical works about language and correctness. (Dekeyser 1975: 24)

On the one hand, the prescriptive and proscriptive attitudes towards grammatical correctness and propriety that had developed in the late eighteenth century ‘hardened into ideology’ during the nineteenth century: the feeling is now that ‘everyone ought to consult’ grammars and dictionaries (Bailey 1996: 215, 3). As in the previous century, correct and proper usage is a matter of major importance in the nineteenth century, fuelled by an increasing number of grammars. It becomes an obsession for educated people, whose leisure time will be taken up in worrying about language; as Bailey explains, ‘[u]sing standard forms of the language was a requirement for gentility (and much else), and there arose a new class of zealous pedants who assumed the task of regulating the language’ (ibid.). Some grammarians and rhetoricians adopt a purist attitude, even in the latter part of the period. The laws of logic and the pursuit of analogy are still pervasive as vital principles of grammaticality, and so are perspicuity and accuracy. Prescriptivism does not really disappear, but at times it is ‘validated with claims to scientificity’ and is seen to ‘re-appear in a different guise’ (Crowley 1996: 149). Following the long influence of Lindley Murray’s (1795) grammar, which lasted until the 1840s, prescriptivism ‘reaches its zenith’ with Goold Brown (1791–1857) in *The Grammar of English Grammars* (1851), a ‘pedantic and unscientific work of over a thousand pages’ full of rules and notes from the author alongside rules and observations from other grammars (Dekeyser 1975: 278, 22). Other grammarians who adopt this approach include Alexander Crombie (1762–1840), described as ‘Murray’s self-appointed antagonist’, in *The Etymology and Syntax of the English Language* (1802) and *Grammar of the English Language* (1818); Matthew Harrison (1792?–1862) in *The Rise, Progress and Present Structure of the English Language* (1848); Henry H.

---

12 With regard to the use of *shall* and *will* in the nineteenth century, Facchinetti (2000: 123) argues that it is the ‘high education’ of the speakers in her corpus along with ‘their socio political status’ that ‘might quite possibly have led them to comply with the rules’.
Breen (1805–82) in *Modern English Literature: Its Blemishes and Defects* (1857), a work in which mistakes from reputable authors ‘were exposed and pilloried’; William B. Hodgson (1815–80) in *Errors in the Use of English* (1881), published posthumously by his widow; Anglophil (pseudonym) in *The Queen’s English up to Date* (1892), subtitled ‘an exposition of the prevailing grammatical errors of the day’, a piece in which ‘purism was pushed to the extremes’; and George W. Moon (1823–1909), with whom ‘purism grew into a mania’ – he attacked Dean Alford and Lindley Murray’s works, and ‘he sneeringly rebuked the revisers of the Authorized Version’ in a series of papers published between 1864 to 1886 (see Dekeyser 1975: 22–4).

Alongside the strength of prescriptivism is the influence of the New Philology, and as a consequence prescriptivism experiences a decline during the second half of the century, while descriptivism slowly gains ground. Bailey (1996: 3) observes that ‘[a]pprehension and disapproval were slowly replaced by caution’, influenced by cultural changes in the complex relation between theories of language and science. In matters of language, linguistic thought had been occupied since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with theories of language discussed in universal grammars such as John Wilkins’ *An Essay towards a Real Character* (1668), the *Port Royal Grammar* (1660), James Harris’ *Hermes* (1751) and James Beattie’s *Theory of Language* (1788). A major influence in the late eighteenth century that lasted into the nineteenth century was John Horne Tooke’s (1736–1812) theory of etymological derivations based on the relation of language and mind, *a priori* reasoning, and the belief that there is only one true primitive meaning for each word (*Diversions of Purley*, 1786). Tooke’s marriage of philosophy and philology had an enormous influence and it was not until the 1830s that the New Philology from the continent began to find its way into the linguistic thought of scholars in Britain. According to Aarsleff (1967: 102), the philosopher Dugald Stewart (1753–1828) ‘divorced philosophy from the study of language and thus helped prepare the ground for philology proper as an autonomous discipline’. Benjamin Thorpe (1782–1870) and John Mitchell Kemble (1807–57), who had studied abroad with Rasmus Rask (1787–1832) and Jacob Grimm (1785–1863), respectively, introduced the empirical and *a posteriori* methods that would be followed by the founders of the *Oxford English Dictionary* in the 1850s and 1860s, as well as by historical grammarians such as Robert G. Latham in *The English Language* (1841) and Henry Sweet in *A New English Grammar* (1892–8). This is the transition from old to new, from amateurism to linguistic professionalism, mentioned by Dekeyser.
Eighteenth-century precept

With the influence of philology there comes a more moderate attitude towards grammatical correctness that paves the way for the descriptive approach to language. The obsession with regulation and codification, ‘the feeling that there ought to be one correct usage, no more, no less’, starts to fade and gradually becomes a tradition rather than an active movement (Strang 1970: 106). The aim – or perhaps, rather, the intention – is increasingly to describe usage and record facts, so that grammar and usage are gradually reconciled ‘on the understanding that it is grammar which is, at least partly, gradually adapted to usage, not vice versa’ (Dekeyser 1975: 278). To quote from the grammarian Henry Alford:

(58) Grammarians and rhetoricians may set bounds to language: but usage will break over in spite of them. And I have ventured to think that he may do some service who, instead of standing and protesting where this has been the case, observes, and points out to others, the existing phenomena, and the probable account to be given of them. (Alford 1864: 256)

This shift from prescriptivism to descriptivism from the 1850s can be described as a move from a period of ‘Authoritarian English’ to a period of ‘Mature Modern English’, a transition marked by social, historical and cultural changes, including new scientific discoveries but also improvements in the standard of living, the extension of the British Empire, and the rise of new intellectual movements such as Romanticism, emotionalism and nationalism (see Nist 1966: 298; also Nist 1966: 302–29, Mugglestone 2006). There is a turn towards liberalism and towards objective methods, led by the historical–philological tradition and scholars such as Henry Sweet (1845–1912), Robert Latham (1812–88), Hyde Clarke (1815–95), Charles Peter Mason (1820–1900) and Alexander Bain (1818–1903), in whose works ‘liberalism is revived for the first time after Priestley’ (Dekeyser 1975: 278). The tone, emphasis and tolerance make the difference between ‘a dogmatic Murray and a more liberal Clarke or Bain, an uncompromising Moon and a more flexible and compliant Dean Alford’ (1975: 4). In the late decades of the century the normative approach does not enforce or impose precepts, but rather grammarians and rhetoricians are ‘less commanding in their wordings, more and more they take the facts of usage into account, and more often than not allow for a diversity of correct forms’ (1975: 278).

Dekeyser (1975) and Bailey (1996) are sceptical about the true effect of prescriptivism on language usage in the long term. Bailey argues that ‘the popularity of the incorrect forms might have increased even more
Nineteenth-century context

rapidly without their strictures’ and that ‘the features where no significant change took place might have fluctuated even more widely without their attention’, but he is of the opinion that prescriptivism is hardly accountable beyond raising users’ doubts, fear and anxiety (1996: 261). Dekeyser’s (1975) case study suggests that nineteenth-century metalinguistic comments on case agreement such as who versus whom had a moderate effect: while it is true that the prescribed forms are more frequent overall, they do not show a notable increase over time, and some proscribed forms have still not disappeared from spoken language (e.g., I wonder who you are talking to). However, in Mugglestone’s (2006: 284) view, ‘prescriptivism was not . . . entirely without effect, especially in the domain of language attitudes’. In fact, she argues that the nineteenth century gives rise to new shibboleths such as the split infinitive. In her overview of morphosyntactic features, she observes an influence – to a greater or lesser extent – in the competition between the passival and the progressive passive (e.g., The book is printing vs. The house is being built), object versus genitive pronominal usage with the gerund (e.g., as calm as him, I heard of him/his running away), and the past perfect infinitive (e.g., I intended to have returned on Monday), which is frowned on on the grounds of logic and reason (see Mugglestone 2006: 278–88).

3.4.2 Attitudes to preposition stranding

The case study of P-stranding epitomises the fusion of the prescriptive-descriptive tradition. On the one hand, proscriptive attitudes extend the ethos reached in the heyday of the 1790s and are readily found throughout the century, echoing eighteenth-century concerns with matters of style and level of formality, as in Goold Brown’s (1844 [1823]) The Institutes of English Grammar (59), as well as with matters of harmony and cadence of the sentence, as in Alexander Bain’s (1867) English Composition and Rhetoric, and George Gregory’s Letters on Literature, Taste and Composition, addressed to his son (1809 [1808], see (60)):

(59) In the familiar style, a preposition governing a relative or an interrogative pronoun, is often separated from its object, and connected with the other terms of relation; as, “Whom did he speak to?” But it is more dignified, and in general more graceful, to place the preposition before the pronoun; as, “To whom did he speak?”

(Brown 1844: 173)
When it is practicable, let the sentence close with the principal and emphatical words . . . Agreeably to this rule we ought to avoid such words at the end of our sentences as only mark the cases of nouns, e.g. “Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of.” And a certain author speaking of the Trinity, says, “This is a mystery, which we firmly believe the truth of, and humbly adore the depth of.” The fault and the correction of it are both obvious; it ought to have been expressed thus: “This is a mystery, the truth of which we firmly believe, and the depth of which we humbly adore.” (Gregory 1809: 67–8)

The majority of grammars published in the nineteenth century, in fact, are either reprints or later editions of (mainly late) eighteenth-century grammars. It then follows that these eighteenth-century works ‘contributed to the preservation of the grammar conventions and the standards of correctness imposed in the previous centuries’ (Facchinetti 2000: 118), the proscription against P-stranding being one of these standards. As noted in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, the 1780s and the 1790s recorded the harshest criticism of P-stranding in terms of both the number of mentions and the semantic nuances conveyed through the labels used by precept writers: the most critical grammars and rhetorical works include Hugh Blair (1783), Noah Webster (1784), Philip Withers (1789), John Hornsey (1793) and Lindley Murray (1795); frequent terms of criticism range from bad and erroneous to harsh and imprecise. In contrast, the leading advocate figures, Joseph Priestley (1761a, 1761b) and George Campbell (1776), appeared relatively early. Bearing the time gap in mind for a precept to be reflected in usage, it is to be expected that the influence of the critic works would extend into the early nineteenth century. To give just a few examples from the precept sources investigated: Henry St. John Bullen’s (1797) work was still being republished in 1870; by 1820 Lady Fenn’s (1798a) grammar had reached its twenty-sixth edition; and third or fourth editions of a good many other proscriptive works, such as those of William M’Ilquham’s (1781) and John Hornsey’s (1793), were also published in the early decades of the nineteenth century (Alston 1965). As mentioned earlier, criticism lingering into the nineteenth century is largely due to the great success of Lindley Murray’s work as a must-have textbook for school and home instruction. Murray published his English Grammar in 1795, followed by a book of exercises of bad English (1797), readers (1799, 1800, 1801), and a spelling book (1804). His grammar ran to (at least) seven editions between 1795 and
1800, both in England and America, including the publication of ‘other’ issues, and it had reached over two hundred editions and reprints by 1900 (Alston 1965: 92–6). With the same success, its abridgement, ‘to all intents a new book’ (1965: 96), had quickly reached a fourth edition by 1800, and over two hundred editions were likewise published over the course of the nineteenth century (1965: 99–102). In Görlach’s view, the strictures in Murray ‘determined many nineteenth-century views of correctness’ (2001: 117, n.68; also Görlach 1999: 15). Murray has also been described as the ‘Father of English grammar’ (see Nevalainen and Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006: 285). That he was still read in the 1840s is evinced by comments in book reviews, such as the author of The Eclectic Review, who complains about Murray’s ruling against the omission of the relative pronoun:

This is some of the same sort of nonsense we had from Mr. Lindley Murray. Our language has suffered very materially from the influence of this grammatical rule-making system. Who told Mr. Murray (if he says so, we do not remember now) or Mr. Hiley that the relative is improperly omitted? (The Eclectic Review 1841: 201)

Another area that witnessed the clear influence of prescriptivism is the teaching of grammar with exercises of bad English. It was noted in Section 3.2.1 that this pedagogical method remained a staple feature of school grammars at least until the 1830s. In addition to the exercises included in grammar books, there are books of exercises printed separately, these being equally popular – Murray’s *English Exercises, adapted to the Grammar lately published by L. Murray* being an example. First published in 1797 in York, it has four different editions and some ‘other’ issues published between 1797 and 1800, and numerous editions/reprints come out in England and America during the following century, reaching the twenty-first edition in 1815 and the fifty-second edition in 1848 (Alston 1970: 94–6). Murray censures P-stranding twice in his grammar: in terms of grammar and style in the grammar section, borrowed from Lowth’s work, and in terms of perspicuity in the appendix, borrowed from Blair. Accordingly, twice he provides examples of bad English in his book of exercises ‘containing instances of false syntax’: first, in relation to the ‘rules’ discussed in the syntax chapter, Murray provides illustrative quotations in which stranded prepositions are branded ‘false’ grammar (61); and second, from the chapter on ‘perspicuity and accuracy’, Murray provides sentences to encourage students to ‘avoid concluding them with [stranded] prepositions’ (e.g., 1797: 167).
(61) *The following examples are adapted to the notes and observations under Rule XVII.*

To have no one whom we heartily wish well to, and whom we are warmly concerned for, is a deplorable state. (Murray 1797: 79)

As attitudes to precept changed and Murray’s influence found detractors, the views on P-stranding changed for the better. This was helped by the reduced influence of Latin: by ‘loosening the ties that bound English to Latin’ the nineteenth century ‘arrived at a greater freedom’ (Görlach 1999: 75–6). For instance, Henry Hallam (1777–1859) commented briefly on the end position of prepositions in *An Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries* (1837–9), this being ‘one of the most extensive works of literary history to appear during the early Victorian period’ (*ODNB*, s.v. ‘Hallam, Henry’). In passages such as (62) he shows unease at the imposition of Latin grammar on English, as George Campbell (1776) and John Fell (1784) had previously done. They find that criticism on the grounds that the end position is idiomatic and not a Latinate structure is simply ‘untruly’, as Fell had said (1784: 128–9); for Hallam it is also ‘an unnecessary fastidiousness’. The custom of Latin and French is ‘not always to bind’ the use of English, the historian argues. According to Smith (1923: i.1.2), Hallam ‘ventures to defend this idiom’ as being ‘sometimes emphatic and spirited’; for Hallam, ‘nothing but Latin prejudice can make us think it essentially wrong’ (1839: IV.535) – see passage (63). Yet Hallam does not seem to be an enthusiastic advocate of the vernacular idiom, since, according to Visser, Hallam’s attitude is rather a ‘reserved rejection’ of the ‘stylistic dogma’ attached to end-placed prepositions – note that Hallam himself uses P-piping rather than P-stranding in ‘to which I have not uniformly deferred’ (see Visser 1963–73: I.§412). We will see that authors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often play linguistically with preposition placement in the passages where they discuss P-stranding; given that Hallam was ‘an obvious participant in the learned societies and literary clubs of the day’, and that he contributed to ‘Victorian intellectual life’ (*ODNB*, s.v. ‘Hallam, Henry’), he might have wanted to adhere to the formal style of writing. Yet in the footnote Hallam strands the preposition in the passive, the construction he is at that point discussing: ‘nor can it always be dispensed with’ (63).

---

13 Wild draws the parallel between attitudes to P-stranding and phrasal verbs in relation to the move away from Latin in favour of Saxon/native forms (see Wild 2010: 120–1, 254).
[The Anglicism of terminating the sentence with a preposition]
And, though the old form continued in use long after the time of Dryden, it has of late years been reckoned inelegant, and proscribed in all cases, perhaps with an unnecessary fastidiousness, to which I have not uniformly deferred; since our language is of Teutonic structure, and the rules of Latin or French grammar are not always to bind us. (Hallam 1839: IV.535)

The form is, in my opinion, sometimes emphatic and spirited, though its frequent use appears slovenly. I remember my late friend, Mr. Richard Sharp, whose good taste is well known, used to quote an interrogatory of Hooker: “Shall there be a God to swear by, and none to pray to?” as an instance of the force which this arrangement, so eminently idiomatic, sometimes gives. It is unnecessary to say that it is derived from the German; and nothing but Latin prejudice can make us think it essentially wrong. In the passive voice, I think it better than in the active; nor can it always be dispensed with, unless we choose rather the feeble encumbering pronoun which. (Hallam 1839: IV.535, note)

The stigma against the use of stranded prepositions in formal styles would not go away, but during the nineteenth century attitudes towards idiomatic expressions became generally more lenient as a result of the growing interest in and knowledge of philology. In addition to the point made by Hallam (‘unless we choose rather the feeble encumbering pronoun which’), the transition from the old to the new approach is well illustrated in Henry Alford’s *The Queen’s English* (1864). This work has been described as ‘one of the most influential works of this period’, one which combines the ‘advances in philology’, the new scientific and descriptive approach to language, with the ‘social forces at work in the eighteenth century’; in other words, ‘a middle path between prescription and description’ (Beal 2004: 119). Henry Alford presents himself as an agent of the new, more descriptive approach: the object of the grammarian ‘is not to lay down nor to exemplify mere rules of grammar... but to illustrate the usages and tendencies of our common language, as a matter of fact, by the discussion of questions arising out of doubtful words and phrases’ (1864: 62). Alford is aware that the idiomatic nature of English is prone to criticism in terms of grammatical correctness ‘if judged by strict rules’, that is, by Latin,

---

14 Alford describes Hallam as a grammarian ‘who does not lay down rules only, but is anxious to ascertain on what usages are founded’ (1864: 143).
an observation which testifies to the pervasive influence of analogy and logic in the history of English grammatical thought (1864: 64). He claims, however, that ‘the English language has become more idiomatic’, and that the tendency now in the nineteenth century is ‘to set aside accurate grammatical construction, and to speak rather according to idiom than according to rule’ (1864: 63). In this new spirit, usage plays a major role. In passage (58) above, Alford then warns the reader about the power of usage: ‘Grammarians and rhetoricians may set bounds to language: but usage will break over in spite of them’ (1864: 256). As far as P-stranding is concerned, Alford ‘allows’ this ‘peculiar’ use because it is an idiomatic construction, again echoing eighteenth-century authors such as Joseph Priestley, George Campbell and John Fell:

(64) There is a peculiar use of prepositions which is allowable in moderation, but must not be too often resorted to. It is the placing them at the end of a sentence, as I have just done in the words “resorted to”; as is done in the command, “Let not your good be evil spoken of”; and continually in our discourse and writing. (Alford 1864: 147–8)

Alford’s observations touch on stylistic differences between conversation and writing, on which he elaborates elsewhere in the grammar in more general terms: ‘We must distinguish between the English we speak, and that which we write. Many expressions are not only tolerated but required in conversation, which are not usually put on paper’ (Alford 1864: 68). As mentioned earlier, precept writers tend to play with preposition placement – on this occasion Alford deliberately strands the preposition in order to illustrate the linguistic feature (‘must not be too often resorted to’), and then draws the reader’s attention to it. A few lines later Alford comments on zero-relative clauses as a context in which the stranded preposition ‘would always be said’: it is usage, it is accepted custom (‘You’re the man I wanted to have some talk with’). The alternative construction with a fronted preposition and the wh-relative pronoun whom (‘You’re the man with whom I wanted to have some talk’), he believes, ‘would sound stilted and pedantic’ (1864: 150).

Alford’s mention of rhetoricians in passage (58) is also relevant to P-stranding: usage ‘will break’ not only the rules established by grammarians but also those by rhetoricians. In another passage, quoted here in (65), Alford cites one of the most proscriptive rhetoricians in my eighteenth-century precept sources, ‘Dr Blair’, referring specifically to the latter’s
‘capital rule’ against P-stranding, which Blair sees as necessary in order to ‘regulate the arrangement of words in sentences’ (see Section 5.5.3). Of interest to Blair here are the principles of unity, clarity and perspicuity, and although Alford admits that the rule is ‘a good and useful one’, it is only ‘for general guidance’; in practice, in usage, he does not recommend it, because ‘[i]f this rule were uniformly applied, it would break down the force and the living interest of style in any English writer, and reduce his matter . . . to a dreary and dull monotony’ (1864: 114). For the sake of emphasis, vivacity and expressiveness, Alford advocates that the word or clause be out of its natural place: ‘a sentence arranged according to the rule’, he continues, is ‘simply’ an ‘ordinary and straightforward construction’ (1864: 115). In other words, the preposition may well be stranded: ‘Let us violate the rule’ because otherwise ‘the whole force and point would have been lost’ (see 1864: 116, 118).15

(65) The one rule which is supposed by the ordinary rhetoricians to regulate the arrangement of words in sentences, is this: that “those parts of a sentence which are most closely connected in their meaning, should be as closely as possible connected in position;” or, as it is pronounced by Dr. Blair, “A capital rule in the arrangement of sentences is that the words or members most nearly related should be placed in the sentence as near to each other as possible, so as to make their mutual, relation clearly appear.” (Alford 1864: 113–14)

A final sample of nineteenth-century attitudes to P-stranding comes from Henry Sweet’s grammar (1892–8), described as the ‘first really scholarly grammar written by an Englishman’ (Dekeyser 1975: 22). As can be inferred from passage (66), Sweet’s approach to what he calls ‘detached’ prepositions is primarily descriptive: they are ‘liable to be disassociated’ under certain circumstances, such as passive, relative and interrogative clauses; there is no further evaluation of whether this is in itself good or bad. Interestingly, whereas the usual approach in discussions of P-stranding is to point out its familiar nature and association with informal styles, Sweet’s remark on style concerns the use of fronted prepositions as ‘confined to the literary

15 A note of caution should be included here on Alford’s ‘descriptive’ approach. According to Dekeyser (1975: 23), Alford’s The Queen’s English is ‘a work in which the side of usage was often defended, at least as far as syntax is concerned, though admittedly not always on sound principles’. According to Beal (2004: 119), Alford’s ‘is a more subtle prescriptivism, which, rather than making ipse dixit statements about errors, recommends what he considers the better usage’; in other words, he is ‘by no means ill informed, but he is certainly normative and prone to caprice and prejudice’.

Nineteenth-century context
Similarly, several years earlier in *Essentials of English Grammar* (1877), William Dwight Whitney (1827–94) had adopted a neutral attitude by merely referring to the frequency of the structure, notably ‘in all styles’ (see (67)).

(66) Detached prepositions are liable to be disassociated from their noun-words not only in position, but also in grammatical construction, as in *he was thought of*, where the detached preposition is no longer able to govern the pronoun in the objective case because the passive construction necessitates putting the pronoun in the nominative. Prepositions are also detached in some constructions in connection with interrogative and dependent pronouns and adverbs, as in *who are you speaking of?*. *I do not know what he is thinking of; where is he going to?*, *I wonder where he came from;* such constructions as *of whom are you speaking?* being confined to the literary language.

(Sweet 1892: I.138)

(67) Very frequently, in all styles of English, the object of a preposition is placed before the verb in the sentence, while the preposition comes after it. [e.g. What did you come for?]

(Whitney 1877: 144, quoted in Wild 2010: 112)

### 3.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has raised various issues that help us in gaining a better understanding of the normative tradition in the eighteenth century, of what attitudes towards P-stranding were like, and of how they changed over time.

In the first place, it has been shown that during the eighteenth century prescriptive grammar becomes largely ‘a grammar of errors’ (Sundby *et al.* 1991: 1), but as far as P-stranding is concerned there is more to it than simply criticism: many works make no evaluative judgements, and positive comments are also attested throughout the century, albeit at a lower rate. These findings lend support to the view that attitudes on language usage

---

16 Note Sweet’s explanation in the preface to his grammar:

As my exposition claims to be scientific, I confine myself to the statement and explanation of facts, without attempting to settle the relative correctness of divergent usages. If an “ungrammatical” expression such as *it is me* is in general use among educated people, I accept it as such, simply adding that it is avoided in the literary language. (Sweet 1892: I.xi)
stand on a continuum from descriptive to prescriptive and proscriptive, rather than on a binary distinction. The findings here also challenge the traditional account in the literature, largely restricted to negative comments on stranded prepositions. Second, the classification of explicit and implicit comments according to an array of semantic labels has provided fruitful insights: different labels indicate different semantic nuances. Stranded prepositions might be mentioned in a neutral tone in terms of frequency, order or grammaticality; they might be advocated because of their nature as a vernacular idiom or in terms of prosody – a harmonious end; yet they might also be proscribed as inelegant, bad English or for resulting in a harsh sound to the ear. The analysis of dimensions of usage has revealed further views on P-stranding, such as the close association between matters of style and medium, the force of criticism related to matters of decorum (dimension ‘Responsibility’), and subjective judgements on the part of the hearer or reader (dimension ‘Attitude’).

Chronologically, prescriptive and proscriptive strictures become more frequent during the second half of the century as we move from the codification to the prescription stage of standardisation, which will culminate in the nineteenth century. Furthermore, as time goes by, not only do authors increasingly mention the syntactic construction, but they also gradually adopt a more critical attitude towards it. In addition, the diachronic distribution of the semantic labels sheds more light on whether and how attitudes evolved over the course of the eighteenth century: from mild criticism in the early half to a harsher critical attitude in the middle decades and a fiercer attitude in the late eighteenth century. This accords with eighteenth-century prescriptive attitudes in general and with other case studies such as spelling variants (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002: 242). As González-Díaz (2008) points out in her study of double comparatives, ‘at a very local level of analysis’, that is, a particular grammatical feature, ‘a corpus-based stylistic analysis of the technical terms used by authors’ is worth looking into.

In relation to this, from the methodological perspective, this chapter has shown that as a pioneering study which aims to cover an impressive range of grammatical features (macro-level), DENG is undoubtedly an invaluable reference source. At a micro-level however, a more focused and comprehensive corpus is necessary. To this purpose, my investigation has been based on a self-compiled database of comments documented in eighteenth-century normative works, from grammar books to treatises of rhetoric, dictionaries and books of exercises. In DENG end-placed prepositions are treated as a ‘positional error’ in terms of word order, one of the deviations known as transposition (1991: 414–8). Sundby et al. (1991: 418)
observed that ‘among elements too light to bear end position our grammarians mention prepositions in particular. Put differently, they are prejudiced against Deferment, a term used by Quirk et al. 1985: 9.6.’ DENG provides (shortened) illustrative quotations drawn from forty-three authors in total, while my database consists of three times that number. Naturally, crucial differences emerge. First, in my sources there are over ten critic authors, and there are also works which are not listed in DENG, such as Henry Bullen (1797), John Burn (1766), Ellenor Fenn (1798a) and John Seally (1788). Likewise, my list of prescriptive epithets is more comprehensive (24 vs. 10). DENG does not make use of six labels of which there is evidence in my materials: censurable, corrupt, erroneous, inaccurate, poetic (genre poetry) and obsolete, the latter of which refers exclusively to the stranded preposition withal. On the other hand, there are two tags in my labelling system which are exclusively based on DENG’s materials – barbarous and vulgar.

As a consequence of the difference in size, it can be seen that the chronological account in DENG should be revisited. The earliest grammar in which ‘deferred’ prepositions were criticised according to DENG dates from the 1740s (Kirkby 1746), while in Section 3.1 I gave evidence of earlier comments against the use of end-placed prepositions, as early as 1711 in James Greenwood’s grammar. Criticism is also documented in the 1720s and 1730s. William Perry’s grammar, published in 1776, is mentioned in DENG, but the shorter grammar attached to Perry’s earlier dictionary (1775) is overlooked. In the first edition of John Burn’s (1766) grammar, the author describes P-stranding from a neutral perspective, but in the third and fourth editions, he revises the original passage and shows a negative attitude (1778/1786); this seems to have escaped the compilers’ attention. In DENG the label bad appears in quotations from works published in the 1790s, while my materials show it had been frequent since the late 1740s. Most important, the interpretation of some passages differs. For instance, in my view, the passage in Joseph Priestley’s second edition of The Rudiments of English Grammar does not convey a negative attitude towards P-stranding (1768: 100–1). What Priestley seems to be discussing is the choice of relativiser: ‘if a preposition must precede the relative’, then the necessary relative is which or who(m) because that-relative ‘does not admit of such a construction’ with front position (e.g. *to that – to which/whom). P-stranding is ungrammatical or erroneous for purely syntactic reasons as is the case in present-day English. Another discrepancy concerns James Buchanan’s discussion in The British Grammar (1762: 170–1, 194–5, 224–5). A close reading of Patrick Lynch’s (1796) comments also yields a different interpretation (see passages in (68) and (69)). In his list of ‘solecisms’,
number 204 refers to the split of prepositions in coordination, not to P-stranding, and number 205 is concerned with pronominal case, not with preposition placement, as indicated by the fact that the illustrative examples are borrowed from Lowth’s discussion of pronominal case (1762: 126–7; see (70)), and the correct form in parentheses is the oblique case form whom, yet the preposition remains in final position. It is fair to say, nonetheless, that Sundby et al. are dealing with a large number of grammatical features and therefore ‘some sort of editing [of their 500–600 different prescriptive epithets] was necessary in order to keep the Dictionary within bounds’ (1991: 38).

(68) 204. Some Writers inelegantly separate the Preposition from its Noun in order to connect different Prepositions with the same word; this is an impropriety which should not be admitted except in forms of Law; thus, “To suppose the Zodiac and Planets to be efficient of and antecedent to themselves”.

(Lynch 1796: 93)

(69) 205. “We are much at a loss who (whom) civil power belongs to”, “Who (whom) do you speak to,” “Who (whom) servest thou under”.

(Lynch 1796: 93)

(70) Prepositions have a Government of Cases; and in English they always require the Objective Case after them: as, “with him; from her; to me.” [note 1] “We are still much at a loss, who Civil Power belongs to.” Locke. It ought to be whom.

(Lowth 1762: 126–7)

Finally, this chapter has also raised the topic of plagiarism and ‘customary appropriation’ of illustrative quotations. The case study of P-stranding provides more evidence that (acknowledged and unacknowledged) borrowing was common practice in the eighteenth century, but also that it was not done uncritically – authors were careful enough to make slight modifications to their passages, such as the replacing of proper names, and to make other, more noticeable modifications, such as altering the place of the prepositions. This and the shared repertoire of epithets point to the existence of a discourse community of normative authors in the eighteenth century, as suggested by Watts (2008). We will return to this matter in Chapter 5.
P-stranding and P-piping have been attested since the Old English period, yet not always in all the contexts in which we find them today; the Middle English period, and the fourteenth century in particular, was a period of major reorganisation of word order patterns. An overview of the stages before the period that concerns us in this book (1500–1900) is offered in Appendix 3, and they have also been discussed at length in standard reference works such as Poutsma (1914–29), Mustanoja (1960), Allen (1980), Mitchell (1985), Fischer (1992), Traugott (1992), and Rissanen (1999), amongst others. Broadly speaking, we can say that by 1500 P-stranding was ‘firmly rooted’ in the structure of English, and that instances of P-stranding are attested ‘in nearly all texts’ (Allen 1980: 230). For example, van der Gaaf (1930: 8–9) notes that in reading ME texts he found stranded prepositions in that-relative clauses so ‘often’ that ‘they bring home to us the fact that some modern English constructions that strike us by their peculiarly idiomatic character can boast a venerable age’; and Allen (1980: 227–8) names one particular author as ‘an enthusiastic preposition strander’, namely Richard Rolle of Hampole (c. 1305–49), a hermit and religious writer. During the ModE period (1500–1900), differences emerge in matters of frequency and style. This chapter addresses these issues in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Before that, Section 4.1 offers an overview of the linguistic contexts in which P-stranding appears in the data under scrutiny, attending to the type of clause.

### 4.1 Preposition placement and clause type

The types of clause in which P-stranding and P-piping might occur have been presented in Section 1.1 with illustrative examples from PDE. The aim of this subsection is to illustrate usage with actual examples drawn from the early and late ModE usage corpora. Figure 4.1 shows the distribution patterns, where we can see that P-stranding occurs most frequently
in passive clauses, followed by zero- and wh-relatives; infinitive clauses also host P-stranding readily. Conversely, P-stranding is not very frequent in comparative clauses, non-finite ing-clauses, as-relative clauses and exclamative clauses. Since the trends have remained stable over time with just a few exceptions (an increase of passives and of zero-relatives, a decrease in that-relatives), in what follows I will largely address the ModE period as a whole.

4.1.1 Categorical preposition stranding

The types of clause in which the preposition is categorically stranded are non-wh-relative clauses, comparative structures, prepositional passives, infinitive clauses and non-finite ing-clauses.

The non-wh-relative clauses attested in my usage corpora include zero-relatives (71)a, that-relatives (71)b and as-relatives (71)c; as mentioned in Section 2.2.1, there happen to be no instances of but-relative clauses.

1 Jespersen (1909–49: III.§9.7.2) understands but-relative as ‘a negative relative connective, meaning “that (who or which) . . . not”, but only used after a negative expression’. According to the OED, the earliest examples date from the early sixteenth century (s.v. but adv. B.12.b). Moessner (1999: 74–6) observes that the relative but-construction first appeared in the late fifteenth century ‘as a case of grammatical interference’ with French; it ‘flourished’ in EModE but during the twentieth century receded in use and gradually became obsolete. As for P-stranding, unfortunately, the illustrative examples quoted in Moessner (1999) do not show any instances with stranded prepositions. Given that in the late fifteenth century P-stranding is attested in other types of relative clause, one could argue that this is a literature gap, rather than a systematic gap.
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(71) a. But I think, beloveth, there is never so dark a night, but there is something to sing about, even concerning that night; for there is one thing I am sure we can sing about, let the night be ever so dark,

(18xxspur.h6b [1850–99])

b. I made it my first attempt to compare it with its Relative Pondus to Water, having first of all satisfied myself that there is a certain Term of Gravity that all true and genuine Stones (the which are a sort of natural Vitrifications) do meet in or arrive at:

(1685slar.m2b)

c. Oh, but you must not persuade me to that! If you do I shall think you are a bad man, such as my grandma warned me of!

(1792holc.d4b)(1685slar.m2b)

Stranded prepositions are very frequent in zero-relative clauses in the early and late ModE subperiods and seem to have increased over time. They tend to be of short length, as in ‘You may discerne the hast I am in by my writeing’ (1654osbn.x2b), but they also occur in more complex embedded sentences. The majority of these clauses appear in informal registers such as private letters, plays and diaries. The register distribution is not surprising if we recall Jespersen’s observation on the general use of ‘contact-clauses’ that they ‘have probably been extremely common in everyday speech for at least six or seven hundred years’ (Jespersen 1909–49: III.§7.1.5). The observed increase in the data is, however, somewhat unexpected given that the omission of the relative was often criticised in eighteenth-century normative works as colloquial and improper, especially if it was omitted in subject position, which today is considered ungrammatical (see Sundby et al. 1991: 247–8). This criticism may well have brought an end to the ‘popular favour’ that this type of clause had gained during the EModE period (Jespersen 1909–49: III.§7.1.6), and the proscription may well have caused, subsequently, the ‘remarkable decline in the currency of the zero-construction’ in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Visser 1963–73: I.§§629–30). Nonetheless, as for the omission of the relative pronoun in the function of prepositional object, which concerns us here, Visser tells us that the idiom ‘rapidly increases in frequency, with consequence that in [Present-Day English] it is extremely common’ despite the fact that ‘grammarians repeatedly found fault with it’ (1963–73: I.§633). The findings in our ModE data tally with Visser’s observation: the LModE proscription does not seem to have brought the use of P-stranding to a halt in this respect. Joshua Story (1783) reflects on the omission of the relative governed by a preposition in passage (72).
Mr Wood, p 56 Grammatical Inst. says the preposition is sometimes placed not only after the noun, but at a considerable distance from it, as, “It is not me you are in love with.” This observation, however *highly useful* it may appear to Mr. Wood, certainly merits a place under his section of *bad arrangement*, *ambiguity of expression*, . . . Let us advert to Dr. Lowth’s critique upon the same sentence; “It is not me you are in love with.” The preposition *with* should govern the relative *whom* understood, not the antecedent *me*; which ought to be *I*. [“]It is not *I*, or *I* am not the person with *whom* you are in love.” It is easy to perceive that the sentence is elliptical, and must be supplied by the relative *whom*.  

(Story 1783: 47–8.n) 

P-stranding with *that*-relatives is not uncommon. As in *zero*-relatives, it usually appears in short sentences of the type ‘that I know of’, but there are also coordinated structures, as in (71)b, where *that* is the object of the prepositions *in* and *at*. As with *zero*-relatives, the use of *that* as a relative pronoun was criticised in normative works as inelegant and improper; the prescribed form was the *wh*-relative pronoun: ‘That is often used, but inelegantly, for who, whom and which’, as James Buchanan stated (1767: 73; see Sundby *et al.* 1991: 172–6). Denison (1998: 279, reporting from Ball 1996: 248–51) observes that ‘in written data for the period 1700–1900 . . . *that* lost ground to *who* and *which*, rapidly during the eighteenth century and more gradually in the nineteenth’. Jespersen also notes that ‘in the middle English period and in the beginning of the modern period *that* was the usual relative word, but its sphere of use has since then been narrowed through the encroachments of the *wh*-pronouns, especially in the literary language’ (1909–49: III.§8.1.1, also III.§§4.3.1–2). My ModE data record a slight decrease in the use of P-stranding in this particular context, which might then be related to the stigma against *that*-relatives more than – or as well as – to the stranded preposition itself: in *that*-relatives the end position is obligatory; once the *that*-relative is avoided in favour of *wh*-relative pronouns, the end position becomes optional. 

Stranded prepositions are not very common in relative clauses introduced by *as* or in comparative sentences, which can also be introduced by *as*. The relative use of *as* originated in the sequences *such as* and *same as* (Jespersen 1909–49: III.§9.1.2), and this is in fact the ‘chief domain’ in which P-stranding occurs in my ModE data, (71)c. There are also structures with an intermediate noun (*such_ N_ as* and *such_a_N_as*), like ‘such stuff as you and I are made on’ (1730vanb.d3b). Fischer (1992: 358) argues that
the use of such as in relative clauses developed from the sequence such as in comparative clauses, where ‘it often happened that as referred to the noun following such rather than to such itself’. Hence, the clause is turned into a relative clause, for instance in ‘That’s my best Nurse; do as you wou’d be done by;’ (CEPLAY3A 1697).

Comparative clauses can be introduced by as, (73)a, and by than, (73)b. The particle as may occur in correlation with as or, in negative clauses, with so. For its part, than can be combined with moreless and with inflected adjectives in -er, as in (73)b. According to Biber et al. (1999: §7.8), the latter is in PDE ‘by far the most common type of comparative expression in all registers’, and, overall, ‘these constructions are considerably more common in academic prose than in other registers’. My ModE data are perhaps of insufficient size to draw firm conclusions, but the distribution here seems to favour the periphrastic comparison moreless_than. In addition to these competitive forms, that appears for than in ‘Hell also hath a wide mouth; it can stretch itself farther that you are aware of’ (16xxbuny.h2b [1650–99]); and the sequence than what, described by Jespersen (1909–49: III.§9.6.2) as ‘a redundant combination’ of ‘vulgar speech’, is also found in (73)c.

(73) a. but should it be thought proper, to have the water as highly saturated with fixed air as it admits of, nothing more than repetition of the same process is requisite. (1775noot.s4b)
b. They are far higher, and far deeper, than ever thought or fancy of man has reached to. (18xxarno.h5b [1800–49])
c. For though the ancients made a great ado about the various degrees of heat of the different parts of the human body; yet some of the best and most careful observers amongst the moderns, by methods more certain and regular, than what the others were masters of, have been assured that they are all nearly of the same degree of heat, (1735mart.m3b)

Passive constructions are the context in which P-stranding appears with the highest frequency in my data, and it can be found in a variety of arrangements: simple prepositional passives, such as ‘My bernishch and turban were well approved of’ (1836mont.j5b); phrasal-prepositional verbs, as in ‘[I am] sick to death at the notion of things changing, and my one consolation being done away with’ (1891dows.x6b); and phrasal idioms, such as ‘it is taken hold of with one hand’ (1775gard.s4b). Any of these
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Subtypes may occur with the auxiliary verb in an untensed form, like -ing in ‘being done away with’ above, or with the past participle on its own, as in ‘The manner of doing it, so unsought for and unexpected,’ (CEOFFIC3 1697). These clipped passives can also appear as preposed adjectives, though rarely in my data: ‘only succeeded in one solitary instance in obtaining the wished for result’ (1825john.s5b). Another peculiarity of prepositional passives is that the subject of the passive may be filled with a relative pronoun: most often the wh-pronoun which (74)a, but who is also found; that- and as-relatives are occasionally attested, as is whose (74)b. It has been reported that prepositional passives with verb–adjective combinations (e.g., make merry with) were in use in the fourteenth century, but Claridge observes that ‘there is no information about [their] fate’ in the literature, and it seems to her that they were ‘very much a development of the early modern era’ (2000: 99–100 and 93–4).

(74) a. till, some days before it came away, it hung down a full half inch more than at first, which can only be accounted for, by the artery being elongated and reproduced in a corresponding length.

(1775carm.m4b)

b. It has you see, no patrons, and I think has yet had no opponents except the Criticks of the coffeehouse, whose outcries are soon dispersed into the air, and are thought on no more:

(1755john.x4b)

The use of P-stranding in infinitive clauses also offers a rich variety of constructions. First, there are non-wh infinitive clauses, as in (75)a, which contrast with the infinitive clauses in which a wh-pronoun is overtly expressed, like which in (75)b. This latter construction is considered a ‘less common and more formal alternative’ (Quirk et al. 1985: §17.30). Second, there are infinitive clauses modifying an adjective: example (76)a illustrates the pretty-type, while example (76)b illustrates the easy-to-please type (also known as tough-movement because of transformations such as ‘The problem is tough to solve’ – ‘It is tough to solve the problem’). The adjective may stand alone or be modified by degree adverbs such as too in (76)a, or enough in ‘if there was ever a Fool soft enough to throw it upon’ (1692soth.d2b). And third, there is the easily-pleasant construction, said to have emerged in the late sixteenth century and not common until the late eighteenth century (Visser 1963–73: III.i.§1389), which accounts for those very few instances attested in the corpus data; example (77) illustrates the construction in the early nineteenth century.
(75) a. he fyndeth that mans harte is natural and frendly to the Lungs, for he geueth him of his owne nutrimental to nourishe him with; and the Lunges rewarde him with ayre to refreshe him with agayne, &c. (CESCIEA 1548)

b. upon which we enter with the utmost diffidence of our powers, yet with the full purpose of straining them to the utmost, according to the measure with which it hath pleased God to endow our mind. (18xxirvi.h3b [1800–49])

(76) a. she dwells so securely on the excellency of her honor, that the folly of my soule dares not present it selfe: shee is too bright to be look’d against. (CEPLAYA 1623 [1597])

b. There is another error which is of less consequence, but still desirable to be got rid of, as it practically reduces the available aperture of the mirror, and consequently the size of the telescope. (1874lass.s6b)

(77) The difference in $\alpha$ Cygni is considerable, and not easily to be accounted for, as this star is one of those most frequently observed. (1825pond.s5b)

Any of these types could appear with the infinitive in simple form, in the perfect tense, and also in the passive voice. The last one has undergone change over time. With regard to post-adjectival passives, Denison (1998: 185–6) makes the following remarks: (i) with the pleasant-type ‘it is generally the active rather than the passive which has triumphed’; (ii) passive infinitives of the easy-type ‘took a long time to die out’; and (iii) some other adjectives which belong to neither of the two previous types ‘still permit or even require a passive infinitive’, for example ready, fit. The usage corpora document fluctuation between passive and active in the same period: ‘I was induced to suspect, that either they had not the knowledge of it, or judg’d it unfit to be spoken of’ (1675br–2s2b), and ‘the lately mention’d Cushion, which, by reason of its rough Superficies and porosity, was fit for the Electrical Effluvia to fasten upon’ (CESCIE3B 1675–6). Denison (1998: 184) also takes note of an extended construction with the sequence NP_be_to_Vpassive, where ‘the logical object of V is co-referential with NP’, as in ‘among many pretenders, some Men of taste are to be met with’ (1717berk.x3b), compared with ‘The wet and the cold were now to reckon with’ (1902). In this case the passive infinitive has become ‘dominant’ from the LModE period onwards (Denison 1998: 185).
Non-finite *ing*-clauses are not very common in my ModE data and when they occur they are mostly complements of *worth/worthy,* which accompanies non-finite *ing*-clauses ‘without a subject, but with a passive meaning’, as in (78)a. The passive is particularly implied in example (78)b, with the gerund accompanied by the possessive *my*; this is the old construction, nowadays less common than in the accusative case (e.g., ‘me sending for’).  

(78) a. This is very cheering, though we have heard it before. This is something **worth working for.**  
       (1870thri.j6b)  
b. I was the first that was called in, all beit, Maister Doctour the Vicar of Croydon was come before me, and diuers other. After the cause of **my sendinge for,** declared vnto me (wherof I some what merueyled in my minde, consideringe that they sent for no mo temporall men but me) I desired the sight of the other,  
       (CEPRIV1 1500–70)

4.1.2 Syntactic variation

As explained in Section 2.2, for the analysis of syntactic variation between *P*-stranding and *P*-piping I have narrowed the scope to four types of clause: *wh*-relative clauses, subordinate *wh*-interrogative clauses, independent *wh*-interrogative clauses, and exclamative clauses. *Wh*-relatives are by far the most frequent type of clause in which we find syntactic variation between *P*-stranding and *P*-piping (e.g., (79)a–b). They are attested with all kinds of *wh*-relativisers, including combinations with *-ever,* though these are less common. We also find free relative clauses, as in (79)d, which strongly favour *P*-stranding.  

The so-called continuative relative clauses as in (79)e are very frequent and often trigger *P*-piping. Besides its pronominal role, *which* can also occur as a determiner, a function which conveys a high degree of formality and explicitness in the expression. The use of determiner-*which* was ‘popular’ in ME and EModE (Rissanen 1999: 297), but it decreased in frequency and became less varied in use

---

2. On the status of *worth/worthwhile* as a preposition in this context, see in particular Visser (1965–73: I.§413), Quirk *et al.* (1985: §9.6, §15.12.n[c], §16.83).

3. See also Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 12.§3.2.4) on percolation from NP to non-finite clauses where the non-finite element is the complement of a preposition.

4. On free relative clauses, see Jespersen (1909–49: III.§3, III.§10.2.7), Quirk *et al.* (1985: §6.35.n[c], §15.8, §17.12), Rissanen (1999: 300), and Huddleston and Pullum’s ‘fused’ relative clauses (2002: 12.§2.2). On continuative clauses, see Jespersen (1909–49: III.§5.4.1, III.§6.5, III.§10.4.6).
from the nineteenth century onwards; in fact, it was considered obsolete by some eighteenth-century grammarians (Sundby et al. 1991: 367). In my data, determiner-which is mostly found in continuative clauses, or relative clauses post-modifying nouns, such as ‘the right makyng of whiche figures, I wyll declare hereafter in the thirde booke’ (CESCIE1B 1551). It is thus not surprising that P-stranding is extremely rare in this context (but see (79)f). Another peculiar relativiser is the which, a combination common during the EModE period but which fell into disuse by the end of the eighteenth century; it is said not to have favoured P-stranding greatly, and indeed there is only one example in the usage data (79)g (Fischer 1992: 303–4; Rissanen 1999: 296–7). Determiner-which is frequently accompanied by all, as in ‘Some ten days; in all which time I could not till yesterday, find out your Habitation’ (1671cary.d2b); according to Jespersen this combination ‘refers to the whole of a preceding argument’ (1909–49: III.§6.4.7). Fischer (1992: 303) also mentions the combinations the whom and the whose, but these ‘occur only rarely’, and not at all in my data. P-stranding is also rare with whose, and ‘generally’ appears with a fronted preposition, as observed by Jespersen (1909–49: III.§10.4.5, III.§10.5). Johansson (2006: 141) notes that in the nineteenth century possessive of which was ‘clearly infrequent’ and partitive of which was ‘similarly rare’. Quirk et al. (1985: §17.14) add that the ‘avoidance [of whose] involves stylistic difficulty’: while of which is ‘cumbersome’, whose is ‘stiffly formal’. Example (79)h is one of the very few examples in the corpora with P-stranding.

(79) a. he found no inconvenience from the acid, which freed him from the state of suffering in which he had been. (1820m’sw.m’sb)
b. The cause of this lamentation, was the great dreade whych they were in. (CESERM1A 1521/35)
c. The former kind of knowledge (whatever it amounts to) hath been, and may be, in Gentiles as well as Christians, (1732berk.h’sb)
d. the immensity of the creation, no part of which can be thoroughly understood without taking in its reference and respect to the whole; and this is what we have not faculties for. (17xxbutl.h’sb [1700–49])
e. an endeavour which we make with a full perception of the difficulties to be overcome on every side, within no less than without the sacred pale; and upon which we enter with the utmost diffidence of our powers, (18xxirvi.h’sb [1800–49])
f. Sir – I thanke you for sending me word, I may hope to see you at Easter, which time will be much longed for by me.

(CEPRIV2 1625)

g. Sir, it is so now that I have made you thewsans of the money, that ye sent to me for, and I have sent it you with John Walker at this tyme; the which I shall shew you how I mayd schift of, at your comminge.

(CEPRIV1 1503–4)

h. Also, Doues dung mingled with Hony, hath the same effect, so is it by me also wel approoued, this plaister called Oxicroceum, whose composition is not far to be sought for.

(CESCIE2A 1602)

P-stranding may also appear in more complex constructions such as ‘relative concatenation’ and ‘push-down relative clauses’. In the former, a relative clause is ‘concatenated or interwoven with another clause’ so that the same relative pronoun carries two functions, one for each clause, and two functions which are usually different (Jespersen 1909–49: III.§10.7.1ff). For instance, in (80)a two VPs are coordinated so that which is the direct object of the verb desire as well as the prepositional complement of stranded for, headed by the verb pray. Jespersen (1909–49: III.§10.2.6) notes that in such cases of coordination the final position of the preposition is ‘necessary’; the same observation is made by Visser (1963–73: I.§411, I.§§533–47) and Quirk et al. (1985: §17.17). Sometimes it is the entire PP that is shared across two VPs, like upon which in (80)b; in this case P-piping is not blocked. For their part, ‘push-down’ clauses are structures where ‘the modifying clause becomes itself embedded in a[other] clause’ (Quirk et al. 1985: §11.18, §§17.63–4). In these complex constructions P-stranding is grammatical but clumsy, as in (80)c; for the sake of clarity the front position of the preposition is often preferred.

(80) a. It would much rejoyce me to here of your good health this winter, which I much desire and pray for. I thank God I and my children are well.

(CEPRIV2 1629)

b. But notwithstanding all this ignorance and dissatisfaction, there is somewhat upon which he assuredly rests and depends;

(17xxbutl.h3b [1750–99])

c. The act of friendship was one which it is painful for me to attempt to express my sense of by words.

(1834disr.x5b)
Subordinate interrogative clauses with *wh*-pronouns normally appear as complements of verbs such as *ask, consider, enquire, know, observe, say, see, tell, wonder*, all of which may exhibit P-stranding or P-piping, as in (81)a and (81)b. This clause type may also occur with expressions such as *give notice, send/have word*, as in ‘Send me word which of the twist you will have of’ (CEPRIV2 1623). A few instances have been found with short fragments, such as ‘they found a great horne (they know not weill of what beast)’ (1667laud.j2b), which contains a pied-piped preposition in a sluicing construction. Sluicing may exhibit P-stranding if the preposition is ‘undeleted in its underlying position’, as in ‘John left but I don’t know who with’ (quoted in Inada 1981: 125–6). Example (82) illustrates sluicing in an independent interrogative clause. In general, main interogatives favour P-stranding, the P-piping variant being considered more formal and less natural; compare the example from a play in (83)a and one from a medicine text in (83)b. Trotta has argued that preposition placement in main interrogative clauses is largely influenced by discourse functions: ‘In the typical communicative function of interogatives as questions, it is the *wh*-word which signals interrogation and should logically come early to successfully fulfill that purpose’; it follows then that P-piping will be preferred less (2000: 55, quoted in Hoffmann 2011: 53). The same argument would apply to exclamative clauses, a context in which P-Piping is generally ‘rare’ (Quirk et al. 1985: §11.31). For Trotta, P-stranding in fact seems to be ‘heavily favoured regardless of any grammatical, contextual or situational factor’ (2000: 107, quoted in Hoffmann 2011: 55). In my data exclamatives are uncommon, like main interrogatives, and they appear mainly in plays; the examples in (84) illustrate the two syntactic variants.

(81) a. O madam, if you did but see what a passion my master was in, you would not be so merry. (1697pix-.d2b)

b. and he alone knows what the wife shall prove, and by what dispositions and manners, and into what fortune that child shall enter: (CESERM3B 1673)

(82) {SAM} I’ve managed it, sir – crust of bread and cheese, and a pickle!

{GOLIGHTLY} Who for, sir?

{SAM} For you, sir. – you said – (1889madd.d6b)

A recent account of sluicing is given in Nykiel (2012), where priming is discussed as a determining trigger of P-stranding or P-piping.
(83) a. Sir, I shall obey you – But pray who does this House belong to? (1709cent.d3b)
   b. On accurate calculation, I found the spindle of the mill fly round 140 times in a minute, when working with its full force. To what cause are we to ascribe the total absence of haemorrhagy in this case? (1775carm.m4b)

(84) a. My poor Grace, what a strange crew you have fallen among! This dreadful husband! (1899mart.d6b)
   b. Innocent! My daughter innocent! Thank Heaven! Thank Heaven – Oh, from what pangs has that one word relieved me. (1819phil.d5b)

One peculiarity of interrogative questions involves the sequence what for? versus for what? As noted by Biber et al. (1999: §2.7.5.4), ‘the two types of fragment are not necessarily equivalent’. Whereas in the combination with P-piping the preposition retains its original meaning, that of purpose, stranded for conveys the meaning of reason in the sense of ‘why’ – compare (85)a and (85)b. The place of the preposition in these sequences is not a matter of syntactic or stylistic preference but of semantics and pragmatics. The meaning is altered if the preposition is arranged differently, when this is acceptable (see also Quirk et al. 1985: §11.15). Instances of what for? and for what? are more characteristic of spoken language, and thus in my data they appear predominantly in plays, with a few instances in letters, diaries and sermons. Eighteenth-century grammarians were aware of these distinctions too, observed for example by James Elphinston in English Grammar Reduced to Analogy (86).

(85) a. {WIDOW} Given it away, minikin?
   {SOPHIA} Yes, ma.
   {WIDOW} Given my purse away! To whom? For what purpose?
   {SOPHIA} La, ma, only – only to keep a poor woman from starving! (1792holc.d4b)

b. {AUBREY} <listening> That’s Paula’s cart. Let’s discuss this again.
   {DRUMMLE} <going up to the window and looking out> It isn’t the dog-cart <turning to AUBREY> I hope you’ll forgive me, old chap.
   {AUBREY} What for?
   {DRUMMLE} Whose wheels do you think have been cutting ruts in your immaculate drive? (1893pine.d6b)
Common stile says therefore, *what* does this amount *to? whom* do you aim *at? what* is he proud *of? &c. and the precise, To *what* does it amount? at *whom* do you aim? of *what* is he proud? But the familiar *what* amounts *to* is – the person I aim *at* is – the thing he is proud *of* is – become precise only by resolution or suppletion: That *to which* it amounts is – the person *at whom* I aim is – the thing *of which* he is proud is – So the natural question, *what* are you *for?* loses all its nativeness and almost its nature, (for the very sense may be changed) in *For what* are you? (Elphinston 1765: II.146–7)

Another feature of *wh*-relatives and interrogatives often discussed in eighteenth-century works is the appropriate use of *whom* in the object case and not *who* in the subject case (87) (see also Sundby *et al.* 1991: 426–8). Guy Miège (1688) had already raised the matter in the late seventeenth century, and it is still a matter of concern in twentieth-century usage guides (Gowers 1975: 185–6; Ilson 1985: 178; Crystal 1995: 194, 366). Reference grammars of PDE such as Quirk *et al.* (1985: §1.17 §6.35, §6.38, §17.17) and Biber *et al.* (1999: §8.7.1.4) still echo the distinction and the stylistic and attitudinal differences conveyed in each form. According to Quirk *et al.* (1985: §6.35), there seems to be ‘a stylistic incompatibility between the preposition + relative pronoun construction (*to whom*), which is rather formal, and the use of *who* rather than *whom* as a prepositional complement (*who* . . . *to*), which is informal’. Regarding relative clauses, Biber *et al.* (1999: §8.7.1.4) remark that *who* with P-stranding is ‘rare and stigmatised in written texts’; *that*-relatives or *zero*-relatives are the viable alternatives ‘more commonly used’. Compare (88)a, the most frequent pattern in my ModE data, with (88)b, which is very unusual in my usage data. The combination of *whom* with stranded preposition (*whom* . . . *to*), as in (88)c, can then be regarded as standing halfway along the formal–informal continuum. These stylistic connotations are felt most in interrogatives. Visser claims that ‘the putting of the preposition before [interrogative] pronouns has always been less usual’ and that ‘this usage is reserved for literary diction’ (1963–73: I.§414). The variant *whom* . . . *to* is certainly unusual in my ModE data. Formal/informal clichés aside, nominative case *who* with P-piping (*to who*) results in ungrammaticality (Quirk *et al.* 1985: §17.14) and is harshly criticised in normative works as an ‘ungrammatical acerbity’ (Mittins *et al.* 1970: 107); yet infelicitous instances occur occasionally, as in (18)d.6

Prepositions are improperly separated from the words which they govern; as, *Whom* did you give it to? *whom* did you come *with? him* I will attend *to*. Grammarians seem to allow of this mode of expression in conversation and familiar writings; but it is generally inelegant, and in the grave and sublime styles, is certainly inadmissible. But this is much more pardonable than another error which has crept into general use, which is to make prepositions govern nominative case; thus, *Who* did you give it to? *who* do you speak to? *who* is she married to? *who* did you go for? *who* did he come *with?* These are questions in every person’s mouth and yet they will be shocked to hear the preposition pronounced where it ought to stand; thus, *To who* did you give it? *to who* do you speak? *to who* is she married? *for who* did you go? *with who* did he come? Yet, these lasts are as proper as the first, though not so familiar to the ear. (Webster 1784: 78–9)

---

Relative, interrogative and exclamative clauses are also attested with adverb relative pronouns such as *where* and *whence*. In the usage data *where* shows a tendency towards P-stranding. The directional adverbial *whence* is always headed by the preposition *from* and it triggers P-piping, as in (89)a. The combination *from whence* is in fact redundant or pleonastic in relative and interrogative use (also *OED* s.v. *whence* etymology, s.v. *from* A.15.a). According to Denison (1998: 247, 284), *whence* has become ‘virtually

---

7 The only exception in my data is a seventeenth-century instance with pied-piped *of*: ‘A Widow! what is she, or *of whence*?’ (1693powe.dzb). The use of *of* in this context is not uncommon in EModE (*OED* s.v. *whence*); in the late eighteenth century it was corrected by grammarians such as Benjamin Dearborn (1795: 116).
obsolete’ since the nineteenth century, probably under the influence of harsh criticism from eighteenth-century grammarians; for instance, James Carroll (1795) points to the tautology and inelegance of the construction in passage (90) (see Sundby et al. 1991: 189, 370). The usage corpora also document early uses of the form whether in the sense of ‘which of the two’, a meaning which was ‘evidently obsolete about 1600’ (Rissanen 1999: 276, OED s.v. †whether adv.); (89)b is the only instance I could identify in my data. There is one other instance of whether where the governing preposition is stranded after sixteen intermediate words, an unusually long span, in (89)c. In the literature this usage is referred to as a ‘conjunctival use’, that is, in a subordinate polar interrogative which responds to a yes/no question. According to Denison (1998: 247), ‘that is now the main function of whether’, and Jespersen adds the remark that already in the seventeenth century it could be used ‘where no alternative [i.e. or] is expressed’ (1909–49: II.§7.743, also III.§2.4.71).

(89) a. Now it had been observed in general by others, that the conjunct amplitude of the branches of arteries are always larger than the trunks from whence they arise. (1735mart.m3b)
b. And if the matter be such, as both the parties may stande with saluacyon, then on whither side his conscience fall, he is safe ynough before God. (CEPRIV 1500–70)
c. Whether the recited Phaenomenon have had any influence for this extream Cold, I know not, but leave it for Astrologers to examine. Whether the like Appearance have ever been observ’d in England, I should be glad to be informed of. (1674leew.s2b)

(90) The adverbs hence, thence, whence, include, in their meaning, the idea of the preposition from: consequently the prefixing of this preposition to these adverbs, is superfluous, and is so, inelegant . . . Whence signifies from what place, time, origin, or book; as whence came you? That is, from what place came you? Whence to Christians reckon their years? That is, from what time, or epocha? (Carrol 1795: 115–16)

It should be recalled that syntactic variation is also attested in contexts of topicalisation, as in (91). As explained in Section 2.2.2, topicalisation with P-stranding was taken into account for the analysis of the overall trends, but not for syntactic variation.
4.2 Diachronic trends

The analysis of the usage corpora yielded 968 instances of P-stranding in the four centuries of early and late Modern English, which represent a normalised frequency of 12.2 per 10,000 words (see Figure 4.2, Table 4.1). If we compare the earlier and later halves of the period, there is a slight decrease from 12.4 to 12.1, which in itself is not statistically significant, although, as we will see in Section 4.3, the decrease is particularly drastic.

Methodological notes: (i) Frequencies are normalised per 10,000 words. (ii) Statistical differences in frequency have been calculated with the chi-square test for statistical significance; attention will be drawn to some of the statistical differences observed. (iii) As explained in Section 2.2.1, the data in the late EModE period from HC (1640–1700) and from ARCHER (1650–1699) have been combined in the period 1640–1700. (iv) Regarding the diachronic representation of graphs, it must be noted that the EModE data represent 70-year time spans, while the LModE data are distributed in fifty-year time spans, which may make the slopes appear steeper.
in registers such as science, medicine and private letters. The change in the frequency of P-stranding is indeed significant if we break down the data by subperiods, as well as in the subperiods within the EModE period and the LModE period. The diachronic distribution shows that the use of stranded prepositions increases steadily during the EModE period to the extent that at the end of the seventeenth century its frequency has almost trebled (5.9 to 16.0). The eighteenth century witnesses a reversal in trends: the gradual increase comes to a halt in the first half of the century, followed by a sharp decline in the second half, to a level lower than the frequency observed in the late sixteenth century (16.0 to 9.4). At the start of the nineteenth century the use of P-stranding increases moderately, and continues rising in the latter half of the LModE period, yet slowly and with a frequency lower than in the late seventeenth century (10.3 to 12.4). Considering the common use of stranded prepositions in PDE (Biber et al. 1999: §2.7.5.4), one might hypothesise that P-stranding would continue to rise during the twentieth century.  

Differences are statistically significant when the seven subperiods in ModE are compared ($\chi^2 = 72.021, p < 0.001, df = 6$), as well as when the EModE subperiods ($\chi^2 = 48.385, p < 0.001, df = 2$) and the LModE subperiods ($\chi^2 = 23.043, p < 0.001, df = 3$) are compared separately. Differences are likewise significant for the periods 1640–1700, 1700–1749, 1750–99, and 1700–1749, 1750–99, 1800–1849.

In her study of phrasal verbs, Wild observes that a move towards positive attitudes began in the early twentieth century, which she associates partly with positive attitudes towards P-stranding (2010: 110–21, 254).

---

9 Differences are statistically significant when the seven subperiods in ModE are compared ($\chi^2 = 72.021, p < 0.001, df = 6$), as well as when the EModE subperiods ($\chi^2 = 48.385, p < 0.001, df = 2$) and the LModE subperiods ($\chi^2 = 23.043, p < 0.001, df = 3$) are compared separately. Differences are likewise significant for the periods 1640–1700, 1700–1749, 1750–99, and 1700–1749, 1750–99, 1800–1849.

10 In her study of phrasal verbs, Wild observes that a move towards positive attitudes began in the early twentieth century, which she associates partly with positive attitudes towards P-stranding (2010: 110–21, 254).

---

Table 4.1: Preposition stranding, 1500–1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>/10,000w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EModE 1500–70</td>
<td>74,710</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>182,131</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>333,541</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LModE 1700–49</td>
<td>108,463</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>96,519</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>123,281</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>131,105</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>459,368</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>792,909</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diachronic trends

Table 4.2: Preposition stranding versus pied piping, 1500–1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>P-stranding</th>
<th>P-piping</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EModE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1570</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LModE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 Preposition stranding versus pied piping from 1500 to 1900 (percentages).

In contexts of syntactic variation, P-stranding is the less preferred choice during the four centuries under scrutiny (20% vs. 80% overall; see Figure 4.3, Table 4.2). The data indicate that P-stranding increases

11 Differences are statistically significant when the seven subperiods in ModE are compared ($\chi^2 = 23.185, p < 0.001, df = 6$), as well as when the EModE subperiods ($\chi^2 = 6.866, p < 0.05, df = 2$) and
gradually during the EModE period, as seen in the overall data, but is far from reaching the frequency of P-piping, and at best reaches thirty per cent of the instances attested. The eighteenth century again shows a drastic decline in the use of P-stranding, which continues to fall in the early nineteenth century, to a third of what it was a century earlier, and with a ratio as low as in the sixteenth century (29.1%, 21.4%, 10.4%). The late nineteenth century seems to witness a moderate recovery of P-stranding, yet this is still lower than in the late seventeenth century (10.4% to 21.3%).

The dominance of P-piping in contexts of variation does not come as a surprise. Previous studies have consistently found that the front position has always been the preferred variant in the history of wh-relative clauses, the context in which variation is most often attested (see Section 4.1). P-piping was the obligatory construction in interrogative clauses until the late thirteenth century, and remained ‘customary’ during Middle English, a period in which P-stranding occurs rarely or sporadically in this type of clause (Johansson 2002: 152). With exclamative clauses, P-piping appears to be the old form, too. P-stranding in wh-relative clauses only emerged in the thirteenth century and although it became more common during the fourteenth century it was still a minority choice – one per cent in Johansson’s study (2002: 152). Furthermore, it has been observed that P-piping has a higher frequency not only in written English but also in spoken English; as Henry Sweet said: ‘even in colloquial speech the construction with preposition + which cannot always be avoided’ (1898, quoted in Johansson and Geisler 1998: 74).12 (See in particular the overview in Bergh and Seppänen (2000) and Hoffmann (2011: 81–3.).)

While P-piping is evidently the more frequent construction, the rising use of P-stranding during the EModE period is also noteworthy. Jespersen summarises the history of P-stranding by stating that he ‘found some examples in Chaucer, many in Elizabethan English, and a great many in later books’ (1909–49: VII.§2.3.5). Scholars have described Middle English authors such as Chaucer and Richard Holle of Hampole as ‘enthusiastic stranders’ (Allen 1980: 227–8). In their review of historical studies, Bergh and Seppänen (2000) reported an increase from two per cent in late Middle English to thirteen per cent in EModE. In the sixteenth-century prose writings of Sir Thomas Elyot (1509–70), Rydén found an average of eleven
per cent of stranded prepositions with *which* and ten per cent with *whom* (1966: Table VII). Eleven per cent is also the average of P-stranding in Ingels’ (1985) sociohistorical study of late sixteenth-century texts (1550–1600); and similar results were reported in Lindelöf’s (1997) survey of relative *which/who*(m), based on the full range of texts available in the *HC*. In Bengtsson’s (1996) analysis of the works of Shakespeare during the period 1595–1611, including *which, who*(m) and *whose*, P-stranding reaches fourteen per cent of the total tokens. More evidence comes from Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg’s findings in a sample of *wh*-relative clauses from correspondence between 1410 and 1681: ‘cases of preposition stranding can be found throughout the data, with a gradual increase from 1560 onwards’ (2003: 75–6). As Dekeyser (1990: 92) put it: ‘the expansion of stranding in Modern English seems to be an unassailable fact’.

The main observation to be drawn from these patterns is that the first change in trends takes place in the early eighteenth century. In Section 1.2.1 it was noted that in assessing the effect of prescriptivism on usage, it is essential that there be a time gap between the timing of the prescription and the change in usage. In order to be able to claim that late eighteenth-century normative works were responsible for a change in the use of P-stranding, as traditionally granted in the literature, a time gap should be observed between the boom of prescriptive strictures and any effect on usage; that is, the change should have started in the late eighteenth century or in the early nineteenth century. The data in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.2, however, reveal that the trends were already changing in the early half of the century, before the heyday of prescriptive precepts. This is borne out by the data in contexts of syntactic variation: the increase from the late seventeenth to the early eighteenth century is minor and contrasts with the steep rise observed in the seventeenth-century subperiods (see Table 4.2, Figure 4.3). Since a time gap is not observed, then, late eighteenth-century prescriptivism cannot be held principally to account; in other words, late eighteenth-century precepts did not trigger change, but rather reinforced an existing trend. Thus, we need to consider the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century as the key periods for the emergence of the stigma against P-stranding.

The comparison between the earlier and later subperiods presents the early eighteenth century as a transition period from the genuine increase observed during the course of EMOD to the noticeable downturn in the late eighteenth century; this, we will see, is attested in all the registers of the selected corpora. Something must have happened at this early stage, or even before it, to bring the steady rise in usage to a halt. In my view, the
early eighteenth century can be regarded as a period of ‘latent awareness’ of
the stigmatisation of end-placed prepositions, with mild criticism already
beginning to be seen in contemporary grammar books, treatises on rhetoric
and other works on language. It is a period of hibernation which paves the
way for the ‘more definite awareness’ of norms of language use character-
istic of the late eighteenth century. In Chapters 5 and 6, I will argue that
the origin of this latent awareness can be found in seventeenth-century
works, especially in grammars of English through the teaching of Latin,
and in the explicit proscription of end-placed prepositions by the literary
writer John Dryden. The normative tradition emerged in the late seven-
teenth century and so too did the stigmatisation of P-stranding. Once
awareness is established, it materialises into attitudes, both positive and
negative. Evidence in support of this view can be drawn from the current
usage corpora, where a large number of samples in various registers of the
subperiod 1700–49 do not contain any instances of P-stranding, but do
contain P-piping, such as Thomas Pocock’s journal (1704), Micajah Perry’s
diary (1739) and the private letters of Laetitia Pilkington (1743). Further
evidence can be found in Elizabeth Montagu’s private letters, whose use of
P-stranding had already decreased by the period 1757–62, prior to the boom
of prescriptive grammars (Sairio 2009). Similarly, it has been observed that
Joseph Addison consciously changed his writing style in favour of relative
classes with the preposition in front of the relative pronoun, and that this
was the case as early as the first decade of the century (Wright 1997). I will
return to these case studies in Chapter 6.

Late eighteenth-century precept works evidently play a crucial role in the
diachronic development of P-stranding. The decline in use can be noticed
in contexts of variation and also in the overall frequency of P-stranding,
which seems to suggest that eighteenth-century writers resorted to a variety
of strategies to avoid the stigmatised feature even in contexts other than
wh-relatives. A frequency analysis by clause type indeed shows that the use
of P-stranding in LModE declines in clauses such as that-relatives, infini-
tives, comparatives and topicalisation structures. Sairio (2009) observed a
similar pattern in the data from Elizabeth Montagu, and we will see that
John Dryden turned stranded prepositions into fronted prepositions in the
revision of his essay Of Dramatrick Poesie (1684 [1668a]) (see Section 6.3
and Section 5.3.1, respectively).

13 The terms ‘latent’ and ‘definite’ awareness are here borrowed from Hiltunen’s discussion on phrasal
The nineteenth century epitomises the descriptive–prescriptive continuum described in Section 3.4: the age of ‘continual alternating between descriptivism and prescriptivism’, as depicted by Dekeyser (1975: 34). On the one hand, the prescriptive and proscriptive attitudes towards grammatical correctness and propriety that had developed in the late eighteenth century ‘hardened into ideology’ during the nineteenth century (Bailey 1996: 215). The overall frequency of P-stranding in the early half of the century remains low after the drop in the previous period, and in contexts of variation the decline that had started in the eighteenth century continues well into the nineteenth. The effect of late eighteenth-century proscriptions seems to be stronger in contexts of variation, given that in this period precepts are most often concerned with variation in *wh*-relative clauses, and occasionally with interrogative clauses. Writers would thus be more conscious of the stigma in these contexts; as Claridge put it, ‘a stigmatised feature, however advantageous, would not have been used that often’ (2000: 278). We should also bear in mind that *wh*-pronouns are favourably prescribed in normative works, to the detriment of *that*-relatives and zero-relatives; as noted above, *that*- and zero-relatives require obligatory P-stranding, whereas with *wh*-pronouns preposition placement is the writer’s choice. If children in the late eighteenth century were taught in school to correct end-placed prepositions and put them in front position in exercises of bad English, it is not surprising that when writing in the nineteenth century they would avoid the end position, especially in formal styles, as often stated in normative works. We can conclude, then, that harsh criticism in the late eighteenth century did exert an influence on language practices: P-stranding was avoided not only during the heyday of prescriptive attitudes but also during its aftermath. Quoting from Görlich (1999: 75–6), end-placed prepositions were one of the ‘problems inherited’ from the previous century.

On the other hand, the prescriptive approach came up against the influence of the New Philology and, consequently, its strength diminished during the second half of the nineteenth century while the descriptive approach slowly gained force. Thus we see the overall frequency of P-stranding increase moderately from the early part of the century; in contexts of variation it is only in the latter part of the century that the use of P-stranding starts to rise again. We can infer that the (late) eighteenth-century normative tradition had a strong influence on the use of P-stranding, but the resulting decline was only a transient one: the nineteenth century acts as a period of transition, paving the way for the high frequency observed today. Attitudes in the nineteenth century become less prescriptive
overall. For instance, Milroy and Milroy (2012: 5) point to Richard Chevenix Trench (1807–86) as one of those ‘reacting against the authoritarian linguistics of the eighteenth century’, against prescriptive attitudes, and Beal (2004: 118) identifies Fitzgerald Hall (1872, 1873) as one who ‘criticised the ignorance of his predecessors and some of his contemporaries’. This had a knock-on effect on the stylish trends of the nineteenth century when, as McIntosh (1998: 7) argues, some writers started to feel that ‘the prescriptivists had gone too far, and wrote contemptuously about the “immoderate embellishment” of [nineteenth-century] prose’. Crystal (1995: 86) adds that ‘the Romantic movement in particular promoted a special interest in the way ordinary people spoke’ and that ‘there was a growing sense of the distance between linguistic scholarship and language reality’.

4.3 Register variation

4.3.1 Historical drift

Genres and registers have received much attention in the literature, from text linguistics and stylistics to sociohistorical linguistics and corpus linguistics. The linguistic study of registers has been approached for the most part from a variationist perspective, taking into account factors such as the topic and purpose of the text, the background of the author, the audience addressed, and spoken/written medium. In historical studies, texts are understood ‘as a linguistic construct [which] is affected by extralinguistic features in various complex ways, and this is reflected in variation and change over time’ (Meurman-Solin 1997: 267). Registers are seen as multifunctional in that they are produced and perceived in relation to social functions; as such, linguistic features may change over the course of time according to changes in the sociohistorical background (Fowler 1982: 38–42; Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1989: 96–9; Taavitsainen 1993: 171–2). The eighteenth century in particular was a period of ‘considerable linguistic self-consciousness’ in notions of grammatical correctness and propriety in style (Finegan 1992: 104). As described by Görlich (1999: 151), style can be viewed as the choice among linguistic variants, its proper use being determined by (1) the adequacy according to function, text type and situation – the decorum; (2) period-specific conventions; (3) idiosyncratic preferences. For McIntosh (1998: 4–10), prescriptivism and standardisation are two key sociocultural factors underlying eighteenth-century stylistic trends. Grammar books were concerned with correctness and rhetoric was
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concerned with the elegant use of style, but in this century one subsumed
the other and good style also became ‘one of the main objectives of writers
of grammar books’ (Görlich 1999: 151; see further Section 5.4). We have
seen in Section 3.2 that P-stranding was criticised in terms of grammatical
correctness as erroneous, faulty or as bad arrangement, and also in terms
of stylistic propriety as inelegant, harsh, feeble and improper. Preposition
placement, then, seems to be a likely subject for prescription and literary
stylistic trends to intertwine. In this section, I develop the premise that the
‘flux’ in linguistic attitudes towards good and correct English runs side by
side the ‘flux’ in attitudes towards good and proper style (Finegan 1992:
104–5).

Biber and associates have carried out extensive research into register
variation based on multidimensional analyses, whereby ‘a co-occurrence
pattern indicates an underlying communicative function shared by the
coccurring [linguistic] features’ (Biber and Finegan 1989: 490; Biber
1995: 141–235). Three of the six major dimensions are particularly insight-
ful for identifying ‘oral’ and ‘literate’ differences in English, namely
Dimension 1 ‘Involved versus Informational Production’, Dimension 3
‘Situation-dependent versus Elaborated Reference’, and Dimension 5 ‘Non-
Impersonal versus Impersonal Style’.\(^{14}\) Diachronically, seventeenth-century
texts are found to be relatively oral, eighteenth-century texts become more
literate, and nineteenth-century texts gradually shift towards more oral
styles again. These trends respond to changing aesthetic preferences and
functional and attitudinal influences, as well as to increasing linguistic self-
consciousness. The label for a register may not change, but linguistic use
changes in line with changing social functions. Seventeenth-century texts
are typically oral and involve maintaining the accessible prose at which sci-
entists and humanists aimed. Oral dimensions can still be found in some
eyearly eighteenth-century writings, the result, for instance, of the demands
of a growing literate audience from the socially rising middle classes, but
during this century registers consistently evolve towards the more liter-
ate pole of the stylistic continuum, moving towards the less involved,
more elaborated and more impersonal. The oral trend thus finds itself

\(^{14}\) ‘Oral’ refers to linguistic features produced in situations typical of spoken language, and ‘literate’
to language produced in situations typical of writing (e.g., Biber and Finegan 1989: 493). Notice
that the names of some dimensions vary slightly in some of Biber’s studies. Here I follow Biber and
Finegan (1997), but see also Biber and Finegan (1992) and Biber (2001). The other dimensions are
labelled Dimension 2 ‘Narrative versus Non-narrative Discourse’, Dimension 4 ‘Overt Expression
of Argumentation/Persuasion’, and Dimension 6 ‘On-line Informational Elaboration Marking
Stance’.
in competition with a new form fuelled by neoclassical ideas and influential prescriptivists who, in an elitist way, encouraged a more carefully wrought, elaborate and sophisticated style of prose (Finegan 1992: 109). Biber and Finegan (1989: 514) describe the eighteenth century as ‘a period of considerable conflict concerning literacy, with markedly different views of intended readers, the appropriate purposes of prose, and appropriate styles’. The eighteenth century is also a period of ‘flux in linguistic attitudes’ (Finegan 1992: 104). Norms are laid down in grammar and rhetoric books about ‘proper’ and ‘correct’ English. The target is written, formal prose; consequently, spoken, colloquial and informal features are deemed incorrect, improper, inelegant and inappropriate. Prescriptive grammars and rhetoric treatises play a part in guiding writers towards making their texts more written and less oral (McIntosh 1998: 1, 35). The result was the drift towards a literate and ‘purple prose’ style; rhetorical devices promoted formality, and consequently ‘written English was divorced from the common idiom’ (Finegan 1992: 109; McIntosh 1998: 22–41). Attitudes shifted again during the nineteenth century with the Romantic movement, when the preference for ‘naturalness and utility’ resulted also in a preference for ‘an individual, colloquial self-expression’; for writers ‘natural prose meant colloquial style’ (Biber and Finegan 1989: 514), and, as Finegan put it, ‘the norm of orality gained the upper hand again’ (1992: 116).

Stranded and pied-piped prepositions are amongst the linguistic features examined in these multidimensional analyses: P-stranding co-occurs with features representative of involved, oral, interactive and affective communicative situations, while P-piping is associated with highly explicit, elaborated reference and informational situations (see, in particular, Dimensions 1 and 3 in Biber 1995; also Biber and Finegan 1989: 490–2). This section thus explores the distribution patterns of P-stranding and P-piping in the context of the historical drift of register variation, paying special attention to the eighteenth century, the century that ‘clearly bucks the trend’ in the historical drift (Finegan 1992: 116). I will first discuss the overall trends by register over time (Section 4.3.2), followed by the analysis of medium (Section 4.3.3) and level of formality (Section 4.3.4), two of the main distinctive features of registers (Görlich 1999: 140). Alongside register-specific trends, one must also bear in mind that idiolectal preferences and idiosyncrasies are unavoidable and should not be underestimated in historical investigations (see Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 1989: 99–100; Rissanen 1991: 324; Biber et al. 1998: 222–6); outliers will be examined and will help account for any possible skewing in observed tendencies.
### Table 4.3: Diachronic evolution of preposition stranding and register variation, 1500–1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Let-P</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Let-O</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500–70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EModE</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LModE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 1500–1900 | 249| 173| 87 | 67 | 137| 113| 119| 16 | 7 |

b. Normalised figures per 10,000 words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1500–70</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>9.4</th>
<th>7.7</th>
<th>–</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>14.6</th>
<th>7.4</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EModE</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–49</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LModE</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### 4.3.2 Preposition stranding across registers

The distribution of P-stranding across registers and subperiods is presented in Table 4.3, while Figure 4.4 sets out the overall frequency in the nine registers under scrutiny.\(^{15}\) It must be recalled that official letters and legal texts are only available for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; science and medicine texts have been split, as have diaries and journals (see Section 2.2.1).

\(^{15}\) Differences are statistically significant overall ($\chi^2 = 68.203$, $p < 0.001$, df = 8), and also when the EModE and the LModE periods are compared ($\chi^2 = 70.352$, $p < 0.001$, df = 8).
The first observation to be made here is that P-stranding appears most frequently in private letters and plays, two registers closely related to informal and spoken language in terms of setting and medium. Private letters score the highest frequency overall (17.0 per 10,000 words), and this is consistent across the two subperiods (19.1 in EModE, 15.1 in LModE). The second and third positions in the frequency ranking are occupied by plays (14.4) and sermons (13.6). These registers are similar in that both are scripted, written texts to be spoken (‘speech-purposed’ texts in Culpeper and Kytö 2010); they differ in that plays are produced in an informal setting, written to be performed, while sermons are formal, consciously elaborated texts, written to be read out. As far as the use of P-stranding is concerned, it seems that the two registers run parallel. In the LModE period they hold the same second and third positions with very similar frequencies (14.7 and 14.2); in EModE close similarities emerge as well (13.8 and 13.1). It is worth pointing out that these three registers (private letters, plays, sermons) have something else in common: they are interactive texts. The registers with the lowest frequency of stranded prepositions are legal texts and official letters, the two characterised by their formal setting. The former contains seven stranded prepositions only (1.9), and the latter just sixteen (9.0); compared, for instance, with the 249 instances of stranded prepositions in plays (13.8), the writers of legal texts and official letters show a strong reluctance to end sentences with prepositions. While the findings in these registers are somewhat expected, the very low occurrence of P-stranding in diaries is
unexpected: given its association with speech-related types of text and its informal setting, one would have expected a higher frequency of this particular linguistic feature. However, it is found to score the third lowest ratio of stranded prepositions overall (10.1), with comparatively low frequencies in both subperiods (10.8, 9.5). The frequency of stranded prepositions in scientific and medical texts, two expository written registers, is moderately low overall (10.6, 11.1), but this is mainly due to the drop in frequency attested in the LModE; as we can see in Table 4.3, these were amongst the most welcoming scenarios of P-stranding in the EModE period (14.5, 14.3), but came to occupy the lowest positions in the frequency rankings in the LModE period (8.6, 10.3).

The comparison between the EModE and the LModE periods clearly shows a decrease in frequency in four of the six registers in which we can trace diachronic continuity, these being private letters, diaries, science and medicine; in sermons and plays the frequency remains stable.16 This suggests that the proscription against stranded prepositions had an effect in all contexts. As McIntosh (1998: 9) observed, ‘if the mid-century flood of prescriptive grammars eventually left a mark, the over-all direction of the changes they recommended was as much towards refinement as towards correctness’. This is more evident when we examine the data in the crucial periods concerning the emergence and consolidation of the prescriptive approach to language (1640–1800). As we can see in Figure 4.5, the use of stranded prepositions decreases consistently across all registers from the early to the late eighteenth century, and in four of the six types the decline can already be observed in the early half of the century compared to the frequency attested in the late seventeenth-century period.17 We can see that ‘the world of speech’ of the pre-prescriptive era was opposed to ‘the prose of a print culture’ in the late eighteenth century (McIntosh 1998: 117).18 The drop is most dramatic in sermons, which exhibits a very high frequency in the period 1700–1749. Diaries and private letters also show a drastic drop during the eighteenth century, with diaries rapidly falling from a high score in the seventeenth century to just two stranded prepositions a century later. In plays and medicine the reduction in P-stranding is notable too, while in science the more drastic change took place from the late

16 The register journals is excluded here because there are no data for the two early periods in EModE.
17 Differences are statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ with df = 2 in private letters ($\chi^2 = 6.618$), and at $p < 0.001$ with df = 2 in diaries ($\chi^2 = 19.121$), science ($\chi^2 = 16.077$) and sermons ($\chi^2 = 20.28$).
18 Similar conclusions were reached in Yáñez-Bouza (2006): five of the six prose registers examined showed a decline in the use of P-stranding in the period 1740–80, compared to the period 1680–1740, namely education, essays, fiction, travelogue and letters/memoirs; the frequency of history remained low and stable. (The data in this study were based on the Century of Prose Corpus, Part B.)
seventeenth century to the early eighteenth century. It seems, then, that writers were ‘register conscious’ in their production, according to whether a piece was written to be read or to be spoken (see, for instance, Bergs 2005: 20). They must have been aware of linguistic connotations and social conventions, even in private documents, which until the late nineteenth century are known to have been shared with close relatives and acquaintances. Writers can be expected to have been wary that deviations from rules and models in style and in grammatical correctness would have been noticed, positively so when the linguistic feature was considered correct, appropriate and polite, but negatively in the case of stigmatised linguistic features. As stated above, ‘a stigmatised feature, however advantageous, would not have been used that often’ (Claridge 2000: 278).19

4.3.3 Spoken and written registers

It is known that in PDE preposition placement is sensitive to the medium in which the text is produced: P-stranding is more salient in spoken than written language (Biber et al. 1999: §2.7.5.4; Hoffmann 2011: 76). These claims about PDE hold true for the early and late ModE periods too, as we can see in Figure 4.6: 13.8 tokens per 10,000 words in speech-related texts (plays, diaries, sermons, private letters, official letters) compared to

---

19 Claridge (2000: 178) also ascribes the overall decline in the use of phrasal verbs during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries to ‘(a) the standardization process, (b) a certain dominant stylistic ideal, and (c) prescriptivist tendencies’.
Figure 4.6  Preposition stranding in speech and writing, 1500–1900 (normalised frequencies).

9.6 tokens in writing-related texts (science, medicine, law).\textsuperscript{20} The diachronic trends in Figure 4.7 confirm the close link between P-stranding and speech: P-stranding is consistently more frequent over the course of the four centuries.\textsuperscript{21} Biber and associates observe that stylistic trends in the seventeenth century move towards oral styles, and the increase of P-stranding fits such a trend. Notice that the rise in frequency is documented in all speech- and writing-related registers, with up to fifteen tokens per 10,000 words, for example, in plays, diaries, science and even official letters (see Table 4.3). The only exception is law, which remains relatively low in the three subperiods of EModE. The eighteenth century certainly ‘bucks the trend’, and this is so in both types of medium. Given that the normative tradition aimed primarily at establishing norms for the written language, it is not surprising that the proscription against stranded prepositions is more strongly felt in written texts: the decline in usage here can be observed from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and persists into the early nineteenth century; in both science and medicine, the frequency of P-stranding drops by a third over the same time span (see Table 4.3). In addition, the fact that the frequency of P-stranding also decreases in the

\textsuperscript{20} Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 24.372, p < 0.001, df = 1$). The register journals has been excluded from these calculations because of their mixed categorisation in the ARCHER corpus as a written register but a personal style of communication (see Yáñez-Bouza forthcoming c). If journals are taken into account, the distribution patterns still hold true, with writing-related registers at a 9.9 ratio per 10,000 words.

\textsuperscript{21} Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 13.945, p < 0.05, df = 6$).
second half of the century in speech-related registers, and more drastically so than in writing-related registers, testifies to the strong influence of precept in this subperiod. The late eighteenth century underwent a stylistic drift towards a more written and less oral prose; it transformed the style of the speech-based prose of the late seventeenth century into a more baroque kind of prose, ‘more bookish, more elegant, more precise, and more consciously rhetorical’ (McIntosh 1998: 1, vii). In the early nineteenth century the writing-related, specialised registers of science and medicine show an even lower frequency of P-stranding, which again lends support to the strong effect of prescriptivism in writing contexts.

The distributional patterns in contexts of syntactic variation likewise confirm the link between preposition placement and medium (see Table 4.4). As shown in Section 4.2, P-piping is the dominant variant when there is a choice between the front and the end position of prepositions, and this holds true regardless of medium: ninety-two per cent in written texts and seventy per cent in spoken texts. Similar trends have been observed with regard to PDE, and also in some sporadic studies of early and late ModE data. For instance, concerning wh-relative clauses, Bergh and Seppänen (2000: 310) report ninety-eight per cent P-piping in written LModE and eighty per cent in spoken LModE; regarding PDE which relatives, Johansson and Geisler (1998: 69) observe seventy-nine per cent

---

22 Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 55.697, p < 0.001, df = 1$).
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Table 4.4: Preposition stranding versus pied piping in speech and writing, overall data 1500–1900 (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-stranding</th>
<th>P-piping</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-piping in speech (see an overview in Hoffmann 2011: 81–4). On the other hand, it is important to note that P-stranding has a higher frequency in speech-related texts than in writing-related texts, in fact nearly a third higher (30% vs. 8%; see Table 4.4). In plays the ratio of P-stranding reaches fifty-three per cent, and in private letters it exceeds the average at thirty-five per cent. As we can see in Figure 4.8, the writing-related registers hardly document instances of P-stranding in variation contexts, ranging from ten per cent in science to two per cent in legal texts. We can safely ascribe these trends to the influence of precept comments in which the end position of prepositions is related to spoken, familiar conversation while the front
4.3.4 Formal and informal settings

Like the medium, the level of formality is one of the strongest determining factors in preposition placement. In PDE P-stranding is paired with informal, conversational settings, whereas P-piping is paired with formal, ‘stilted or pompous’ discourse (see Quirk et al. 1985: §9.6; Biber et al. 1999: §2.7.5.3, §3.13.2.7). These trends are confirmed in the usage data for the early and late ModE periods. First, P-stranding is more frequent in the group of informal registers, at 14.1 (plays, private letters, diaries), while it scores 10.5 in the larger group of formal registers (science, medicine, sermons, law, official letters) – see Figure 4.9.24 Second, the diachronic distribution shown in Figure 4.10 confirms that P-stranding is more common in informal contexts throughout the four centuries of the ModE period. The differences become less marked during the eighteenth century, the period in which P-stranding is criticised by grammar writers as an expression characteristic of familiar styles which is not suitable in the solemn and elevated styles (see Section 3.2 and Section 5.4.2). The eighteenth century ‘demanded greater formality and precision; the age applauded a more flowery style’ (McIntosh 1998: 1). As Rissanen points out, ‘by a careful comparison of texts’ which stand at different poles on the formality continuum we can ‘trace the typical domain of certain syntactic features either to the

23 Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 127.209, p < 0.001, df = 7$).

24 Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 18.947, p < 0.001, df = 1$).
oral level of language, as “change from below”, or to the literate end of the scale, as “change from above” (1999: 188). The fact that informal registers also show a decline in trends testifies to the influence ‘from above’. In private letters and diaries, the decrease can already be observed in the early eighteenth century; in plays it continues into the early nineteenth century. Science and medicine, in the formal group, also record a gradual decrease in the subperiod 1800–49 (see Table 4.3). On the whole, we can see again that the development of P-stranding conforms to Biber and associates’ historical drift. The increase of P-stranding during the seventeenth century in both informal and formal contexts responds to the move towards oral prose styles. The eighteenth century, we have seen, shows a reversal towards less informal, more formal prose, and hence P-stranding drops consistently in both settings. The nineteenth century witnesses a move towards less formal styles, a more natural and idiomatic kind of prose, in which P-stranding began to be accepted again. The increase can be observed in both informal and formal settings – the former at a faster pace, as might be expected.

The patterns concerning syntactic variation lend more support to what has been claimed in this section, and they also mirror very closely the patterns observed in spoken and written texts (see Table 4.5; cp. Table 4.4). P-piping is the preferred variant in both settings, although there is evidently a closer connection with formal settings (89%) than with informal settings (64%). Conversely, and as expected, P-stranding is more frequent in informal contexts (36%) than in formal contexts (11%).\(^{25}\) The distribution by

\(^{25}\) Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 69.313$, $p < 0.001$, df = 1).
Table 4.5: Preposition stranding versus pied piping in formal and informal settings, overall data 1500–1900 (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-stranding</th>
<th>P-piping</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.11 Preposition stranding versus pied piping in formal and informal registers, 1500–1900 (percentages).

register shown in Figure 4.11 (cp. Figure 4.8) again points to two informal registers as the environments where stranded prepositions are most common – plays and private letters. P-stranding also occurs often in official letters and in sermons, and we might argue that this is so because they are speech-related types of text. The lowest frequency is observed in law, a formal register, followed by medicine and science, two expository, formal registers. Diaries stand out because of their low ratio, as low as science, which is unexpected given their informal and speech-based nature.\(^\text{26}\)

\(^{26}\) Differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 127.209, p < 0.001, \text{df} = 7$). The level of formality has also been found to be statistically significant for the choice of preposition placement in PDE data (Hoffmann 2011: 83–4).
A thorough examination of the propensity to P-stranding in each register goes beyond the scope of the present study, as it would involve a thorough investigation of aesthetic trends and textual conventions. Thus in what follows I will briefly discuss some of the most salient changes observed in the usage corpora.

4.3.5 Further observations

4.3.5.1 Science and medicine

Medical and scientific prose are known to bear many similarities: they are written, expository registers, representative of ‘specialised writing for a professional audience’, and stereotypical literate texts characterised by careful, sustained production circumstances, informational communicative purposes and minimal interactivity (Finegan and Biber 1995: 245; Biber and Finegan 1997: 260–1; Biber et al. 1998: 210–15). It has also been reported that science and medicine follow a parallel drift towards more literate styles from the late seventeenth century to the twentieth century, alongside other written expository types of text such as legal prose and news reportage (see in particular, Biber and Finegan 1997; Biber 2001). As far as the use of P-stranding is concerned, the corpus analysis confirms the linguistic similarities between these two registers (see Figure 4.12, Table 4.3). The overall figures for ModE are very close (science: 10.6, medicine: 11.1), and so are the frequencies in EModE (science: 14.5, medicine: 14.3) and LModE (science: 8.6, medicine: 10.3). The upturns and downturns over time are attested in the same time spans, the main difference being that for some periods in scientific texts the blips are more accentuated, as in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In contexts of syntactic variation they also show a parallel development, with the only difference being that stranded prepositions are slightly more common in science (science: 10.8%, medicine: 5.3%, not plotted).

Late seventeenth-century prose in science and medicine is largely associated with the stylistic trend towards ‘plain style’, that is, clear and precise expression, away from the ornamental Ciceronian style and towards the more utilitarian prose championed by Francis Bacon (1561–1626); natural,

---

27 The stylistic drift in science is also traced in Finegan and Biber (1995) and González-Álvarez and Pérez-Guerra (1998).

28 Regarding the frequency of P-stranding, differences between science and medicine in the periods 1640–1700 and 1700–1749 are statistically significant (χ² = 21.791, p < 0.001, df = 1). Regarding syntactic variation, differences between science and medicine overall are not statistically significant; figures are too low for statistical significance to be calculated by subperiods.
idiomatic features would thus be promoted, presumably including stranded prepositions. It is generally agreed that the Royal Society is behind these changes in style:\(^\text{29}\)

The Royal Society of London was founded in 1662 and energetically advanced the utility and accessibility of English prose. Some members were especially keen to simplify style while keeping it sufficiently versatile to accomplish the functions previously carried out by Latin. In the period following the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, many writers consciously strove for plain and simple prose; they aimed at a conversational style that would ensure wide accessibility to the findings of the new science, the new philosophy – to Enlightenment thought in general. (Finegan 1992: 107)

The high frequency of P-stranding in science and medicine in the late seventeenth century fits the general pattern (science: 19.3, medicine: 15.9). Notice the strikingly high frequencies in the samples of scientists such as J.L. (70.2), A.I. (54.9), Robert Boyle (53.6), Petrus Natus (40.1), and Monsieur Havelius (26.8); likewise, in medical prose, outstanding levels are seen in the sample by Frederick Slare (32.2) and Roger Howman (27.8).\(^\text{30}\)


\(^{30}\) Other than scientists, the diarists Samuel Pepys (1633–1703) and John Evelyn (1620–1706) were both public servants and fellows of the Royal Society and both were also frequent stranders, Pepys to a greater extent (27.2 and 18.1, respectively).
In fact, the step away from Latin, which few could read, was taken earlier by authors such as Robert Recorde (c. 1512–58), who was aware that he was ‘treating a subject [geometry] never before published in English’, and in order to render it ‘familiar to all’ he showed in this and other texts ‘his preferred dialogue form and choice of the vernacular’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Recorde, Robert’). The medical writer William Clowes (1543/4–1604) did so amongst his surgeon peers: ‘He wrote, abandoning precedent, in English’ in an attempt to ‘open up the profession to a broader spectrum of the public by the use of plain English’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Clowes, William’). And, likewise, Thomas Vicary (d. 1561) wrote ‘the first anatomical textbook in English’ (1548), a work which was published ‘for practical use’ by and for apprentices (ODNB, s.v. ‘Vicary, Thomas’).

Scientific and medical prose undergo a drastic change during the eighteenth century, already appreciable in the early half, more dramatically in science. In both registers the frequency of P-stranding becomes very low, a trend that continues into the nineteenth century. The ‘written’ nature of the period evidently plays a role. Authors of the Royal Society changed their attitudes towards more literate styles characterised by formality, precision and tighter sentence structures in which wh-relative pronouns and P-piping structures would be more suitable than disjunctive constructions with P-stranding (see Biber and Finegan 1997: 269; Johansson 2006: 144–5). An author’s idiosyncrasies are ruled out as potential sources for the trends – the reluctance to end sentences with prepositions is shared by most authors, including the grammarian Joseph Priestley, the natural philosopher whom we have described as an advocate of P-stranding (see Sections 3.1 and 5.4.2). One could argue that a change in audience and readership also had an effect on style. LModE authors were aiming at publication in journals of the best reputation, such as the Philosophical Transactions, Edinburgh Medical Journal and Medical and Philosophical Commentaries, and were aiming at a specific and very select professional audience. Their prose would then be consciously crafted in an elaborate manner, one which would adhere to the norms imposed at the time. Consequently, stigmatised (colloquial) features like end-placed prepositions had no place in their writings. There is also a shift in the authorial persona from author-centred to object-centred styles, especially in texts from the Philosophical Transactions, one of the major sources of texts in the ARCHER corpus used here; thus, scientific and medical writing become less persuasive and more abstract, more passivised (Atkinson 1999, as reported in Rodríguez-Puente
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2013: 238). We might note that some writers of scientific and medical texts in the usage corpus were also concerned with language, grammar and style. In addition to Joseph Priestley, already mentioned, there is Benjamin Martin (bap. 1705–d. 1782), a lecturer on science and maker of scientific instruments who also published a grammar appended to his dictionary Lingua Britannica Reformata (1748), and Mark Anthony Meilan (c. 1743–c. 1813), the author of A Grammar of the English Language in 1771, who was at one time master of an academy in Hoxton and for over 40 years gave private instruction in languages, arts, mathematics, and sciences (ODNB, s.v. ‘Meilan, Mark Anthony’).

4.3.5.2 Private letters
Personal letters are seen as representative of colloquial language and intended for a (relatively) familiar audience; hence they are said to reflect (relatively) involved, spoken language. It thus comes as no surprise that this register welcomes the use of P-stranding the most. However, what is perhaps unexpected is that the frequency of stranded prepositions from the EModE to the LModE period decreased, and not only in terms of their overall frequency (19.1 to 15.1), but also in contexts of syntactic variation with P-piping (45.1% to 27.0%).

Previous studies on historical stylistics have observed that personal letters follow a general drift towards more oral styles from the late fifteenth century to the present day (Biber and Finegan 1992, 1997; González-Álvarez and Pérez-Guerra 1998). The trend is not uniform throughout the centuries, however. According to these studies, letters are moderately involved in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. An increase in P-stranding during EModE concurs with this trend; notably, the frequency increases not only in overall terms (9.4 to 21.3) but also in contexts of syntactic variation (12.5% to 51.6%). The relatively oral characterisation of late seventeenth-century letters turns into a more literate style over the course of the eighteenth century, when letters become ‘extremely elaborated’ (Biber and Finegan 1988: 92). Compared to PDE letters, which are ‘personally involved and interactive’, eighteenth-century epistolary writing is primarily ‘expository, descriptive, or argumentative in purpose’ (Biber 2001: 105). As McIntosh puts it, there are ‘different degrees of familiarity in familiar letters, and eighteenth-century letters [become] fully naturalized citizens of the world of print’ (1998: 130). In this century, writing and

32 Regarding P-stranding, differences between EModE and LModE are not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.458, p < 0.05, \text{ df} = 1$), but differences across subperiods are significant ($\chi^2 = 17.851, p < 0.01, \text{ df} = 6$). Regarding syntactic variation, differences between EModE and LModE are also statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 4.06, p < 0.05, \text{ df} = 1$).
receiving letters is an important social practice for people of all ranks, from love and family letters to patronage, commercial documents, petitions, etc. Private epistles in particular become a major text type (Görzlach 2001: 211), and letter-writing manuals come to be in great demand in that they provide people with the necessary knowledge for the ‘inditing’ of correct and polite English, an essential tool for social advancement. Besides proper formulae of address, appropriate topics for discussion and elegant layout, grammar also featured amongst the topics which letter-writers should learn about: ‘a polished style expressed in correctly spelt grammatical sentences became a sought-after accomplishment’ (Howatt 2004: 107). Writers of letters were fully aware that their letters might be read not only by the addressee but, rather, they were often read aloud within small social circles; writers thus felt the pressure to adhere to the social conventions of polite society. Bearing in mind that the letter-writers of the (ARCHER) usage corpus are published literary authors, it is not surprising that the use of a stigmatised feature such as P-stranding dropped dramatically over the course of this period (21.3 to 9.6). Also, parallel to this, the frequency of P-piping increases considerably, from forty-eight per cent in the late seventeenth century to seventy-five a century later. For instance, the sample letters from Laetitia Pilkington (1743), Tobias Smollet (1751–63) and Edmund Burke (1770–84) do not contain any stranded prepositions.33 In the nineteenth century, private letters begin to turn once more ‘in the direction of more oral styles’ (Biber and Finegan 1989: 512), although they are still ‘relatively informational’ and ‘relatively elaborated in reference’ (Biber and Finegan 1988: 92, 96). In contexts of syntactic variation P-piping is evidently the preferred choice in the eighteenth century: seventy-one per cent in the first half and eighty-nine per cent in the second. This was possibly reinforced by the preference for *wh*-relativisers, ‘which were looked upon as the literary norm at the time’ (Johansson 2006: 139).

4.3.5.3 Diaries and Journals
It was mentioned in Section 2.2.1 that for the purposes of my analysis here the register *diaries/journals* in ARCHER has been split into two separate types of text, following Yáñez-Bouza (forthcoming c). In brief, diaries reflect on private matters, domestic affairs, everyday activities and routines, whereas journals narrate or report on a journey or a task associated with travel, including sea travel and war campaigns. Diaries and journals

33 Rodríguez-Puente (2012: §5.3) also observed a notable decline of phrasal verbs in the eighteenth century.
share a number of characteristics, such as their autobiographical nature and personal style of communication, but are produced under different situational circumstances (e.g., participants involved, private/public domain), and this is likely to be reflected in the use of linguistic features. The use of P-stranding overall is relatively similar (10.1 in diaries, 11.3 in journals), but the diachronic development by subperiods fluctuates, with the two registers seemingly running in opposite directions; differences only even out in the late nineteenth century (see Table 4.3, Figure 4.13).34

The trends in diaries seem to follow the drift reported by Biber and associates: from a relatively high use of P-stranding in late seventeenth-century texts35 to a drastically lower frequency during the eighteenth century, which then increases once more during the nineteenth century. The frequency of stranded prepositions in contexts of variation is remarkably low, with a ratio of just ten per cent in the whole ModE period; even writers who score P-stranding frequently in obligatory contexts, such as Samuel Pepys (1666–7), James Fretwell (1735–40) and Thomas Whitwell (1827–8), show a

34 Differences between diaries and journals in the EModE and LModE periods are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 23.172, p < 0.001, df = 4$).
35 The high frequency of P-stranding in the seventeenth century concurs with other studies of diaries from the same period. For instance, Oldireva Gustafsson (2002: 212) noticed that spelling forms in private writings of the period 1680 to 1710 ‘contrast to the respective figures for the public register’ in their ‘prevailance of variation’, that is, their informal, natural characterisation.
strong preference for P-piping when there is a choice of preposition placement. Journals also seem to follow the historical drift in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, albeit at different rates from diaries. In terms of variation, P-stranding scores slightly higher in journals than diaries, at fourteen per cent.

The trends in the eighteenth century deserve closer attention. In contexts of variation, the data tallies with the general observation that the frequency of P-stranding drops drastically in the late decades, and in this particular register of journals, the decrease continues into the early part of the nineteenth century, thereby testifying once again to the influence of prescriptive norms (1700–49: 57.1%; 1750–99: 18.8%; 1800–49: 0%). However, as we can see in Figure 4.13, the overall frequency of P-stranding increases in the latter part of the eighteenth century, from 12.3 to 16.0, before decreasing in the early nineteenth century. This is a notable finding, in that all the other registers showed a decline in usage in the same time span (see Figure 4.5), and this is the time when the construction is most often and most severely criticised. One could speculate that it is simply ‘a somewhat unusual pattern of variation’, and that the results are in accord ‘with the less standardised type of usage characteristic of these texts’, as concluded by Oldireva Gustafsson (2002: 55, 217) with regard to spelling practices of regular verbs in travelogues (1760–90). A closer look at the individual samples in the corpora used here, however, reveals that the increase in usage is due to idiolectal preferences on the part of one particular author – William Strickland (1788–1854). The sample from his Journal of a Tour in the United States of America (1794) documents over fifty per cent of the total stranded prepositions in this subperiod and reaches a normalised frequency as high as 48.6 per 10,000 words. That Strickland’s peculiar usage has skewed the results is supported by the fact that two of the three stranded prepositions found in variation contexts are his.\footnote{To these data from ARCHER, we can add the observation that stranded prepositions are also very uncommon in late eighteenth-century travel accounts compiled in the Century of Prose Corpus (Yáñez-Bouza 2006).} If the Strickland sample is removed from the frequency calculation, the use of P-stranding in the late eighteenth century does decrease as expected (12.3 to 9.2), and the decline in contexts of variation is also more pronounced (57.1 to 9.1%). This corroborates the importance of looking into the preferences of individual authors, as these may at times bias the results and lead to misinterpretations.
4.3.5.4 Sermons

Sermons are a difficult register to interpret because of their mixed nature as a written register that is speech-purposed but produced in a formal setting. Yet it is precisely their ‘intermediate position between the spoken (if unpremeditated), the written-to-be-spoken (if read out) and the written (published) medium’ that makes them so intriguing as a focus for linguistic study (Görlach 2001: 204). They are also interesting because of their ‘appeal to the audience, which provokes specific verbal and paralinguistic features’ (ibid.). Given the formal background, language use in this register is expected to be conservative and more distant from ordinary speech than other registers (Claridge and Wilson 2002: 25); in a religious context one could also expect to see a higher incidence of archaic and Latinate features. However, as Pooley (1992: 97) points out, one ‘should not confuse “religious” with “decorous”’, for religion ‘need not necessarily be more sublime than ordinary speech’. P-stranding is associated with informal, familiar contexts, and because of the formal setting of sermons we might expect a low frequency for this feature; yet because of the speech-based nature of sermons, we might anticipate a high frequency of stranded prepositions. The data in Table 4.3 show that P-stranding in sermons steadily increases during the EModE period to the extent that it doubles its frequency (7.4 to 15.2). This continues in the early part of the eighteenth century, where it doubles the frequency observed in the previous subperiod and is also the highest frequency across registers (30.9). The rise is also apparent in contexts of syntactic variation, recording the highest ratio of all subperiods in this register (30%). In the late eighteenth century, the frequency drops abruptly, both overall and in variation contexts, this being the lowest in all subperiods for this register. The nineteenth century shows fluctuation, but the data remain lower than in the seventeenth century.37

Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (1989: 99) point out that sermons ‘serve as a good illustration of conscious style selection’. The high frequency of P-stranding in the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century seems to respond to the call for ‘plain style’, away from the ornamented Latinate style – as noted above with regard to medicine and science. Rather, the language of sermons should be ‘wholesome and affectionate expository writing’, as proposed by John Wilkins in Ecclesiastes (1646) (see Claridge and Wilson 2002: 25; also Pooley 1992: 103–22). For instance, it is known

---

37 Differences across the seven subperiods in ModE are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 33.462, p < 0.001$, df = 6), as are the differences in the crucial periods of change 1640–1700, 1700–49, 1750–99 ($\chi^2 = 20.28, p < 0.001$, df = 2).
that Archbishop Tillotson (1630–94) ‘strongly supported the theories of Wilkins and the Royal Society on the reform of prose style’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Tillotson, John’), and it has also been suggested that Tillotson’s ‘most urgent concern’ for the revision of his sermons was to attain a ‘more conversational’ style (Brown 1961: 27–9). Tillotson’s plain style might be derived from his association with the Royal Society, in particular with John Wilkins (1614–72). Tillotson was elected as a member on the 25th of January, 1672, at the time when Wilkins was the Society’s ‘guiding spirit’; and it was also suggested by a contemporary that it was Tillotson’s work with Wilkins on the Essay towards a Real Character that ‘led him to consider exactly the Truth of Language and Stile’ (Burnet, Sermon 13, quoted in ODNB, s.v. ‘Tillotson, John’). As Brown describes it, Tillotson ‘writ with the greatness clearness and propriety, in the language that man uses’ (1961: 32), and one of the features that he frequently resorts to is stranded prepositions, his use being slightly more frequent than the average among his peers (11.3, compared to average 10.3).

In the eighteenth century, preachers seem to have moved away from the oral prose style towards a profoundly literate style. For Biber (2001: 96.n1), sermons in this century ‘are primarily a formal written register rather than a speech-based register’; they are the exception to the general trend towards a more ‘involved production’ and more ‘situated reference’ characterisation (Biber and Finegan 1997: 269). Instead, they become extremely explicit and elaborate in terms of references, highly informational and more abstract; in other words, ‘increasingly “literate” in expression’, and they represent ‘formal, planned speaking intended for a general audience’ (Finegan and Biber 1995: 249, 245; also Biber and Finegan 1997). Propriety in rhetoric and eloquence plays a role, too. As observed at the start of this section, the standard norms are concerned not only with grammatical correctness but also with propriety in style, and one of the main canons of propriety was the harmonious cadence of the text. In Section 3.2, it was reported that P-stranding was often considered harsh and unpleasant to the ear. Eloquent preachers would thus avoid end-placed prepositions for the sake of harmony and sonority as a means of pleasing their audiences. It is worth noting that many grammar writers and rhetoricians were members of the clergy, and thus would regularly read out their own sermons. Hugh Blair is a good example: he is one of the strongest critics of P-stranding in my precept corpus, and the sample of Blair’s sermons in the ARCHER usage corpus contains no instances of stranded prepositions. A good training in the canons of rhetoric was ‘of the greatest importance’, as Thomas Sheridan (1719–88) explains:
What could be imagined more elegant, if entertainment alone were sought; what more useful, if the good of mankind were the object, than the sacred function of preaching, properly performed? Were the most interesting of subjects treated with proper perspicuity and adequate judgment, and well wrought discourses delivered to listening crowds with that dignity which becomes a teacher of Divine truth, and with that energy, which should shew, that the preacher spoke from his own heart, and meant to speak to the hearts of his hearers, what effects might not follow? (Sheridan 1781, quoted in Görlach 2001: 204; italics in original)

As with journals, the close analysis of idiolect helps us to account for certain peaks in the data. First, the preacher Joseph Butler (1692–1752) stands out as the most ‘enthusiastic’ strander in the entire corpus of ModE, with a mean score of 74.8 (period 1700–49). Since this sample contains half of the total instances attested in the five sermons documented in the early eighteenth century, Butler’s strong preference for the form is certainly prominent in the rising use of stranded prepositions in this time span. That said, even when Butler’s sermon is excluded from the frequency calculation, there is still an increase with respect to the late seventeenth century (15.2 to 19.9). Second, in the late nineteenth century, the sermon of Charles Spurgeon (1834–92) is the odd one out in that sermons in this subperiod show a strong reluctance to strand prepositions, whereas Spurgeon’s idiolect reflects a salient preference for P-stranding (31.6). Notice that Spurgeon has been described as a ‘leading exponent of a more natural, direct preaching style’ and ‘plain speaking’ of the late century (ODNB, s.v. ‘Spurgeon, Charles Haddon’). The frequencies obtained for the subperiod 1850–99 are, then, essentially a mirror image of Spurgeon’s literary practices: seven of the nine stranded prepositions attested for the period are from his sample, and two of the three stranded prepositions in paradigmatic variation with P-piping are also his. If Spurgeon’s sample were left out of the calculations, the frequency of P-stranding in this subperiod would decrease, and the decline would be more marked (13 to 9, cp. 11.7 to 2.3). In addition, the idiosyncratic use of the construction by preacher Richard Baxter (1615–91) did affect the interpretation of the trends for the late seventeenth century. Baxter, minister and religious writer, is remembered as ‘remarkable for the unaffected directness of his style [and for] the intimacy of his address to the reader’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Baxter, Richard’). He is said to have ‘assumed a distinctively puritan character’ in his preaching practice (ODNB, ibid.), which possibly played a role in his strong preference for stranding prepositions: according to Pooley (1992: 115–16) ‘the puritans were as definite about the appropriate style of preaching as they were about its purpose. It
Concluding remarks

This chapter has dealt with the analysis of the usage corpora, based on the data drawn from *HC* and from *ARCHER*. The aim was to trace the evolution of P-stranding from 1500 to 1900 and to identify whether changes in the observed trends could be related to the criticism found in eighteenth-century works, as reported in Chapter 3. Before the diachronic analysis, Section 4.1 illustrated the types of clause in which P-stranding and P-piping have been documented in the corpora.

P-stranding increased steadily during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but suddenly came to a halt in the early eighteenth century, followed by a drastic decline in the latter part of that century. The early nineteenth century witnessed a moderate upturn, with a slow rise during the second half of the century. As regards the trends in contexts of syntactic variation, P-piping is evidently the preferred choice during the four centuries, which tallies with the trends in ME and in PDE too. The frequency of P-stranding fluctuates over time, and also increases gradually during the EModE period, before dropping sharply during the eighteenth century and further still in the early nineteenth century; the late nineteenth century shows a moderate rise but at a very low ratio.

Two main observations can be drawn from these patterns. First, eighteenth-century precept did have an influence on usage patterns, given the decrease in the use of P-stranding during the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century. Second, the stigmatisation of P-stranding cannot have originated in the late eighteenth century, because of the lack of a time gap between precept and usage. The change in trends has already begun to occur in the early eighteenth century, which points to the seventeenth century as the period of incipient criticism. The early eighteenth

---

John Howe (1630–1705), another preacher who stranded prepositions quite frequently during the late seventeenth century, was a ‘Baxterian middle-way Calvinist’ whose sermons were ‘of the more popular puritan divines’ (*ODNB*, s.v. ‘Howe, John’).
century is, in my view, a period of latent awareness which paves the way for the definite criticism found in late eighteenth-century works. This will be examined in Chapter 5.

The analysis of usage across registers was twofold. On the one hand, it confirmed that P-stranding is more frequent in speech-related registers compared to writing-related registers, and that it is also more frequent in informal than in formal settings. This was observed across the four centuries under investigation. Also, the diachronic analysis provided more evidence of the stigma against stranded prepositions in that the use of P-stranding during the eighteenth century declined not only in written and formal contexts, but also in speech-related registers and informal settings; in some registers, the effect persisted into the nineteenth century as well. On the other hand, it has been suggested that the usage trends in preposition placement respond to a stylistic drift that develops towards a ‘more written’ and ‘less oral’ prose style in the late eighteenth century (McIntosh 1998: 23–4). Normative works, ‘both cause and symptom of language consciousness’ (1998: 180–1), aimed their rules at written prose and thus encouraged writers to make their texts more written-like, with informal and speech-like features such as P-stranding considered to be inelegant, inappropriate or imprecise. The analysis of register variation was complemented by an examination of idiolectal preferences, which has helped to account for certain unexpected patterns in the data. For instance, it was shown that the apparent increase of the form’s use in journals in the late eighteenth century was skewed by the high frequency of P-stranding in one particular journal, William Strickland’s, and that the sermons of Richard Baxter in the early eighteenth century and Joseph Butler in the late seventeenth century also skewed findings slightly in this register.
5.1 The long eighteenth century

Chapter 4 has shown that the first half of the eighteenth century (1700–49) is crucial for the development of the use of P-stranding and for the interpretation of the role played by the normative tradition. Comparison with usage data from earlier and later subperiods shows this fifty-year time span as a transition period from the genuine increase observed during the EModE period to the noticeable downturn in the late eighteenth century. Something must have happened in this early stage, or even before it, which brought the steady rise in usage to a halt. In historical sociolinguistics, when a change in language usage is identified at a certain point in time, the approach is to explore the sociohistorical context of the period immediately prior to it as a means of unearthing the origins of that change. A time gap is typically assumed to exist between cause and effect. In the particular case study of P-stranding, the fact that the change takes place in the early eighteenth century leads us to scrutinise the seventeenth century. Let us recall that the precept database starts in 1700 (Chapter 3). The first author that comments on P-stranding is A. Lane in A Key to the Art of Letters (1705). James Greenwood is the first grammarian in the database to criticise explicitly transposed (stranded) prepositions, in An Essay towards a Practical Grammar (1711). These grammarians happen to be the first precept authors in my data, but that does not mean that they are the first authors ever to discuss P-stranding in the English grammatical tradition. The eighteenth century follows a preexisting tradition: the first grammar of English was published in 1586 and the first prescriptive grammar in 1685. A closer investigation of EModE grammars, then, seems necessary: these may well have been a source of reference for late seventeenth-century literati and for eighteenth-century grammarians, rhetoricians and other educated people with a concern for language (see also Oldireva Gustafsson 2002: 224).
In this chapter I will argue that the incipient stages of the stigmatisation of P-stranding date from the seventeenth century, and that the downturn in the usage data runs parallel to the increase of language consciousness and the development of the normative tradition from descriptivism to prescriptivism. In my view, the early eighteenth century stands as a period of ‘latent awareness’ of the stigmatisation of this construction, with mild criticism already appearing in contemporary grammar books, treatises on rhetoric and other works on language. It is a period of hibernation which paves the way towards the ‘more definite awareness’ observed in the latter part of the century. The early eighteenth century can thus be viewed as a period of transition in terms of both usage of and attitudes towards P-stranding. As Claridge (2000: 198) argued, ‘the level (or lack) of consciousness on which the choice takes place might influence the nature and/or the outcome of the choice’, and consciousness ‘presupposes’ awareness.

The eighteenth century has often been described as the ‘age of prescriptivism’, when the ‘doctrine of correctness held sway’ (Beal 2004: 89; Leonard 1929), though in fact there was more to come in the nineteenth century. According to Rydén (1984: 513–14), ‘[t]he 18th century is the first century to evince a more massive interest in syntactic usage, albeit primarily from a prescriptive or proscriptive angle: the grammarian, not usage, became the official arbiter of language’. The codification of English was in the hands of ‘a band of independent entrepreneurs’ who made dogmatic assertions with authoritarian attitudes (Finegan 1998: 536–47). These codifiers were viewed as authorities in language and their ‘ipse dixit pronouncements’ were the rules to be complied with (Leonard 1929: 35–44; also Finegan 1998: 572). 1

This atmosphere, Bryant (1962: 89–90) says, ‘reached its height’ in the eighteenth century, 2 but the origins lie in the late seventeenth century: the Restoration period, one of social and political turmoil, which ‘longed for prescription’ (Söderlind 1964: 124), 3 and which saw a new attitude to language and prose style. Language, Söderlind argues, ‘is too intimately associated with social and individual life ever to escape attention of reflective minds’ (1964: 111). For instance, John Dryden (1631–1700) expressed

---

1 As Mittins et al. (1970: 1) put it, these ‘ipedixitisms’ are dogmatic assertions unsupported by evidence or reason, that is, ‘a grand arbitrariness’ (‘ipse dixit’ ~ ‘he himself said it’). In their view, grammarians in this tradition have often shown ‘considerable ingenuity in finding reasons for insisting on their preferred usages’.

2 Quoted in Beal (2004: 89).

3 See, for instance, Joseph Aickin’s call for a ‘standard of the English Tongue’ in 1693: ‘The daily obstructions and difficulties that occur in teaching and Learning our Mother Tongue, proceed from the want of an English Grammar, by Law establish’d, the Standard of education, as in other Tongues; for no Tongue can be acquired without Grammatical rules’ (1693: A2†).
his confidence of living in a new time when he referred to Ben Jonson (1572–1637) and William Shakespeare (1564–1616) as those who belonged to ‘the last age’, those whose language he set out to correct in order to ‘conform to stricter usages of the Restoration prose’ (Watson 1968: 10). It was, then, the beginning of widespread public awareness and consciousness of language change. It was the rise of what has been referred to as the ‘appeal to authority’ and ‘Authoritarian English’ (Baugh and Cable 2002: 253–95; Nist 1966: 269–300):

From the middle of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth, English suffered a shift in the attitude of its educated speakers that can be called authoritarian. Gone was the gusto and the unselfconscious freedom of the Renaissance. With a diminished flexibility in speaking and writing, there arose a school tradition of prescriptive and proscriptive rules that hampered natural behaviour in the language. (Nist 1966: 272)

It is in this context that the normative grammatical tradition emerged. Vorlat, in particular, suggests that on the whole seventeenth-century grammars are of a normative nature, ‘with the supposed language use of intellectuals (and authors) being the norm’, and that by the late seventeenth century prescriptive attitudes had already started cropping up, so that, ‘on the one hand, the grammarians break with a medieval grammatical tradition . . . on the other hand, they go away from it, preparing eighteenth-century prescriptivism’ (1979: 137). Vorlat identifies the first prescriptive grammar as Christopher Cooper’s Grammatica Linguæ Anglicanæ (1685). Leonard (1929: 9–10) notes ‘a few citations’ of a prescriptive type even earlier, such as George Fox’s remarks on the ‘vulgar’ use of you for singular and thou for plural (1660). In lexicography, semantic labels with evaluative implications for usage can be found in Edward Phillips’ (1658) New World of English Words (Card et al. 1984: 57; see Section 3.2.2).

Alongside the ars recte dicendi, ‘the art of speaking correctly’ or ideal of correctness, the ideal of politeness was also crucial in the normative tradition. In a period of considerable linguistic self-consciousness such as the late seventeenth century and the eighteenth century, writers came to associate grammatical correctness with ‘the genteel concern for politeness and refinement’ (Finegan 1992: 106), and, consequently, the ‘initiatives in linguistic prescription were linked to the ideals of politeness’ (Klein 1994: 31; also Watts 2002).4 The notion of ‘politeness’ changed over time.

---

Dryden in the late seventeenth century looked up to literary politeness where ‘conversation’ in plays and poetry was ‘identified as a key component of literary refinement’ (Klein 1994: 34). In An Essay upon Projects Daniel Defoe (1660–1731) associated ‘Polite Learning’ with polish and refinement of the English language in order ‘to establish Purity and Propriety of Stile’; it was thus contrasted with ‘Ignorance and Affectation’ and aimed ‘to purge’ the language from ‘all those Innovations in Speech’ (1697: 233). According to Klein (1994: 32), the ideal of politeness was ‘cultivated’ during the Restoration period but really ‘crystallized’ in the first decades of the eighteenth century in the writings of Anthony Ashley Cooper (1671–1713), 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, and in the periodicals run jointly by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele (mainly the Spectator 1711–12). Politeness was then primarily concerned with ‘pragmatic language behaviour’, that of ‘the polite urban, metropolitan gentlemen, well-versed in the art of polite conversation’ (Stein 1994: 8). Watts refers to this as the ‘ideology of gentrification’, in which language behaviour was ‘one of the most significant markers, if not the most significant marker, of politeness’ (1999: 8). As the ideal of ‘correct’ and ‘proper’ English grew in force, ‘polite’ English was inevitably linked to ‘standard’ English and became a vital marker of social class: proper use of standard language became ‘an indispensable attribute of anyone belonging to, or aspiring to belong to, “polite society”’ (Watts 2002: 155, 167). There came a shift in cultural and social values and this had significant implications for linguistic use, which Klein (1994) calls ‘polite prescriptivism’: a standard, correct form which would be identified with the language used by the educated class in polite London circles. The search for politeness characterised the second half of the eighteenth century. A spate of grammars, dictionaries and treatises on rhetoric and elocution were produced to meet the needs of the rising social ranks; correctness and politeness were a shared goal and also became central values in cultural life:

if the mid-century flood of prescriptive grammars eventually left a mark, the over-all direction of the changes they recommended was as much towards refinement as towards correctness. In language, the age demanded elegance and politeness, not merely a school-masterly freedom from “errors”. (McIntosh 1998: 9)

The following passage from Philip Withers’ Aristarchus (1789) illustrates the importance of social distinctions in language and manners; it is of little surprise that Withers is one of the most proscriptive authors in my precept corpus.
My Animadversions will extend to such Phrases only as People in decent Life inadvertently adopt... Every Novelty in Dress is purchased with Avidity, and all Remonstrance silenced by an Appeal, not to PROPRIETY but to PROPERTY... But the Moment the unhappy Girl attempts to speak, her Origin is disclosed, and her Finery and affected Airs excite Sentiments of Pity and Contempt. Hence the Importance of early Attention to Purity and Politeness of Expression: it is the only external Distinction which remains between a Gentleman and a Valet; a Lady and a Mantua-maker. (Withers 1789: 160–1)

Dryden has already been mentioned here in relation to the incipient stages of the ideal of politeness. He has also often been linked to the ideal of correctness, and his unceasing preoccupation with linguistic matters is as well known to us today as it was in his own times. He was an outspoken voice in the tradition of complaining about the declining state of language, the moving spirit of the Royal Society Committee for the improvement of the English language (1664), and an early supporter of the (unsuccessful) call for an Academy of the language. This was all in the late seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century, Dryden was one of the most frequently cited authors in illustrative quotations of normative works on good and bad usage (Sundby et al. 1991: 35; Wright 1994; Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1997), and he was also one of the major sources in Samuel Johnson’s (1755) A Dictionary of the English Language (Walker 1998). Dryden is perhaps most notorious for his explicit criticism of end-placed prepositions. For this reason he will receive special attention in this chapter.

In addition to overt criticism, one of the indications of language awareness is self-correction. It was once said that ‘no English author stood so badly in need of editorial attention as John Dryden’ (Summers 1931: I.ix), and, it has been argued, Dryden ‘went through all his prefaces contriving away the final prepositions that he had been guilty of in his first editions’ (Fowler 1965: 473). The passage of explicit criticism most often cited in the literature dates from 1672 (see (127), Section 5.3.1). Evidence of Dryden’s self-corrections can, however, be found earlier, and these seem to have received little attention hitherto. I have identified three works in particular: the second revised edition of The Indian Emperor, published in 1668 (first edition 1667); Dryden’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s The Tempest, published in 1670 (first published in 1623); and Troilus and Cressida in 1679 (first published in 1609). Awareness comes prior to attitude. When Dryden said in 1672 that he ‘had but lately observed’ this fault in his own
writings, we now know that ‘lately’ extends at least to 1668, that is, four years earlier. Examples (93)–(96) illustrate the silent correction of P-stranding: a prepositional verb becoming transitive (93), the insertion of a wh-relative pronoun that could be preceded by a preposition (94), the omission of the act/scene (95), and the adaptation of the plot resulting in additions with sentences containing fronted prepositions (96).5

(93)  a. What were you talking of when I came?  (Shakespeare 1609: I.ii)
   b. What were you a talking when I came?  (Dryden 1679a: I.ii)

(94)  a. Your Grace has not only a long time of Youth to flourish in,
       (Dryden 1667: epistle dedicatory)
   b. Your Grace has not only a long time of Youth in which to
      flourish,
       (Dryden 1668c: epistle dedicatory)

(95)  a. That ere I sigh’d for:  (Shakespeare 1623: I.ii line 516)
   b. [scene omitted in Dryden 1670a: I.ii]

(96)  a. My brother and thy vnclle, call’d Anthonio: I pray thee marke me,
       (Shakespeare 1623: I.i lines 80–1)
   b. My Brother, and thy Uncle, call’d Antonio, to whom I trusted
      then the manager of my State,  (Dryden 1670a: I.i p. 6)

This chapter takes a diachronic and thematic approach and provides qualitative and quantitative analyses. The aim is, first, to trace the development of prescriptive and proscriptive attitudes towards P-stranding and map these with trends in usage: Does precept precede change in usage? Second, I will explore language attitudes in the seventeenth century in an attempt to uncover the origins of the stigma on P-stranding: Is there criticism other than Dryden’s, and perhaps earlier? Third, I will examine the role of Dryden as a forerunner of the stigmatisation of P-stranding and of the ideals of prescriptivism that surface during the eighteenth century, with a view to assessing whether, and if so to what extent, eighteenth-century norms mirror seventeenth-century attitudes to language. Section 5.2 analyses EModE grammars. Sections 5.3 to 5.5 are organised thematically: (i) the influence of Latin and the ideal of grammatical correctness (Section 5.3), (ii) awareness of differences in style and medium (Section 5.4), and (iii) the influence of rhetoric (Section 5.5). The data for the study of the eighteenth century come from the precept database described in Chapter 3, whilst

5 Appendix 4 presents a chronological table of Dryden’s works and events related to contemporary literature and grammar writing.
The Early Modern English period (1500–1700)

The seventeenth-century data come from Dryden’s explicit and implicit criticism of stranded prepositions in the ‘Defence of the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada’ (1672), the two editions of Of Dramatick Poesie, An Essay (1668a, 1684), and a private letter to the literary writer William Walsh (1691). Three main findings can be anticipated: (a) eighteenth-century precepts were louder but not original, the roots being readily traced to the seventeenth century; (b) Dryden might have been the first proscriptive author to condemn stranded prepositions, but he was not the first writer to show a preference for P-piping; and (c) as far as attitudes towards P-stranding are concerned, this chapter provides more evidence that eighteenth-century precept writers constituted a discourse community, and that they shared a common repertoire when they set out to discuss the arrangement of sentences with end-placed prepositions. Regarding the last point, this chapter will also provide complementary evidence of acknowledged and unacknowledged borrowing, already discussed in Section 3.3.

5.2 The Early Modern English period (1500–1700)

The increasing attention to correctness and propriety runs parallel to the emancipation of the English language from Latin culture. Robins (1986: 297) succinctly describes the history of English grammar writing as ‘concern[ing] mainly the degree to which, and the ways in which, the authors adjusted their work to Latinate tradition, enshrined in effect since the time of Ælfric’. From Ælfric’s time (c. 955–1020) until well into the eighteenth century, the term grammar was used as a generic label meaning Latin grammar, as in A Shorte Introduction to Grammar by William Lily and John Colet (1549). Likewise, the teaching of grammar implied the teaching of classical grammar. Even when the title of the work included the term English it meant written in English, not of English, as in The English Accidence by Joshua Poole (1646) (see Michael 1970: 150–1). Little attention was given to the vernacular language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because Latin was the only model early grammarians had to hand. This came to be reflected in the approach to the structure of English (that is, trying to fit English into the Latin model) and to teaching methods (exercises of bad English, parsing exercises). The beginning of the English grammatical tradition in the late sixteenth century was a timely response to the cultural climate created by the Renaissance, the Reformation and the rise of Humanism, which together favoured the emancipation of English from Latin and raised the prestige of English in schools (Vorlat 1975: 3–6). In the early seventeenth century, developments were
slow. Grammarians from William Bullokar (1586) to John Wallis (1653) modelled their discussions on Latin, they attempted to explain the patterns of English based on the structure of Latin, and they used Latin terminology. On the other hand, they aimed to present the study of English with a practical approach: the study of the vernacular language would facilitate the study of Latin. Vorlat (1975: 11) describes the quality of the grammars as poor overall: ‘[q]uite often the rules are incomplete, sometimes inaccurate’ and some grammars are ‘rather repetitious’. In the second half of the seventeenth century, greater support is voiced for the teaching and learning of English grammar, English is incorporated into the school curriculum, and the English language gradually replaces Latin in contexts of high style such as literature and science. John Wallis’ _Grammatica Linguæ Anglicanæ_ (1653) marked a new era of interest in the vernacular by pointing out the structural differences between English and Latin, paving the way for a conscious movement of reform ‘which sought to give English a grammar in its own right’ (Michael 1970: 210). In the eighteenth century, Beal (2004: 101) notes, the increasing interest in vernacular education was ‘[p]erhaps the most pressing and practical reason for the production of grammars’. To begin with, in 1700 A. Lane presented the four-fold division ‘in deliberate opposition to the traditional Latin system’, which would be followed by a number of other authors also advocating the use of vernacular terminology (Michael 1970: 171, 509). The shadow of Latin persisted through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially in the description of the parts of speech, but the ‘irregularities’ of mapping English onto Latin were ‘repeatedly denounced’ by nineteenth-century grammarians, and Latin gradually lost ground (Dekeyser 1975: 28).

According to Hiltunen (1994: 131), Latin ‘had both a retarding and a stimulating effect’ on the understanding of the grammar of English. It was ‘retarding’, perhaps, in that awareness of English syntax was scarce in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and ‘stimulating’ in that awareness of the dissimilarities between Latin and English gradually resulted in increasing attention to the peculiarities of English. Yet, as we have said, awareness leads to attitudes, and from a stimulating effect a negative attitude arose towards the peculiarities of the vernacular language, an attitude in which ‘all that did not directly fit into the Latin model was often felt to be inferior or incorrect, something that ought to be resisted both in theory and in practice’ (Hiltunen 1998: 443). In order to gain an overview of the level of awareness of P-stranding in this period – or the lack thereof – I have examined seventeen works on the English language and twenty-four works on the Latin language, given the importance of Latin
Table 5.1 Early Modern English grammars examined, 1500–1700\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Linacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Linacre</td>
<td>1525[a]</td>
<td>Linacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525[b]</td>
<td>Linacre</td>
<td>1527[?1510]</td>
<td>Colet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Colet</td>
<td>1542[?1513]</td>
<td>Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Lily and Colet</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Ramus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Bullokar</td>
<td>1612a</td>
<td>Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Greaves</td>
<td>1612b</td>
<td>Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>1612c</td>
<td>Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Hewes</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Brinsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Brinsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>1615[1612]</td>
<td>Brinsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Jonson</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Lily/Haine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Hoole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Wharton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Hoole</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Lye</td>
<td>1671[1670]</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674[?1670]</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>1674[?1670]</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Hoadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Miège</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>R.C./Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Aickin</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Blaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Port Royal</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Wilkins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) (i) Ben Jonson’s *The English Grammar* was published posthumously in 1640. The original date is uncertain, but it seems to have been written before 1623, when it was destroyed by a fire, and then rewritten by 1632 (Michael 1970: 569). Dons (2004: 244) questions this latter date, given the similarities between Ben Jonson’s and Charles Butler’s (1633) grammars; in Dons’ view, there are indications that Jonson borrowed from Butler and not vice versa. (ii) The grammar by William Lily and John Colet published in 1549, *A Shorte Introduction of Grammar*, is known as Lily’s grammar, but it is in fact based on two earlier works: Colet’s (1527) *Æditio*, first written/published around 1510, and Lily’s *An Introduction of the Eyght Partes of Speche* (1542[?1513]). The 1549 edition became the only authorised grammar in schools by order of Henry VIII, labelled thereafter as the ‘Royal Grammar’. (See for instance Vorlat 1973: 7; Dons 2004: 18.) (iii) Mark Lewis’ *An Essay to Facilitate the Education of Youth* (1674[?1670]) contains both an English and a Latin grammar; hence it is listed in both columns.
grammar as a model in the grammatical tradition.\(^6\) I have also consulted two philosophical/rational grammars given their influential role in the late seventeenth century and during the eighteenth century, namely *An Essay towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language* (1668), written by John Wilkins (1614–72), and *A General and Rational Grammar, containing the Fundamentals of the Art of Speaking* (1660), ascribed to the French Port Royal grammarians authors Antoine Arnauld (1612–94) and Claude Lancelot (c. 1615–95). Table 5.1 lists all the works in chronological order.

### 5.2.1 Prepositions in Early Modern grammars

Following the Latin system, prepositions are commonly considered one of eight parts of speech into which grammar is divided and, more specifically, they are described as one of the *minor parts of speech* alongside adverbs, conjunctions and (occasionally) interjections (see Michael 1970: 214–19).\(^7\) Prepositions are *particles*, that is, words dependent on other parts of speech, and they are ‘undeclined’, that is, indeclinable with no case or number inflexion. Grammarians often comment on the boundary between prepositions and adverbs, some sharing Petrus Ramus’ opinion that prepositions are a kind of adverb, but the difference lies in that prepositions govern nouns – otherwise they become adverbs: ‘if [prepositions] bee sette alone, not hauyng any casuall woorde to serue unto, ioyned with them, be not prepositions, but are chaunged into aduerbes’ (Lily and Colet 1549: image 19\(^v\)).

The treatment of prepositions is rather consistent and repetitive. The focus is primarily on the fact that prepositions express a relation, as already pointed out by the Stoic grammarians in their description of prepositions as *præpositiva coniunction* (Vorlat 1975: 401); on the meaning of the prepositions; and on the grammatical case that each preposition governs. This can be observed in Latin and English grammars alike. In one of the earliest grammars of Latin in my selection, the classical scholar Thomas Linacre (?1460–1524) defines prepositions as ‘a part of speche undeclyned, whiche signifieth circumstaunce or anyone or a thynge in place, ordre or cause, as in post propter’ (1525b: image 16\(^5\)). In the late seventeenth century, the schoolmaster Mark Lewis (1621/2–81) still explains that English

---

\(^6\) Descriptions of these authors and works can be found in Michael (1970: 547–87), Vorlat (1975: 10–20, 440–53) and Dons (2004: 6–22).

prepositions ‘have the same common Notion as Signs of Cases, and may be looked upon as Latin Particles’; he then enumerates them all (1674: 3). The importance of the connective character of prepositions is emphasised in John Wilkins’ philosophical grammar, as quoted in (97), and in other grammars of English such as Joseph Aickin’s *The English Grammar*, where the author claims that ‘[t]he joyining together of Words in Sentences expressive of ones mind, depends for the most part upon the Prepositions’ (1693: pt2.16)

(97) Those are stiled Connexive Particles, whose proper use is to express, either 1. The *Construction of word with word* called *Preposition*; or 2. The *Contexture of sentence with sentence*, called *Adverb* and *Conjunction*.

*Prepositions* are such Particles, whose proper office it is to joyn Integral with Integral on the same side of the *Copula*; signifying some respect of *Cause, Place, Time*, or other circumstance either Positively or Privatively. (Wilkins 1668: 309)

This functional definition is particularly concerned with the ‘government’ of prepositions and nouns (or substantives), as in John Wallis’ passage: ‘The Preposition, when it is put before a substantive which is “governed” shows what relation it (the substantive) has to the word – whether a verb, a noun, or some other part of speech – by which it is governed’ (Wallis 1653: 73; translation from Michael 1970: 455). Mark Lewis makes the same point in his Latin *Accidence*, describing prepositions as ‘Ligaments [used] to tie these Bones together’; that is, they are as ‘Tacks, to tack on the *Substantive* governed to the *Verb*, or any other word influencing it’ (1674: 11). Amongst the English grammarians, Guy Miège (1644–1718?) likewise refers to prepositions as ‘Accessories to Nouns’ and ‘a Word that expresses some Circumstance or other of the Noun’ (1688: 7).

Alongside this connective character of prepositions, early grammarians understand prepositions in terms of word order and word formation: a preposition is in essence a word ‘set before’ another part of speech, either in *apposition* or in *composition*. Vorlat (1975: 401) traces this approach back to the Hellenistic grammarian Dionysius Thrax (170 BC – 90 BC): ‘The preposition is a part of speech placed before other parts of speech in syntactical combinations and in word formation’. This is then borrowed by the Latin grammarian Priscian (fl. 500 AD) in what has become the

---

8 As noted by Dons (2004: 218), *government* means ‘the way in which a word affects the use or form of another word or phrase’.
customary description of prepositions in early and late Modern English grammars, whether directly taken from Priscian or (most often) through the Royal Grammar written by William Lily and John Colet (1549) – see (98). For instance, the definition is copied in the Latin works by Charles Hoole (1651: 182, 1659: 77) and Mark Lewis (1674: pt.2,52), as well as in the English grammars by Charles Butler (1633: 52), Jeremiah Wharton (1654: 58), Thomas Lye (1671: 134) and Joseph Aickin (1693: pt.2,5–6).

(98) a. præpositio est pars orationis indeclinabilis, quæ præponitur aliis partibus vel appositione vel compositione.

(Priscian XIV, quoted in Vorlat 1975: 401)

b. A PRÆPOSITION is a parte of speeche most commonly sette before other partes, eyther in apposition: as, Ad patrem: orels in composition: as, Indoctus.

(Lily and Colet 1549: image 19'; also Lily 1542: image 25', Colet 1527: image 30')

c. Of Prepositions, i.e. words set before other words, either in composition, being joined with other words, or in apposition, i.e. only set before them: And Terminations, or endings of words.

(Lye 1671: 134)

5.2.2 Post-position in Latin grammars

In Latin grammars the prepositive character of prepositions is taken for granted, for two reasons: the etymology of the term, of which grammarians were well aware: ‘Prepositio [is called] prepositas because it is put before other words’ (Lewis 1674: pt.2.52, my emphasis); and the understanding that syntactic word order must follow natural order: ‘Note 3. that the natural place of the Preposition is next before its case’ (Hoadly 1683: 151, my emphasis). However, in Latin there are a few prepositions which must be grammatically placed after the word they govern, that is, in post-position, namely tenus, versus, penes, usque, cum. Authors such as Thomas Linacre take note of these exceptions as being ‘specyaltees of certayn prepositions’ which go ‘agaynst the nature of prepositions’ because they ‘come after the wordes that they be co[n]strued with’ (1525b: image 35'–36', 1525a: image 30') – notice, incidentally, Linacre’s stranded preposition with. Mark Lewis lays down Rule 6 as ‘Let Prepositions be always set before the Cases they govern’, but makes the pupil aware of exceptions: ‘tenus and versus always after, cum and usque sometimes after their Cases’ (1671: 46). Similar remarks are found in William Lily (1542: 43'), William Walker (1655: 154), Charles
Hoole (1659: 78), Petrus Ramus (1685: 127) and William Clare (1690: 97). Some of these grammarians offer the translation of the Latin examples into English, the latter with the preposition in front position, as in Hoole in (99). This is still acknowledged in Latin grammars published during the eighteenth century, for instance in Samuel Shaw’s *A Short and Plain Syntax, for the Instruction of Children in the Latin Tongue* (1727: 109, 136) and Thomas Huntley’s *A Grammar of the Latin Tongue* (1780: 147).

(99) Som Prepositions are wont to bee set after their cases; viz. *Cum*, as *quibuscum* with whom; *tenus*, as *pube tenus* up to the thin; *versus*, as *Londinum versus* towards London; to which *usque* may be added, as *ad Orientem usque* as far as the East.

(Hoole 1651: 184)

In the early seventeenth century, the schoolmaster and educationalist John Brinsley (bap. 1566, d. in/after 1624) offers an insightful account which explains instances of post-position that are grammatically required, and which acknowledges post-position for stylistic reasons, too (100). The latter refers here to the figure of ‘artificial order’ known as *Anastrophe* or *Hyperbaton* whereby the natural order of words or letters is changed, that is, inverted or transposed.

(100) a. Q. What is a Preposition?
   A. A part of speech most commonly sette before other parts of speech, either in Apposition, or in Composition.

   Q. Why doe you say, most commonly set before other parts?
   A. Because some Prepositions are orderly set after their cases; the rest also may be set after, sometimes.

   (Brinsley 1615: 25v)

b. Q. What Prepositions are set after their cases?
   A. These three: *versus*, *penes*, and *tenus*, are ordinarily set after; also *cum* and *usque*, sometimes: as, *mecum, ad occidentem vsque*.

   Q. May not the rest of the Prepositions be so set after their cases also?
   A. Yes: by the figure *Anastrophe*: as, *Italiam contra*.

   (Brinsley 1615: 26r)

Brinsley’s passage seems to carry a neutral connotation, both with regard to grammatical and stylistic post-position. His views on the importance of natural and artificial order elsewhere seem to be, however, prescriptive.
when it comes to construing the sentence, as we can see in the precepts laid down in (101). Brinsley’s approach can be considered representative of seventeenth, and many eighteenth-century grammars, as will become evident in the sections that follow—*anastrophe, hyperbaton* and *transposition* are described as figurative syntax and they are frowned at.  

(101) a. The reason also of the rule, that every one may conceiue each thing, is this:
1. That the wordes must bee placed in order, as they should stand; according to the plain and proper nature of the speech, in which they are used to express any matter: which is the very order which Grammar teacheth, and as one governeth another.
2. The word governing or directing, to be placed before those which it governeth or directeth.
3. Those words which do declare others, are to be set after those which they doe declare or make plain.
So the principal word going before, doth commonly direct the wordes following; either in agreement or governement: that is, it causeth the word following to agree with it, or to be governeth of it;  
  (Brinsley 1612: 98, my emphasis)

b. So that these things obserued shall accomplish your desire.
1. Consider and way wel the generall matter & argument.
2. Marke all the hard words in their proper significations.
3. Keepe in mind that verse of the circumstances of places; *Quis, cui & c.*
4. Cast and dispose the words in the proper Grammaticall order.
5. See that nothing bee against sense, nothing against Grammar: but if either the sense be absurd, or construction against Grammar, cast it, and try it another way vntill you find it out.  
  (Brinsley 1612: 124)

---

9 As an illustrative example from the eighteenth century we can quote Alexander Adam’s *The Principles of Latin and English Grammar* (1772), where figurative syntax is understood as ‘a deviation from the ordinary rules of any language’, including *hyperbaton* and *anastrophe*:

*Hyperbaton* is the transgression of that order or arrangement of words, which is commonly used in any language. It is chiefly to be met with among the poets . . .

*Anastrophe* is the inversion of words, or the placing of that word last, which should go first; as, *Italiam contra, His accensa super, Spemque metumque inter dubii; for contra Italiam, super bis, inter spem,* &c. *Virg. Terram sol facit are, for arefacit.* Lucret. (Adam 1772: 182)
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The prepositive character and natural order not only applies to nouns but also is extended to contexts such as relative clauses, in which grammarians generally provide the English translation with the preposition in front position, as the Latin rule states. William Lily and John Colet’s observation that ‘here is to bee untertended and noted, that the relatiue is not alwaies gouerned of the uerbe that he cometh before, but...Somtyme of a preposition set before hym’ (1549: image 22r) is repeated by grammarians such as Charles Hoole (1659: 92), and further expanded in works such as English Examples of the Latine Syntaxis by William Walker. See passage (102); unusually, there are two instances of P-stranding which the author seems to have overlooked in the passage.

(102) Sometimes [the relative comes next] of a Preposition set before him: as, Lego Virgilium, præ quo cæteri poëte sordent. Quem in locum deducta res sit vides: Unto whom state the matter is now brought thou seest.

He spake many things quaintly, amongst which this also; Seem what you are, or be what you seem.

Now I return to Otho from whom I had digressed too far.

That wound comes not to a scar, in which medicaments are often tried.

He that is disinherited may say many things, for which he would not go to Law.

Those matches which you unwisely rush into, are they joys or burthens?

They fit themselves for the Court, and for Honours, in which those very things are to be feared which are hoped for.

(Walker 1683: 50)

5.2.3 Post-position in English grammars

English grammars, as noted above, are modelled on grammars of the Latin language and often repeat the same rules but applied to English. Post-position is a clear example in which authors strive to find a parallel with the classical language. For instance, William Bullokar (1586), Ben Jonson (1640), John Wallis (1653) and Christopher Cooper (1685) take note of the use of the English particle ward in post-position equivalent to the Latin versus:
But, *ward* or *wards*; and, *toward*, or, *towards*, have the same syntax, that *versus*, and *adversus*, have with the Latins: That is, the latter coming after the Noun, which it governeth, and the other contrarily: Nort. in Paul Angel’s Oration to Scanderbech. For, his Heart being unclean to God-ward, and spiteful towards Men, doth always imagine mischief. (Jonson 1640: 215)

The majority of the EModE grammars examined do not comment on the post-position of prepositions in contexts of what is today P-stranding. On the one hand, the rules laid down for the English language tend to mirror the rules of Latin and, with the few exceptional cases mentioned above (*tenus*, *venus*, *penes*, *usque*, *cum*), Latin did not offer grammatical contexts for post-position. On the other hand, syntax was seldom attended to, on the grounds that there is little, or no variation in the parts of the English tongue and therefore syntactic rules are altogether needless (Wharton 1654: 60). Jeremiah Wharton (fl. 1654), a graduate of Cambridge, writes his grammar in English and aims to present the learning of the English language as essential prior to studying Latin; yet his grammar is not original and draws no attention to syntax. Wharton provides a long list of prepositions in ‘Apposition’ and ‘Composition’, a common practice in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but makes no comment on post-positions. Paul Greaves’ *Grammatica Anglicana* (1594) and John Wallis’ *Grammatica Lingue Anglicane* (1653) are written in Latin, and despite the somewhat misleading titles, both impose Latin grammatical categories on the grammar of English (Vorlat 1975: 12–13). Paul Greaves (1588–1616), a soldier and writer, is ‘the typical representative of his time’: aiming at raising the status of English but largely influenced by the Latin grammars of Petrus Ramus and William Lily (Vorlat 1975: 12, 439). John Wallis (1616–1703), a mathematician, is famous for his ‘anti-Latin stance’ and his innovative empirical approach, which led him to unveil structural differences between English and Latin (Howatt 2004: 81), but the section on syntax deals with government of cases and not with the placement of prepositions (Wallis 1653: 73–8). Claridge observes that, although Wallis is most unlike his contemporary grammarians, he ‘also views the matter via Latin’ (2000: 203). The discussion in Joseph Aickin’s *The English Grammar* is similarly reduced to the use and function of prepositions in composition and apposition (1693: pt2.24–5), with little attention to syntax despite the author’s awareness of the importance of the placement of prepositions (see Section 5.2.1).

For its part, *The English Grammar* by Charles Butler (1633) has no syntax and the discussion of word classes is superficial.
This lack of attention towards P-stranding tallies with Hiltunen’s (1998: 435) observations on the treatment of phrasal and prepositional verbs in EModE grammars. According to Hiltunen, Paul Greaves (1594) ‘has nothing to say about phrasal verbs’, like Alexander Gill (1619), Charles Butler (1633), Francis Lodowyck (1652), John Wilkins (1668) and Joseph Aickin (1693), who provide the reader with a list of adverbial and prepositional meanings, but without making any point, syntactically or semantically, about adverbs or prepositions forming groups with verbs. In Hiltunen’s (1998: 436) view, ‘the Latin tradition must have impeded many of them from taking up constructions so alien to Latin in their accounts of English’. Besides, the descriptive nature of early grammars, focused on the parts of speech, ‘made it difficult to include these verbs’; the discussion of word order is ‘rather scarce’ in comparison with that of morphology (Dons 2004: 184, 152). Those grammarians who do deal with prepositional verbs seem to be aware of contexts of post-position in noun phrases and other contexts, such as relative and interrogative clauses. These are William Bullokar (1586), Ben Jonson (1640), Christopher Cooper (1685) and Guy Mi`ege (1688).

William Bullokar (c. 1520 – c. 1590), a Renaissance scholar and humanist, presents his Bref Grammar for English in the belief that ‘a perfect ruled tung, conferabl in Grammar-art, with any ruled long’ provides the foundation for the study of any language (1586: To the Reader, image 4f). In Vorlat’s view, he wrote a ‘rather poor’ grammar, but in England it represents ‘the first step toward grammar writing’, and it ‘clears the ground for many subsequent works’ (1975: 11–12, Hiltunen 1998: 435). His is also the first grammar of English to make explicit acknowledgement of variation between prepositions placed ‘prepositively’ and ‘post-positively’. The full passage reads as follows:

(104) A Preposition is a part of spech prop[e]rly used prepositiuly, that is, governing an accusatiu-cas sett next after it (except from tym in uers it is sett after his casual word) as I go too the church: and is som tym post-positiuly used, that is, when it gouerneth the relatiu[e], that, or which, coming befor a verb, whoos gouerning preposition is sett after such verb: as, this is the man whom we spak of, or of whom we spak, and is som tym used in composition after a verb, but being seuered from the verb by the aduerd, not, or by an accusatiu-cas, may be sayed too be sett in apposition on aduerbially, and then hauing this not befor it, as other aduerbs so seuered: but being vsed so in post-position, and seuered as
befor-sayed, may hau this not [, and saied too be sett in
post-position seuered: as, *bring-in the mans mal*, or *bring the mans mal *in*. for *it is the mal which I brought the mony [in*. So that a
preposition may be saied too be sett, som tym prepositiuily, som
tym post-positiuly, som tym compositiuly, som tym appositiuly,
and som tym post-positiuly seuered: which first post-position is
some time vsed in composition with the verb, and then the
relatiu gouerned of the verb. for verbs compounded in english
gouern no other cas than other singl uerbs, that is, an
accusatius-cas. A Preposition is of diuers voices, as foloweth next,
al-way gouerning an accusatius-cas, otherwis it is an aduerb, as is
befor saied in an aduerb.

[Side notes]
Prepositiuely before an accusatius cas set after the verb.
Postpositiuely ruling that or which, going before.
Compositiuely with this (-). Appositiuely and aduerbially with
this (*) as other aduerbs so seuered. Postpositiuely seuered with
this (\[). (Bullokar 1586: 47–8, italics added)

In the description of the preposition as a part of speech, Bullokar deals
with five different positions in which prepositions can occur: ‘prepositiuily’
(‘I go too the church’), ‘post-positiuly’ (‘this is the man whom we spak of’),
‘compositiuly’ (‘bring-in the mans mal’), ‘appositiuly’ (‘bring the mans mal
in’) and ‘post-positiuly seuered’ (‘it is the mal which I brought the mony
in’). It is the second position, ‘post-positiuly’, that illustrates the syntactic
construction of P-stranding. Post-position is presented as an exception
to the ‘proper’ use (that is, ‘prepositiuely’) and which occurs ‘som tym’
with relative pronouns. Bullokar provides a single illustrative example with
the relative *whom*, which he turns into P-piping but without making
any evaluative judgement on either position: he simply aims to show
the ‘prepositiuely’ position (‘or’). As we have seen in Section 3.3, this
illustrative example becomes very popular in eighteenth-century grammars
such as A. Lane (1705), Ann Fisher (1753), James Elphinston (1765), James
Buchanan (1767) and John Shaw (1778). Later on in his grammar, Bullokar
(1586: 59) recaps the main rules, doing so in verse for ease of memory;
among them is the rule on post-position with relatives. Bullokar also shows
awareness of post-position with the particle *ward* in parallel with the Latin
preposition *versus* (105). It is also important to draw attention to the fact
that Bullokar mentions the end position of prepositions when he deals
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with the ‘etymology’ of the parts of speech. The reason may well have been
that he believed, as was customary at the time, that ‘English hath few and
short ruls for declyning of words, so it hath few ruls for iooining of words
in sentenc or in construction’ (1586: 53–4).

(105) Toward, is som tym diuyded by his casual word, o, being changed
too, oo: as, we cam to London ward, or toward London the
monday, and rod too Oxford ward or toward Oxford the sam day.
(Bullokar 1586: 49–50)

The Elizabethan dramatist Ben Jonson (1572–1637) wrote The English
Grammar, published posthumously (1640). Vorlat (1975: 18) describes Jon-
son as a ‘poor’ grammarian and the work as ‘incomplete, sketchy and
carelessly composed’, in that ‘it contains inconsistencies and omits essen-
tial data’. Although Vorlat believes that Jonson’s grammar is ‘to a large
extent’ a copy modelled on the work of grammarians who wrote in Latin,
she also considers it to have been ‘a plea for the supplanting of Latin by
English in scientific publications’, a rather ambitious aim: ‘no grammarian
in the 17th century would be able to do so’ (1975: 18–19). At the same time,
Jonson deserves credit for including in his grammar a section on syntax,
regarded as the beginning of the study of the syntax of English, and for
illustrating grammatical rules with literary examples, which would become
customary in eighteenth-century grammars (see Dons 2004: 12). Jonson
defines syntax as ‘the right ordering’ of words (1640: 141) and, following
Ramus, he understands prepositions as ‘a peculiar kind of Adverbs’ which
are ‘separable’ or ‘inseparable’ (1640: 195). Like Bullokar, Jonson notes that
the English particles ward(s) and toward(s) may appear in post-position,
mirroring the syntax of the Latin versus and adversus (see quotation (103)
above). Jonson is also aware of other contexts in which prepositions ‘follow’
the noun they govern (106). He illustrates the end position with a single
element, a wh-relative clause which allows variation, though the front posi-
tion is not illustrated. Perhaps playfully, Jonson illustrates P-stranding in
the wording of the rule: ‘the Nouns they are coupled with’, a zero-relative
clause which requires obligatory P-stranding. This practice of illustrat-
ing usage within the statement of the rule is also found in eighteenth-

It is not unusual either to find instances of P-stranding in Latin grammars, such as Thomas Linacre
above-mentioned (1525a: image 30) or Mark Lewis in ‘A Verb compounded with a Preposition, hath
sometimes the Case of the Preposition it is compounded with’ (1671: 44).
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descriptive and neutral. In a note on the right margin of the page he points out the contrast with the syntax of Hebrew, but again in a neutral way: whereas in English they ‘follow sometimes’ the noun, in the classic Hebrew prepositions are ‘always’ set ‘before’.

(106) These *Prepositions follow sometimes the Nouns they are coupled with: God hath made Princes their Subjects Guides, to direct them in the way, which they have to walk in.

[note on the side*] The Hebrews set them always before.

(Jonson 1640: 215)

In an earlier section on ‘the Syntax of a Pronoun with a Noun’, there is a passage in which the construction of the sentence is altered so that a that-relative clause with an obligatory stranded preposition is turned into a wh-relative clause with the preposition in front position (107). This testifies to Jonson’s awareness of the form, but the passage does not seem to convey a negative attitude, since Jonson’s comments relate to the use of that for a relative pronoun, not to the place of the preposition. No evaluative judgement is given explicitly on the use of that-relative, either.

(107) That, is used for a Relative: Sir John Cheek. Sedition is an Aposteam, which, when it breaketh inwardly, putteth the State in great danger of Recovery; and corrupteth the whole Common-wealth, with the rotten fury, that it hath putrefied with. For, with which.

(Jonson 1640: 206)

Grammatica Linguae Anglicana, published in 1685, was written by Christopher Cooper (1655–98), a headmaster and curate. It also includes a brief mention of P-stranding. Cooper’s grammar stands out for two reasons: it is the last grammar of English to be written in Latin, and it is considered the first prescriptive grammar (Vorlat 1975: 32, 1979: 137). The latter is a consequence of Cooper’s rational approach to grammar, which indeed includes the definition of grammar as ‘grammatica, quæ cujusq; linguae vernaculæ rationem & analogiam demonstrat’ (1685: A4v); this, according to Vorlat, is ‘inspired by noble motives’ but it is ‘prescriptivism nonetheless’ (1975: 32).11 Cooper’s work is not original, though, and draws much on Alexander Gill (1619), John Wallis (1653) and John Wilkins (1668). Like Wallis, for instance, Cooper takes note of the post-position of ward

11 The Latin passage reads: ‘grammatica, quæ cujusq; linguae vernaculæ rationem & analogiam demonstrat, eamq; per varias gentes disseminata, in omnia sæcula ab injuria temporum conservat; loquendi errores & barbariem expurgat: difficultates, quæ, primo aspectu iusnperabiles [sic] videntur, fugat’ (Cooper 1685: A4v).
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in English (1685: 132). The passage on preposition placement also seems to owe something to William Bullokar – compare (108) below and (104) above. Cooper describes the place of the preposition immediately before the word it governs, but he also says that this is not always so; sometimes it may be placed after it. Cooper offers two illustrative examples, the second of which appears earlier in Bullokar’s grammar (‘The man, whom I spake of’). This suggests that Cooper might have read, and could have been influenced by, the sixteenth-century grammarian when he described P-stranding. In fact, in the introduction to The English Teacher (1687), essentially an abridged translation of the 1685 work, Cooper names ‘Bulloker’ as one of the ‘learned men’ he consulted (Cooper 1687: A3'). In passage (108) Cooper also presents the same illustrative example with ellipsis of the relative pronoun and the obligatory stranded preposition (‘vel elliptice, the man I spake of is dead’). Besides, he provides the translation into Latin, as might be expected from a grammar written in Latin, and there we can observe the preposition placed before the relative pronoun (‘de quo’, ‘circa quod’), as Latin requires. Cooper’s attitude seems to be neutral, despite the explicit comparison with Latin.

(108) Praepositiones immediatè articolis praeponuntur, nisi articolii inter substantivum & adjectivum interseruntur; ut the happiness of so peaceful a government is not sufficiently valued tanta fœlicitas tam mitis imperii non satis æstimatur: vel nisi dependet à praepositione, aliquando posteriorum possidet locum; ut, The man, whom I spake of, vel elliptice, the man I spake of is dead; homo de quo locutus sui, mortuus est. The work he was about, is finished, pro the work about which he was imployed; opus, circa quod occupatus erat, consectum est. (Cooper 1685: 176–7)

A few lines after this passage on P-stranding, Cooper ends the chapter ‘De Syntaxi’ with a note on ‘artificial order’, as opposed to the ‘natural order’ of words, and here he warns the reader about altering the word order of constructions: it may be allowed for the sake of harmony and of a pleasant sound provided that the transposition of words does not render the sense obscure (1685: 177–8, see (109)). Cooper does mention ‘substantivum cum praepositione’ in the passage, but then provides no illustrative example with stranded and/or fronted prepositions – in fact he provides no examples at all. This brief note is especially relevant because it combines grammar and rhetoric; we will return to this in the discussion of Joshua Poole below and in Section 5.5.3.
In artificiale ordine præsertim in poesi, nominativus, verbum, accusativus, vel substantivum cum præpositione; in principio, medio, aut sine locanda sint, vel clausula inter nominativum & verbum interseratur ut sententiae conclusio reddatur, magis euponica at inaffectata; ut nimis frequens consonantium asperarum, vel tumidarum vocalium concursus evitetur: ut sermo lævis à lingua fluat & placidus, & æquali inæqualium sonorum harmonia aures demulceat, fortiterq; mentem afficiat & persuadeat; quod artis oratorie institutum est; at maxima adhibenda sit cura, nè sensus simul reddatur obscurus & constructio intricata; ut latinè frequentiús accidere solet ob diversitatem cassum & concordantiae; ut, Sunt oculos clari qui cernis sydæa tanquam. (Cooper 1685: 177–8)

Soon after the appearance of Cooper’s grammar, Guy Miège (1644–1718?), Swiss by birth but having lived in England since the late 1650s, published The English Grammar; or, the Grounds and Genius of the English Tongue (1688). As in the case of Cooper, Miège’s work ‘reveal[s] prescriptive tendencies’, yet mostly with regard to vocabulary; and it is a fairly traditional grammar, yet ‘incomplete and never putting forward new ideas’ (Vorlat 1975: 32–3). Miège describes the end position of prepositions as an instance of ‘postposition’ in relation to interrogatives, emphasising the etymology of the term: prepositions are ‘commonly placed before Nouns’, as the etymology of the term preposition implies, and yet they happen to be ‘often placed at the end’ (110). This is a peculiarity of the English language and has always been a major argument against the use of the syntactic construction. Miège refers in this passage to Latin in order to show that it is ‘agreeable’ with some peculiar constructions in Latin that require post-position, such as the preposition tenus:

Although the Prepositions took that Name from their being commonly placed before Nouns, yet in English they are often placed at the end of a Sentence; especially after these two Pronouns, Who and What. As, who did you dine with? What place do you come from? By which means the Preposition becomes, if I may say so, a Postposition. But this is agreeable to Ore tenus in Latine.

(Miège 1688: 80–1)

Also notable about this passage is that the two illustrative examples (‘come from’, ‘dine with’) became very popular throughout the eighteenth century, in particular in discussions of ‘transposed’ prepositions led by James...
Greenwood (1711); see Section 5.5.3. It is precisely in these terms that the following passage (111) reminds us of Cooper’s arguments on ‘artificial order’: choose and place the words in the appropriate manner for the expression to be ‘smooth and fluent’ (harmony), and the sense to be preserved ‘from any obscurity or ambiguity’ (precision, perspicuity). The blending together of these two notions will become crucial in the eighteenth century.

(111) Now, to speak or write well in any of the foresaid Styles, take these following Rules. First, make choice of such Terms as are sutable to the Matter in hand; and then so place your Words, that the Expression may be smooth and fluent, the Sense clear, and free from any obscurity or ambiguity. Wherein you must consult the proper Use and Genius of the Language.

(Miège 1688: 128)

As with Ben Jonson’s earlier grammar, there are passages elsewhere in Miège’s grammar in which the illustrative examples contain stranded prepositions, yet attention is not drawn to the end position of the preposition. The focus is on the use of the demonstratives this/that, the disjoint compound what...soever versus whatsoever, or the relative pronoun when governed by a preposition, who versus whom – see (112). This illustrative example appears later in the eighteenth-century precept materials investigated, for instance, in the very popular book of exercises by Lindley Murray (1797) (see Section 3.3).

(112) We say Whom, instead of Who, when the Pronoun depends upon a Verb, or Preposition. For example, the Person whom I love; He is the Man whom I am most indebted to.

(Miège 1688: 46)

5.2.4 Turning the English phrase into Latin

In the EModE grammars examined there are two authors who arguably adopt a prescriptive attitude against P-stranding: John Hewes (fl. 1624) in A Perfect Survey of the English Tongue (1624) and Joshua Poole (c. 1616 – c. 1656) in The English Accidence (1646). Like other early sixteenth-century works, these two grammars were heavily influenced by Lily and Colet’s Latin grammar (1549). Their titles point to the teaching of the English language but their subtitles make clear that their ultimate aim is in fact to teach Latin: A Perfect Survey of the English Tongue, taken according to the Vse and Analogie of the Latine. And serveth for the More Plaine Exposition of the Grammaticall Rules and Precepts, collected by Lillie, and for the More
Certaine Translation of the English Tongue into Latine (Hewes), and The English Accidence; or A Short, Plaine, and Easie Way for the More Speedy attaining to the Latine Tongue, by the Helpe of the English (Poole). There is a crucial methodological difference here from the earlier works of Lily and others: Hewes and Poole will teach Latin by means of English, with a grammar written in English and by drawing analogies between the classical and the vernacular language. Hewes is said to have pioneered this method of ‘basic grammar’ under the influence of John Brinsley (1612), who argued for more attention to the vernacular, and Poole followed suit, influenced by the educational ideas of Comenius (1592–1670). Both grammarians expressed dissatisfaction with contemporary methods for teaching Latin, which ‘puzled and confounded’ children (Poole), and thus advocated the learning of English as ‘the first ground-worke to the Latine’ (Hewes). The same complaint is again heard in the eighteenth century as an argument in favour of the teaching of the vernacular language (e.g., Maittaire 1712; see Howatt 2004: 106–9). Hewes and Poole state their arguments in the prefaces to their works, as follows:

113) And this I finde to grow by many accidents or causes, which hinder at first the younger sort; and this not the least, namely their defects as then in the right knowledge or censure of their owne Mother tongue, in regard it holdeth a great difference in it selfe from the dialect of the Latines...

In those also, or together with them, haue I heere made an exact Suruey (as the time hath yeelded me) of the English Tongue, as the same may for the vse of all the parts of Speech in Composition best conduce or accord with the Latines; and so haue I made as a posteriori the English tongue for those that are English, the first ground-worke to the Latine. (Hewes 1624: Preface A v, B2')

114) The reason inducing me to this little work, was, that I have often observed how Children have been puzled and confounded, by being set to the construing, parsing, and making of Latine, before they had the least knowledge of the Mother tongue, or were able therein to distinguish the parts of Speech... My drift and scope therefore, is, to have a childe so well verst in his Mothers tongue, before he meddle with Latine, that when he comes to the construing of a Latine Authour, he shall from the signification

12 These observations are also made in Michael (1970: 152–62), Vorlat (1975: 19), and Rodriguez-Gil (2002a: I.1.4).
of his words in construing, be in some good measure able to tell distinctly what part of Speech every word is, though he be not able to parse, varie, or give any other account of one word in his lesson; and when he is put to translation, or making of Latine, he shall know from his English, both what part of Speech every word is, and what Syntaxis, or ordering it should have in Latine, though in the meane time hee never heard of one Latine word: And this I conceive may be in an indifferent manner effected by the Rules of this book, and the Praxis of them, according to these following directions. 

(Poole 1646: A2r–v)

John Hewes' passage on preposition placement appears towards the end of the grammar in a section entitled 'A difference betweene the Dialect of the Latines, and that of the English'. In particular, it appears under the figure *Hyperbaton*, which is concerned with the inversion of natural word order (recall Section 5.2.2). Hewes shows awareness that in English the preposition is 'placed last' and advises the pupil that he 'must inuert [it] and place [it] rightly, or conceiue its true vse'; accordingly, he turns the illustrative examples with stranded prepositions into constructions without P-stranding (115). Notably, Hewes' observations about *Hyperbaton* are introduced by a line that reads 'Wordes wrong placed by the English, but here amended to the manner of the Latines' (1624: R2v, my emphasis); this may well suggest that his attitude towards English P-stranding is negative.

(115) Lastly, obserue in your English Tongue, where yee shall reade the *Preposition* placed last in your Speech, which then yee must inuert and place rightly, or conceiue its true vse; as

This precept yee haue [for] You haue *seldom* heard of this precept.
seldome heard of And which I haue not told [for] And *of* which I haue not tolde you.
you of.
But now yee shall not be [for] But now yee shall not bee long troubled
*herewith.*

(Hewes 1624: R2v–R3r)

The final piece of advice that Hewes gives to young scholars of Latin is to remind them of the grammatical figures discussed in the section on dialect differences, and here he once again places the stress on idiomatic word order:
(116) The eighth and last Consideration, shall be of those Phrases of the Latines which before I spake of, and which doe somewhat differ from the straine, or Idiom (as I said) of the English, and of every of these now in their order; as to the benefite of every such beginner in his place shall most pertaine. (Hewes 1624: image 69)

Joshua Poole, schoolmaster and author, attended Wakefield Grammar School, Yorkshire, before being admitted as a subsizar at Clare College, Cambridge, in 1632. He was Master for some years at Dronfield Grammar School, near Sheffield, before running a private school for gentlemen’s sons in Middlesex (1641/42). Like other schoolmasters, he calls for the teaching of English, if only to facilitate the teaching of Latin, but Michael (1970: 156) is of the opinion that ‘the grammatical categories are more firmly and consistently applied to English’ than in Hewes. Unlike other early grammars, Poole’s does include a section on syntax, which he defines as ‘the right and due joyning of parts of speech together’ (1646: 20). He understands prepositions as a separate word class and his definition of them emphasises the ordering of elements: ‘A Preposition is a part of Speech undelined, most commonly set before the words which they gouerne’ (1646: 19). This, in Poole’s view, applies to relative pronouns, too, as he notes in a passage in which all the illustrative examples appear with P-piping: ‘When the English of a Relatiue comes before the Substantiue [. . . the Relative] must be put in the same case with the substantiue: as, Into what place am I come? what book doe you read? the nature of which man, which thing when I consider’ (1646: 21).

In the preface to his grammar, Poole explains that the student ‘is put to translation’, that is, to the ‘making of Latine’, and to that end the pupil must know the ‘Syntaxis or ordering’ of words, that is, the place where words are construed. It is for this purpose that Poole laid down ‘directions’ (1646: A2v). At the end of the book he adds ‘Two generall necessary Rules’, here quoted in (117). The first of these modifies the placing of prepositions ‘after the noune’ because they do not occur ‘in their naturall order’; hence the end position obscures ‘the sense’ of the sentence. In compliance with his own stricture, Poole turns the illustrative examples with prepositions stranded out of the natural order so that they are placed before the noun they govern, the natural order in which they must occur. It is worth noting that this is presented not only as a grammatical rule but also as a ‘necessary’ rule, and that the underlying principle is the analogy with Latin. Poole

13 Poole also shows awareness of the required post-position with Latin cum: ‘Note that after me, te, se, nobis, vobis, qui, and quibus, cum must be set after as part of the word’ (1646: 27).
states a second rule: to ‘turn’ the sentence ‘into some other English of the like sense’ so that it resembles the syntax of Latin. The discrepancy between the classical and the vernacular language is too obvious to go unnoticed.

(117) Two generall necessary Rules.

If the sign of a case be far off from the uerbe, or after the noune, the sense must direct a man to place the words in their naturall order: and if any thing be understood, it must be supplyed out of the sense: as, Whom did you give your book to? i. to whom. What is he good for? i. for what. This is the man I told you of; i. of whom I told you. God hath in all times saved his children. What said I? hath, i. saved; yea, doth, i. save, and alwayes will, i. save.

If a phrase seeme hard in English to be turned into Latine, turne it into some other English of the like sense; as, I should be loath to do so to you: i. I would not willingly do so to you. My heart misgave me: i. my mind was struck with feare . . .

(Poole 1646: 38; also 1652: 61)

This practice of ‘turning’ the phrase is further clarified in the postscript, which follows the ‘necessary rules’, in the very last paragraph of the grammar:

(118) Postscript. For the better making use of this last Rule, which is of very great use in the turning of English into Latine, it were not amisse, as soone as a child is capable, to exercise him in turning an English argument into another English of the same sense, by varying the phrase. (Poole 1646: 38)

Inasmuch as the ultimate aim in Hewes’ and Poole’s grammars is the learning of Latin, we can infer that their precepts are not condemning P-stranding outright. The construction with final prepositions is not grammatically required in Latin; accordingly, the authors’ advice is to vary the construction using P-piping in order to adhere to the grammatical requirements of the classical language. In other words, their advice can be interpreted as prescribing P-piping rather than as proscribing P-stranding.\(^{14}\) That said, one can also infer a certain implicit criticism of the final preposition because this end position does not match the Latin construction. Hewes uses the terms rightly and true use, as well as precept elsewhere in the

grammar, all of which denote a prescriptive attitude: ‘Many precepts yet am I further to deliver him, as well concerning the Dialect of the English, which was my prime task; as of the Latin, which yet is the scope I shoot at, and which all appear to his better proceedings: but of those in their times’ (Hewes 1624: D1”). On defining Hyperbaton, Hewes also shows his concern for word order: he is aware that English speakers ‘oftentimes displace their words’ for the sake of eloquence, especially poets, and his advice is ‘to place them in order, or to co[n]ceive their due places’ (1624: R2”). As noted earlier, the header of the right-hand side column reads: ‘Wordses wrong placed by the English, but here amended to the manner of the Latines’ (1624: R2”) – the idiomatic stranded position is to be rectified. Likewise, the second rule and the postscript in Poole’s grammar place a stronger emphasis on the due order of words, crucially, by applying the rule in English: ‘turning an English argument into another English of the same sense’ (1646: 38). This can be read as turning English P-stranding into English P-piping, and then translating readily into the parallel Latin construction. We cannot be certain about Poole’s attitude here, given that in describing this rule in the postscript he does not provide explicit examples involving prepositions; however, the same ‘varying’ technique is indeed applied to English and to P-stranding in later works, becoming one of the most frequent arguments against P-stranding during the eighteenth century (Section 5.5.3.1), and it is also one of the strategies that we will see in Dryden’s criticisms (Section 5.3.1).

The negative connotation can be further inferred from the authors’ understanding of natural and artificial order. The practice of turning elements to the natural order is known as ‘varying’, ‘transposition’, a term already found in Lily’s grammar with examples involving prepositions: ‘Transpositio tonum inuertit. Id quod usu uenit in prepositionibus, quæ postpositae grauantur, ut, Transtra per & remos. Te penes imperium’ (1542: 69”). With a history stretching back to classical rhetoric, it was a customary method of teaching Latin in treatises of rhetoric and grammars during the seventeenth century, and became very popular during the eighteenth century in both types of work, often referred to as ‘resolution’. According to Michael (1987: 283), transposition ‘derived its pedagogic power from the assumption that there was a natural order of words in a sentence, an order that was therefore in some sense fundamentally correct’; it is the time-honoured question of ordo naturalis (Sundby et al. 1991: 415; see also Vorlat 1979: 136–7). Adamson (1999: 603–4) regards this ‘maxim’ as ‘central to neo-classical notions of perspicuous syntax’: in essence, in order to preserve the true sense and meaning of any sentence (perspicuity), words ought not to be transposed. The direction is thus to reduce transposed words to the
natural order, such as end-placed prepositions into fronted prepositions. The point was made above by John Brinsley that you must ‘[c]ast and dispose the words in the proper Grammaticall order’ and you must ‘[s]ee that nothing bee against sense, nothing against Grammar: but if either the sense be absurd, or construction against Grammar, cast it, and try it another way vntil you find it out’ (1612: 124; see (101) in Section 5.2.2). John Hewes, at the end of the section on figurative syntax in which P-stranding is ‘amended’, refers to the figures discussed with displaced order as ‘the defects of the English tongue in its owne Dialect’ (1624: image 68°). In Michael’s (1970: 157) opinion, transposition is a technique which in Joshua Poole’s work represents ‘English teaching in the very process of evolving out of the teaching of Latin’. A few years later, the influential work by John Wilkins bears an overt negative attitude towards figurative syntax, as seen in passage (119). Christopher Cooper also echoes these concerns about transposed elements harming the sense of the sentence, as quoted in (109) above. Cooper does not make explicit reference to prepositions, but transposed prepositions soon become a recurrent topic in the eighteenth century, as for instance in James Greenwood’s (1711) A Practical English Grammar (120).  

(119) **Unnecessary Rules in the Latin Syntax**. That is called figurative and irregular Syntax, which customary use, and not any natural propriety doth make significative; wherein there are some words always either redundant, or deficient, or transposed, or changed, from their proper notion. These Phraseologies are to be accounted an imperfection of Language, and one degree added to the curse of the confusion; because they do exceedingly encrease the difficulty of Learning Tongues, and do not adde to the brevity or perspicuity of expression, but rather cumber and darken it with ambiguities. (Wilkins 1668: 447)

(120) The natural Order also of the Words is chang’d or transplac’d: For in English as well as in Latin, the Words of a Sentence are not always plac’d in their natural Order, as they lie in Sense, but are put into such an Order, as will sound sweetest to the Ear, but so that the Sense be not thereby darkned or render’d obscure . . . The Preposition is frequently transplac’d; as, Who do you Dine with? For, with whom do you Dine? What Place do you come from? For, From what place do you come? (Greenwood 1711: 217–18)

---

15 Poole’s grammar is mentioned, without comment, in Sundby et al.’s (1991: 426) section on ‘transposition’ and ‘deferment’.
Poole’s grammar was a very popular work, and was reprinted various times between 1646 and (posthumously) 1670, with some editions under the slightly different title *The Youth’s Guide: or, English Accidence*. The ‘necessary Rules’ and postscript are preserved throughout all editions. The grammar had been composed for the young gentlemen of his private school in Middlesex, and soon became one of ‘a number of widely used school texts’ written by Poole in the late seventeenth century (ODNB s.v. ‘Poole, Joshua’; see also Alston 1967). The second and subsequent editions enjoyed public recommendation: ‘Published by Authority; and commended as generally necessary to be made use of in all schooles of this Common-Wealth’ (1652: title-page; ‘schools of this Kingdom’ in the 1662 and 1670 reprints). One might speculate as to whether Christopher Cooper’s and James Greenwood’s works might have been inspired by Poole’s early grammar. Some similarities can indeed be drawn. Poole’s grammar was written in English but evidently ‘via a detour through Latin’ (Claridge 2000: 202–3); Cooper’s was entirely written in Latin. Poole’s approach to end-placed prepositions had its foundations in matters of ‘order’. As noted in (109), Cooper ends his chapter ‘De Syntaxi’ with a passage on ‘artificial order’ as opposed to ‘natural order’ of elements, where he warns the reader about the transposition of words because the primary goal is to preserve the sense of the construction (1685: 177–8). Cooper exemplifies P-stranding with a sentence almost identical to Poole’s: ‘This is the man I told you of; i. of whom I told you’ (Poole 1646: 38), and ‘The man, whom I spake of, vel elliptice, the man I spake of is dead’ (Cooper 1685: 177). Another point in common is the reference to the use of stranded prepositions when the relative pronoun is ‘understood’, in Poole’s words, or ‘elliptice’ for Cooper. As for Greenwood’s grammar, it has been described as an ‘eclectic’ work, with little originality, which, like Poole’s, was largely influenced by Latin grammars, for instance Wallis (1653) and Cooper (1685) (Vorlat 1959: 36–7). Greenwood understood ‘Syntax’ as the *right placing of joyning Words together in a Sentence* (1711: 35), in the same way that Poole had defined syntax half a century earlier: ‘the right and due joyning of parts of Speech together’ (1646: 20). And just as Poole laid down his rule that ‘the sense must direct a man to place the words in their naturall order’ (1646: 38), Greenwood stated that ‘the sense be not thereby darkned or rendered obscure’ (1711: 217), hence the censure of transposed prepositions.

There is one other work which can be linked to Poole’s grammar with regard to the passage on P-stranding: *The Royal Grammar compiled formerly by Mr. William Lilly; now modestly endeavoured to be rendred Plain and Obvious to the Capacity of Youth by a Supplement of Things Defective, and
Alteration of Things Amiss, written by an anonymous R.C. (1685). This is one of the many revised editions of Lily and Colet’s (1549) authorised grammar and, as such, it is in essence a grammar of the Latin tongue. Yet, as the title indicates and the author explains in the preface, there are corrections and additions, especially in the syntax section. These additions are particularly relevant not only in that one can trace grammatical changes from 1549 to 1685, but also in that the author draws comparisons between Latin and English. It is in one of these ‘comments’ that R.C. prescribes the rule that stranded prepositions ‘must be rectified’ so that words are placed ‘in their natural order’ (121). Notably, the illustrative examples are nearly identical to those in Joshua Poole’s grammar in the passage quoted in (117). So is the definition of preposition as ‘a part of Speech set before other words’ (1685: 64), although this may have been borrowed directly from Lily and Colet (1549), which is Poole’s source, too.

†Here is to be noted that, 1. Sometimes the signs of cases are set at a distance, which must be rectified by setting the words in their natural order: as, The man whom I told you of; i.e. of whom I told you. What is he good for? i.e. for what, &c. Or else they are joined to the end of the casual word they govern; thus, hereby, thereby, whereby, wherewith, &c. are put for by that, by this, by which, with this, &c. (R.C. 1685: 86)

It is also of relevance that R.C. devotes his additional comments to matters that are seldom discussed in other works and matters that are ‘disputable’ (122); the latter can be taken as evidence that by 1685 there is overt awareness of P-stranding in grammar works.

I have out of all my Collections, and experience, framed as compleat a Grammar, as I could; receding as little from the Royal, as possibly I might: Only lopping off what may justly seem superfluous, correcting what is erroneous, and supplying what is defective. And what doth more seldom occur in Authors, or is more disputable, I have set in the Comment; having always that deference, and respect to our own Grammar, that in all disputable matters, I have adhered to what is there set down, without very demonstrative reasons, and undeniable Authorities to the contrary. (R.C. 1685: Preface, A5r)

One could argue as well that we are dealing with a case of shared repertoire amongst authors who belong to the same tradition. In my view, the discourse community here can be said to comprise not only grammarians
but also rhetoricians. The English Accidence is a grammar book, but Joshua Poole wrote two treatises on rhetoric which also touched on the ‘varying’ method, and which were as popular as his grammar. The English Parnassus (1657) is a book on writing poetry, in which the student is given a Latin passage to rearrange into good verse, ‘first in the grammatical and then from that into the rhetorical order’ (Culler 1948: 859). Indeed, grammar and rhetoric are intertwined in this period, as authors ‘were mainly concerned with transferring classical precepts of rhetoric in order to facilitate the attainment of a suitability eloquent style by writers’ (Beal 2004: 101). The same attitudes are apparent during the eighteenth century; as will be shown in Section 5.5.3, the discussion of transposed prepositions appears in grammar books as well as treatises of rhetoric and other works on language. According to Michael (1987: 151–2), The English Parnassus was ‘sufficiently popular’ to have posthumous editions in 1677 and 1678, and was sufficiently popular for Charles Hoole (1610–67), a former schoolfellow of Poole’s, to recommend it to his and other schools.16 The fact that it was Hoole who promoted Poole’s work is in itself very significant, not only because Hoole was a successful master of two private grammar schools in London, but also because he wrote numerous works in the field of education. Similarly, Poole’s Practical Rhetorick, first published in 1663, was modelled on Erasmus’ De Duplici Copia Verborum ac Rerum (1512) and ‘designed to develop fluency and variety in both English and Latin’ (Michael 1987: 275). Thus, directly or indirectly, Poole’s works were likely to have become known to late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century grammarians, educationalists and rhetoricians. His works were acknowledged as an inspirational source, for instance, in Edward Bysshe’s British Parnassus (1714), Thomas Hayward’s The British Muse (1738) and Solomon Lowe’s The Critical Spelling-book: an Introduction to Reading and Writing Readily and Correctly (1755), and Poole is listed in McIntosh’s chronological checklist as a key figure among the seventeenth-century pioneers in this tradition (1998: 149–54). Poole’s influence on literary writers has also been traced, amongst others, in John Milton (Farrell 1943; see also de Beer 1944). It seems to me that a link can also be established between Joshua Poole and John Dryden, with regard to Dryden’s attitudes to the Latin model as well as to elegance in style and rhetoric. I will return to these matters in Sections 5.3.1 and 5.5.2; for now, I will briefly comment on the conjecture about the unknown author of the preface to Poole’s The English Parnassus.

16 Its popularity is also attested by the fact that Poole’s work is quoted in the OED to illustrate the meaning of the word Parnassus in the EModE period (OED, s.v. Parnassus 1.b).
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The preface to *The English Parnassus* (1657) is signed by a certain ‘J.D.’, which one could speculate stands for John Dryden, something which has attracted little interest hitherto. A key fact in establishing a link between Poole and Dryden is that Dryden’s library included a copy of Poole’s book, Culler reporting that ‘True, Dryden owned a copy’ (1948: 859). Dryden’s particular love of reading is clear from his own words on the subject: ‘I must confess it to my shame that I never read anything but for pleasure’ (quoted in Johnson 1783: 416, n4). According to Osborn, Dryden’s writings ‘prove him to have been an extensive reader, and a man of letters in the seventeenth century had to depend primarily on his own bookshelves’ (1965: 249). That Poole’s book is mentioned by Dryden’s biographers has special relevance because fewer than fifteen works are said to have ‘once had a place in Dryden’s library’ (1965: 245). Although Macdonald (1939) is sceptical about Dryden’s authorship of the preface to *The English Parnassus*, Osborn counters, rightly so in my opinion, on the grounds that ‘the Preface is a highly recommendable piece of writing [. . . and] there were not many men in England in 1657 with the initials of J.D. who combined a knowledge of ‘the Heroick’, ‘the Lyrick’, ‘Dramatick Poesie’, and other types of poetry with the gift of easy exposition possessed by the author of this Preface’ (Osborn 1965: 248). Adler (1961: 219, n12) and Hehir (1964: 253, n1) are of opinions similar to that of Osborn. Also, Jameson (1923), Williamson (1935) and Culler (1948) observe similarities between the unknown J.D. and Dryden regarding shared views on rhetoric and ‘poesie’. For instance, Jameson (1923: 242) associates Dryden’s theory of prosody as a mechanical science with Poole’s (1657) and with Bysshe’s (1702) view of prosody.18 Williamson (1935: 59) points in particular to J.D.’s statement that ‘[t]his harmony, in prose, consists in an exact placing of the accent, and an accurate disposition of the words . . . In Poesie, it consists besides the aforesaid conditions of Prose in measure, proportion and Rhime’ (1657: a2v), words that are echoed in Dryden’s later works, such as in his essay *Of Dramatick Poesie*: ‘how much our poesy is improved by the happiness of some writers yet living; who first taught us to mould our thoughts into easy and significant words; . . . and to make our rime so properly a part of the verse, that it should never mislead the sense’

---

17 For more information on Dryden’s library, see Osborn (1965: 241–50), Macdonald’s (1939) Bibliography, and *A Dictionary of English Book-Collectors* (1898: Pt.xi). Note, however, that doubt has been cast by Macdonald (1939: 326) on the reliability of the latter list.

18 Dryden is quoted as saying, ‘I have long had by me the materials of an English Prosodia, containing all the mechanical rules of versification, wherein I have treated with some exactness of the feet, the quantities, and the pauses’ (Dryden 1697a: 217).
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(1668a: 35). Regarding the ‘accurate disposition of words’, J.D. remarks that if words are misplaced as to ‘run harshly’, he has the solution: ‘with a little transposition [they] will run well enough’ (1657: a5’). To this ‘head’ the author adds a note of attention towards ‘a certain licentiousnesse’ of which he disapproves, namely that ‘some English poets have in imitation of the Greek and Latine, presumed on to dismember, and disjyn things that should naturally march together; placing some words at such a distance one from another’ (1657: a6’). Although in The English Parnassus Poole is not explicitly addressing end-placed prepositions, the discussion bears many similarities with the underlying principles of the ‘rules’ laid down in his grammar The English Accidence, and with Dryden’s strategies to avoid P-stranding in the revision of his essay Of Dramatick Poesie (see Section 5.3.1).

From a linguistic perspective, similarities also emerge with regard to the shared contempt for ‘clog’d’ monosyllables or ‘apostrophes’ by Dryden and J.D. Adler notes that ‘the “gappage” of vowels [i.e., apostrophes] was widely considered ugly’, and that ‘elision – whether to avoid hiatus, to reduce trisyllabic feet, or to solve metrical difficulties the easy way – had been carried to such excess in the seventeenth century’ that a J.D., author of the preface to The English Parnassus, asked poets to refrain from ‘frequent Apostrophes, because of harshness and disturbance consequent thereto, such [as] we have in this verse: “The husband is the head, as soon’s h’unlocks”.’ (quoted in Adler 1961: 219). To this, Adler adds J.D.’s objection ‘to the eliding of us, his, by, to, be, very’ (1961: 219, n12–13; see 1657: x). For his part, on more than one occasion Dryden expressed his discontent with abbreviated words and the language being ‘clog’d with consonants’, as in the ‘Dedication to Troilus and Cressida’ (1679b; see (123)), in the translation of Virgil’s Æneis (1697a, see (124)), and even when correcting the English of his friend and protégé William Walsh in a private letter (125).

(123) We are full of Monosyllables, and those clog’d with consonants, and our pronunciation is effeminate. All which are enemies to a sounding language. (Dryden 1679b: A3”)

(124) I have shunned the caesura as much as possibly I could: for, wherever that is used, it gives a roughness to the verse; of which we can have little need in a language which is overstocked with consonants. (Dryden 1697a: 215)

(125) In the correctness of the English there is not much for me to animadvert. Be pleas’d therefore, to avoid the words, don’t, can’t,
shan’t, and the like abbreviations of syllables; which seem to me to savour of a little rusticity.

(Dryden to Walsh, early 1691, Letter 17)

Crucially, in the preface, J.D. recommended Poole’s *English Accidence* as ‘very useful for such as it was intended for, as teaching a way to make him that can but indifferently read *English*, to turn any sentence into pure and elegant *Latine*’ (1657: image 15v; see (126)). If that J.D. was indeed John Dryden, which I believe plausible, Dryden must have read one of the earliest works in which P-stranding was turned into the preferred P-piping construction, in parallel with the Latin front position. As his friend William Congreve (1670–1729) wrote in the dedication to his master, Dryden’s reading ‘had been very extensive, so was he very happy in a Memory tenacious of every thing that he had read’ (1717: I.a7r–v).

(126) But this [*The English Parnassus*] is not his first appearance in the world; for in the year 1655 came forth a book of his called the *English Accidence*, very useful for such as it was intended for, as teaching a way to make him that can but indifferently read *English*, to turn any sentence into pure and elegant *Latine*, printed for R. Lownds at the white Lion in *Pauls* Churchyard. (1657: image 15v)

### 5.3 Latin and grammatical correctness

The normative grammatical tradition was based on the principles of reason, analogy, propriety, decorum, politeness and correctness. According to Görlach (1999: 476) ‘[v]ariation in English, and attitudes towards the vernacular, cannot be seen independently of views on Latin’, and Latin is described by Mittins *et al.* (1970: 1) as one of the ‘commonest appeals’ to justify arbitrary *ipsedixitisms* in the eighteenth century as well as in the present day. As Leith tells us:

> The grammarians sought to justify one usage at the expense of another by applying certain principles. The most important of these is probably the example of Latin...the grammatical categories established by the Latin scholars were applied, ready-made, to the grammar of English. The fact that by the eighteenth century Latin was usually encountered only in its written form gave rise to the idea that it was fixed, regulated, and invariant language. English, by comparison, seemed untidy: it was therefore felt to be appropriate to promote grammatical variants which corresponded, in one way or another, to equivalents in Latin. (Leith 1983: 51–2)
The influence of Latin syntax is indeed often cited in the literature as the main reason behind the stigma of P-stranding: ‘the natural inference from this would be: you cannot put a preposition (roughly speaking) later than its word in Latin, and therefore you must not do so in English’ (Fowler 1965: 473; Fowler 1996: 618). Sundby rightly argues that this attitude has to do with the ‘anti-variationist’ approach that most eighteenth-century writers adopt: when they were ‘confronted with two syntactic variants . . . the logical outcome of this kind of thinking was to reject the inferior type out of hand’, that is, that which had no parallel in Latin (Sundby 1998: 476; also Milroy and Milroy 2012: 13–15). For preposition placement the outcome was that P-stranding became the stigmatised variant, while the alternative with front position was preferably prescribed. As Baugh and Cable (2002: 278) note, ‘to prescribe and to proscribe seem to have been coordinate aims of the grammarians’. This section will thus examine the role of Latin and the ideal of grammatical correctness associated with the classical language, first in the context of John Dryden (Section 5.3.1) and then in the eighteenth-century precept sources (Section 5.3.2).

5.3.1 John Dryden

John Dryden’s first explicit criticism of the use of stranded prepositions appears in ‘An Essay on the Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age’, which is a ‘Defence of the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada’ (1672a). This is a critical essay on the mistakes of the writers of the previous age, namely the Elizabethan authors William Shakespeare (1564–1616), Ben Jonson (1572–1637) and John Fletcher (1579–1625). In matters of language, Dryden ‘cast [his] eyes but by chance on Catiline’, the play written by Jonson in 1611, and a quick glance at the ‘three or four last pages’ was ‘enough’ to spot ‘a common fault’ in Jonson’s writing: ‘the preposition in the end of sentence’. The full passage reads as follows:

(127)

And be free
Not heaven itself from thy impiety.
A *synchysis*, or ill-placing of words, of which Tully so much complains in oratory.
The waves and dens of beasts could not receive
The bodies that those souls were frightened from.

---

Latin and grammatical correctness

The preposition in the end of the sentence; a common fault with him, and which I have but lately observed in my own writings.

What all the several ills that visit earth,
Plague, famine, fire, could not reach unto,
The sword nor surfeits, let thy fury do.

Here are both the former faults: for, besides that the preposition unto is placed last in the verse, and at the half period, as is redundant, there is the former synchysis in the words the sword, nor surfeits, which in construction ought to have been placed before the other.

(Dryden 1672a: 167–8, my emphasis in bold, italics in original)

The context in which this criticism appears deserves closer attention than it has been given in the literature hitherto. In this postscript to the first edition of Of Dramatick Poesie, An Essay (1668a), Dryden endeavours to ‘inquire into errors’ in language, style and wit (1672a: 162–3). He is aware that his treatise is somewhat ‘bold’ and perhaps it will be thought of as ‘arrogant’ (1672a: 162). The precept passage quoted in (127) appears in the discussion of language; in it Dryden is explicitly discussing grammatical correctness, and the proscriptive epithet chosen is ‘fault’, strongly charged with notions of grammar. Over the course of four pages he ‘accuses’ Ben Jonson of falling into ‘errors’ for which the Elizabethan writer would be severely ‘censured’. In this respect, Dryden is described by Görlach (2001: 29) as a forerunner of the eighteenth-century practice of quoting illustrative examples of bad English from literary writers, which hints at Dryden’s role in the prescriptive tradition (see Section 6.1). The irony is that Ben Jonson is a grammarian, and one of the few seventeenth-century grammarians who make explicit mention of P-stranding in their grammar. As noted in Section 5.2.2.3, Jonson’s attitude was neutral and he committed this ‘fault’ elsewhere; clearly, it was not an issue for him as it was for Dryden.

P-stranding is not only a ‘fault’ with the Elizabethan playwright, and indeed is one which Dryden has ‘but lately observed in [his] own writings’ (127). In a study of EModE attitudes towards multiword verbs, including prepositional verbs, Claridge (2000: 212) argues that ‘supposedly, the more conscious one is of something, the more readily does one develop an opinion of some sorts about it’. That Dryden admits to his own ‘fault’ is indicative of a linguistic awareness which would subsequently develop into a negative attitude towards this particular usage. In fact, Dryden says that the reason for looking into the Elizabethan dramatists’ language is because ‘to observe errors is a great step to the correcting of them’.
and is also a step ‘to extenuate [his own] failings’ (1672a: 165, 167). A close examination of the whole piece yields over eighty different terms of criticism, including corrupt, false grammar, false English, false construction, gross, ill syntax, imperfections, improprieties, redundant. The collocation false grammar is said to be first documented in Dryden (Görlach 2003: §2.2). In my view, by denouncing Jonson’s errors, Dryden takes on the role of linguistic authority which would become so characteristic of late eighteenth-century normative writers. Dryden’s final verdict, that Jonson ‘writ not correctly’ (1672a: 167), as well as the statement that he ‘undertook to remove that heap of rubbish’ in Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida (1679c: 204), clearly mirror the ipse dixit pronouncements we often find a century later in authors such as Robert Baker (fl. 1770) – see (128):

(128) I have paid no Regard to Authority. I have censured even our best Penmen, where they have departed from what I conceive to be the Idiom of the Tongue, or where I have thought they violate Grammar without Necessity. To judge by the Rule of Ipse dixit is the Way to perpetuate Error. (Baker 1770a: iv)

Twelve years after the publication of the Defence, Dryden published the second edition of the Essay (1684). The first edition, from 1668, is described by Samuel Johnson as ‘an elegant and instructive dialogue’ (1783: 340), written when Dryden was ‘yet a timorous candidate for reputation’ and ‘with great spirit and diligence’ (1783: 412). This is for Johnson ‘the first regular and valuable treatise on the art of writing’ (1783: 411). From the stylistic point of view, Dryden’s Essay has been described by modern scholars as his ‘most elaborate piece of criticism, and the most careful of his prose works’ (Ker 1900: l.xxxv). Yet, in Dryden’s eyes, the original version had been written in a ‘rude and indigested manner [. . . which] served as an amusement to [him] in the country’, composed ‘without the help of books, or advice of friends’ (1668a: 21, 27). He thought of it as an ‘incorrect essay’, and promised to himself that if it ‘shall find any acceptance in the world’ he would write a second part to it (1668a: 27). The second revised edition came out in 1684, sixteen years later and with no explicit comment by Dryden on why or what he decided to amend. One of the features subject to revision was P-stranding. As Ker put it, somehow Dryden ‘came to believe that

---

20 Görlach refers here to a quotation in the OED from Dryden’s ‘Defence of the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada’: ‘The sence is here extremely perplexed: and I doubt the word they is false grammar’ (1672a: 167). There is in fact an earlier passage from the ‘Defence of An Essay of Dramatic Poesy’: ‘this cursed printer is so given to mistakes, that there is scarce a sentence in the preface without some false grammar, or hard sense in it;’ (1668b: 117–18).
he ought to put some restraint on his tendency to leave hanging phrases at the end of his sentences’ (1900: I.xxvii). In the voice of the character Neander, Dryden tells us that one must ‘prove that words’ are ‘well chosen and duly placed’ for the rhyme to be ‘natural and easy’; it is not only ‘an election of apt words’ that counts but also ‘a right disposing of them’ (1668a: 95). It is not surprising, then, that Dryden takes special care for ‘the due placing’ of prepositions and silently corrects almost every stranded preposition that appears in the original version. The revised edition has been described as ‘the best evidence of his care’ for style and grammar, with ‘over a hundred alterations’ (Smith 1950: 89), and with some other important stylistic changes.

The two editions of the *Essay* have been subject to close scrutiny in previous studies; yet I decided to carry out my own examination for two reasons. First, none of these studies give a full, accurate account of Dryden’s corrected prepositions: some are rather sketchy, and some seem to have made use of a corrupted edition, which affects the number of stranded prepositions. Second, the focus has been largely on the corrected prepositions of the 1684 edition, while it seems pertinent to me to take into account Dryden’s ‘correctly’ placed prepositions, too – that is, those instances in which the preposition was already duly placed in the original edition with the preposition in front position. I have taken a further step, observing Dryden’s use of relative compounds with *where*, of the type ‘the age wherein I live’ (1668a: 80, 1684: 99); in my view, these could also have been resorted to in order to avoid stranded prepositions (see Section 2.2.3). The printed versions I have collated are the first edition of 1688 as it appears in Ker’s volume (1900: I.21–108), bearing in mind some mistakes and misprints, and the second revised edition of 1684 as printed in Malone (1800: I.pt2, 25–142). In both editions I have considered the ‘Dedicatory Epistle’ addressed ‘To the Right Honourable Charles, Lord Buckhurst’ and the dedication ‘To the Reader’.

Dryden corrects approximately twenty prepositions which in the original version appear stranded, whether at the end of a sentence or of a clause. The alterations fall into various groups depending on the type of clause, which testifies to his concern with P-stranding rather than with clause structure.

---


22 The third edition of the *Essay*, published in 1693, has also been consulted. It has been omitted from the present discussion because it is a reprint of the second with ‘a few modernizations of spelling’, which, in Summers’ opinion, ‘are to be regretted’ (1931–2: I.341).
The first group involves *wh*-relative clauses. One very frequent strategy is to move the end-placed preposition to before the *wh*-pronoun (129). When the relative clause does not contain an explicit pronoun (*zero*-relative clauses), Dryden avoids the final preposition by introducing a *wh*-relative pronoun which allows the preposition to appear in front position, as in (130). The same strategy is applied with *as*-relative (see (131)).

(129) a. the French avoid the tumult which we are subject to in England, (1668a: 62)

   b. the French avoid the tumult to which we are subject in England, (1684: 76)

(130) a. I cannot think so contemptibly of the age I live in (1668a: 33)

   b. I cannot think so contemptibly of the age in which I live (1684: 40)

(131) a. no such arguments against verse, as the fourth act of *Pompey* will furnish me with in its defence (1668a: 24)

   b. no such arguments against verse, as those with which the fourth act of *Pompey* will furnish me in its defence (1684: 26)

A second type of correction involves the omission of the stranded preposition by replacing a prepositional verb with a transitive verb, like *arrive at* with *reach* in (132):

(132) a. to a much higher degree of perfection than the French poets can arrive at. (1668a: 72)

   b. to a much higher degree of perfection than the French poets can, reasonably, hope to reach. (1684: 89)

That Dryden is not reacting against *zero*-relative clauses or against *wh*-relative clauses (cp. Jespersen 1909–49: III.§4.3.2; Bately 1964: 270) becomes evident in the third group of alterations: topicalised constructions. Here the stranded preposition occurs in main clauses where the object of the preposition appears at the beginning of the sentence for thematic reasons; in example (133), for instance, Dryden opted for retaining the topicalisation while changing the verb *hear of* to its transitive counterpart *hear*.

(133) a. but that he should look on it as a judgement, and so repent, we may expect to hear of in a sermon, (1668a: 66)

   b. but that he should look on it as a judgement, and so repent, we may expect to hear in a sermon, (1684: 81)
Sometimes the revision concerns prepositional passives, whether by replacing the prepositional verb with a transitive verb (134) or by turning the construction into the active voice (135):

(134) a. as to let them be often called for and long expected! (1668a: 30)
    b. as to let them be often desired and long expected. (1684: 36)

(135) a. wherein the virtues and faults of the English poets, who have written either in this, the epic, or the lyric way, will be more fully treated of,
    (1668a: 27)
    b. wherein I shall more fully treat of the virtues and faults of the English poets, who have written either in this, the epick, or the lyric way. (1684: 31)

Dryden even takes care to change the noun lookers on into the simple noun sight (136). The fact that this correction is found in the dedicatory epistle to Lord Buckhurst and not in the body of the Essay demonstrates how concerned Dryden is with his revision and how careful he is to avoid hanging prepositions.

(136) a. only because they pleased too well the lookers on. (1668a: 24)
    b. only because they pleased too well the sight. (1684: 27)

Notwithstanding Dryden’s extreme care, Malone was not entirely accurate when he stated that Dryden ‘corrected this inaccuracy in every sentence of his Essay on Dramatick Poesy, in which it occurred’ (1800: I.pt2, 237.n6). I identified four instances in which the originally end-placed preposition was not altered in the revised edition, either because they escaped Dryden’s attention or because they served a better stylistic or rhetorical function in end position (cf. Bately 1964: 277), as in (137):

(137) a. There are indeed some protatik persons in the Ancients, whom they make use of in their plays, (1668a: 61, 1684: 75)
    b. we see they are seldom listened to by the audience, (1668a: 62, 1684: 76)

Besides correcting end-placed prepositions, Dryden is very careful to avoid the stigmatised feature by resorting to two alternative constructions: (i) fronted prepositions in wh-relative clauses of the type ‘the age in which I live’, and (ii) relative clauses introduced by a relative compound of the type where+preposition, e.g., ‘the age wherein I live’. Of the former type there are approximately sixty-five cases, most of which would have allowed variation with the preposition at the end (138). Of the latter there are
fourteen instances (139). All of these have been preserved in their correct form in the second edition. In addition, Dryden occasionally alters the grammar of apparently good sentences from the original version, using in the second edition either P-piping or a *where*+*preposition* expression, as illustrated in (140) and (141):

(138)  in their love-scenes, **of which** Eugenius spoke last, the Ancients were more hearty  
(1668a: 55, 1684: 67)

(139)  and those things **wherein** we excel them so considerable,  
(1668a: 75, 1684: 93)

(140)  a. Doubtless many things appear flat to us, **whose wit** depended on some custom or story,  
(1668a: 42)

  b. Doubtless many things appear flat to us, **the wit of which** depended on some custom or story,  
(1684: 101)

(141)  a. if need be, a **Funeral Elegy on the Duke**; **and after** they have crowned his valour with many laurels, at last deplore the odds under which he fell,  
(1668a: 30)

  b. if need be, a funeral elegy on the duke; **wherein** after they have crowned his valour with many laurels, they will at last deplore the odds under which he fell,  
(1684: 36)

The importance of these corrections in the Essay lies not only in that they testify to Dryden’s contempt for P-stranding, but also in that this work initiated the prose genre of literary criticism which was later developed by literary figures such as John Dennis, Anthony Ashley Cooper and Joseph Addison, as well as Samuel Johnson, the renowned and supremely authoritative lexicographer of the late eighteenth century (see Nist 1966: 286).

5.3.1.1 Latin syntax
The explanation that has most often been put forward in the literature to account for Dryden’s aversion to end-placed prepositions is that it is the result of ‘applying the rules of Latin syntax to English’ (Brook 1958: 148). More precisely, with regard to the revised edition of the Essay, Bately (1964: 275) concludes that it was Dryden’s desire to improve and refine the English language, and that a sense of correctness thus led him to ‘force the mother tongue into a Latin mould’. Hence, by analogy with Latin, the place of a preposition at the end of a sentence was doomed. Simon (1963: 136) believes that Dryden’s contempt is ‘probably prompted by [his] stricter conception of grammar’, as is, for instance, his ‘methodised’ change
of relative pronouns (see also Watson 1967–8: 10). These claims are borne out by the numerous references to the Latin language (lexis and syntax) in Dryden’s own writings, and the fact that Dryden himself admits to ‘translating [his] English into Latin’ (142). As early as the 1660s Dryden calls for the imitation of Latin (143), and by the 1690s he admits to ‘one pretended crime’: ‘that I latinize too much’, and ‘not only’ in translations from Latin classics but also ‘in many of my original poems’, in which he has ‘endeavoured to form my style by imitating their masters’ Virgil and Horace (1697a: 223, 234). In Fowler’s opinion, Dryden’s revised Essay ‘shows him sophisticated with deliberate latinism’ (1965: 473).

(142) But how barbarously we yet write and speak, your Lordship knows, and I am sufficiently sensible in my own English. For I am often put to a stand, in considering whether what I write be the Idiom of the Tongue, or false Grammar, and nonsense couch’d beneath that specious Name of Anglicisme. And have no other way to clear my doubts, but by translating my English into Latine, and thereby trying what sence the words will bear in a more stable language.

(Dryden 1679b: A3’)

(143) Our language is noble, full, and significant; and I know not why he who is master of it may not clothe ordinary things in it as decently as the Latin, if he use the same diligence in his choice of words.

(Dryden 1668a: 104)

Dryden’s negative attitude towards end-placed prepositions because of the influence of the Latin model is, according to Blake (2002: 327), ‘perhaps understandable insofar as English grammar is traditionally presented within the framework of a Latinate grammatical system’. That was precisely the dominant atmosphere during Dryden’s Restoration period and was also the context, a few years earlier, in which John Hewes’ and Joshua Poole’s grammars had been written. The point was made in Section 5.2.4 that Poole’s The English Accidence is in essence a Latin-modelled grammar, written in English but ‘via a detour through Latin’. In the ‘Dedication to the Reader’ the seventeenth-century grammarian admits his Latinism (see quotation (114)), and he does so too in Practical Rhetorick:

(144) it came into my mind to varie some short Sentences according to the prescribed Forms. In translating of which, Children may be employed, as soon as they begin to turn English into Latin; that so, ere they be aware, they may get plenty of Words and Matter, the best
In my view, Dryden and Poole share more than an admiration for Latin: the literary writer seems to have put into practice the two ‘necessary Rules’ laid down by Poole in his grammar (recall quotation (26) above). Poole’s first rule tells us that ‘the sense must direct a man to place the words in their natural order’ (1646: 38). Accordingly, the second edition of Dryden’s Essay contains a number of modifications mirroring the illustrative examples given by Poole. For instance, like Poole’s ‘This is the man I told you of; i.e. of whom I told you’, we find Dryden’s revision from ‘There are some of those impertinent people you speak of’ (1668a: 30) into ‘people of whom you speak’ (1684: 36), and from ‘I cannot think so contemptibly of the age I live in’ (1668a: 33) into ‘the age in which I live’ (1684: 40). Poole’s second ‘necessary’ rule tells us to vary the expression ‘if a phrase seem hard in English to be turned into Latine’; a common strategy in the Essay is to change the prepositional verb into a transitive verb, which can then be easily translated into Latin, or to transform from passive to active voice, as illustrated in (134)–(135).

5.3.1.2 Etymology and logic
In addition to Latin syntax, Bately (1964: 275–6) argues that Dryden’s reluctance to engage in P-stranding has to do with logic and reflects ‘his unceasing search for an exact standard of writing’ and ‘purity of phrase’; in particular the logic of the Latin etymology of the term preposition: præ ‘before’ and ponere ‘place’. Indeed, the prepositive character was the ‘customary description’ of this part of speech in the seventeenth century, and indeed during the eighteenth century too (Michael 1970: 454–61; see Section 5.2.1). Vorlat (1996: 170) explains that this emphasis on the logical/natural order of words lies in the belief that ‘[t]he order of nature is reflected in the order of thinking, and, if the natural order is used, it is also reflected in the order of words’; thus ‘[t]he natural order of thinking is then reflected in sentences with the word order subject + verb + (object +) adverbial’ (ibid.). The fact that Dryden dislikes end-placed prepositions as well as phrasal verbs leads Claridge to conclude that it ‘may be that the presence of “small words” with no immediately obvious (or even “wrong”) grammatical connections did not suit his rational (and Latinate) approach to language’ (2000: 199). In the eighteenth century logic and Latin become allied in terms of regulation and precision, or as Bryant put it, the prescriptive and proscriptive attitude ‘reached its height in the
eighteenth century, the age in which reason and logic were uppermost’ (1962: 89–90, quoted in Beal 2004: 89). Grammarians of the age of Samuel Johnson echo the feeling with regard to Latin syntax and Latin etymology. For James Buchanan (1767) it is ‘not good Grammar’, it is familiar custom that has led to writers departing from the Latin construction (145). For Philip Withers (1789) this kind of separation is regarded as a ‘distortion’ of the arrangement of words, according to ‘analogy and nature’; hence, the practice ‘may be frequently avoided’ and turned into a ‘better’ and ‘superior’ expression with the preposition before the word it governs (146).

(145) a. the English Preposition naturally goes before the Word it governs as well as the Latin Preposition (a quo facta sum omnia) though prevailing Custom has separated it in familiar Writing and Discourse. (Buchanan 1767: 138)  
b. Tell me if the following Phrases are good Grammar? Who did you sup with? Who did you give it to? Who did you serve under? . . . No; they are not good Grammar: For the Prepositions govern the following State of the Pronouns . . . The Prepositions are in these Phrases separated from the Pronouns which they govern, and placed at the End of the Sentence. (Buchanan 1767: 224)

(146) A just Remark. It is certainly incumbent on me to give a rational Account of the Difference. A PREposition, as the Name implies, ought to precede in English the Object or it’s Representative. v.g. The man TO WHOM you spoke: . . . It may be deemed Presumption to arraign the Style of Addison, yet I must caution you against separating the “Preposition” and it’s Object. Even when there is an Ellipsis of a “Noun” or whole Sentence it may be frequently avoided. v.g. He was thrown, when riding, is better than – he was thrown OFF when riding. Modellers of Gardens must SELL their Magazines of Plants, or DISPOSE of their Magazines of Plants, is as much superior to Modellers have their Magazines of Plants to DISPOSE of – as Analogy and Nature are superior to DISTORTION. (Withers 1789: 389–91)

5.3.2 Eighteenth-century precepts

In Section 3.2 we discussed the labels documented in the precept sources under scrutiny. A close look at the labels related to Latin influence unveils a number of epithets with a strong connotation of correctness: bad and
erroneous appear relatively frequently (11% and 8%, respectively), primarily because of works which contain exercises of bad English with stranded prepositions, mentioned in Section 3.2. Others such as censurable and ungrammatical are rare (3% and 2%, respectively). But key labels related to grammatical correctness, such as incorrect or solecism, do not appear in my data set of criticism at all, nor have I found remarks such as illogical or absurd. Besides, the criticism of P-stranding being an idiomatic construction is not as common as one might suspect, represented by only four per cent of labels. This contrasts, for instance, with the frequent criticism of phrasal verbs as anti-Latinate forms that are weaker and less educated than the Latin counterparts (see Wild 2010: 91–2). Recall also Edward Gibbon’s aversion to stranded prepositions to the extent that ‘observing that prepositions and adverbs are not always easily distinguished, [he] kept on the safe side by not ending sentences with on, over, under, or the like, even when they would have been adverbs’ (Fowler 1965: 473–4; see Section 3.3).

In terms of grammatical correctness, precept writers approach the discussion from different perspectives. Many authors acknowledge with a neutral attitude the two possible positions of prepositions; these include William Turner (1710: 41), William Ward (1765: 139) and his faithful follower John Shaw (1778: 94–5), Ralph Harrison (1777: 35), Patrick Lynch (1796: 84) and Jane Gardiner (1799: 88). The rule is usually interspersed within the discussion of relative pronouns. Exceptionally, Charles Coote (1788) offers a very complete account that covers various types of relativisers alongside interrogative, passive and infinitive clauses (147):

(147) a. This part of speech [preposition] is generally placed before the noun or pronoun which it governs, except when a relative depends on it, in which case it frequently succeeds the word governed by it; as, “the house that (or which) he was speaking of is in ruins; they are the persons whom (or that) I wrote to.”

(Coote 1788: 247)

b. The relative that never follows the preposition. We may say, “the acquaintance that I dined with yesterday;” but we never say, “the acquaintance with that I dined yesterday.” Whom and which, however, often succeed the preposition; as, “he is a friend to whom I am highly indebted; the person with whom I traveled has sold the horse on which he rode during our journey.” In these sentences, the preposition may be placed, though with less elegance, after the verb on which it depends; as, “a friend whom I
am highly indebted to; the person whom I traveled with; the horse which he rode on.” (Coote 1788: 215–16)
c. When the relative is understood, the preposition by which it is governed always follows the verb that would have the relative before it; as, “those [whom] I have conversed with about it are of opinion, &c.” Addison. (Coote 1788: 247–8)
d. Prepositions are sometimes placed after participles passive, when the word governed by them is understood; as, “the subjects treated of are abstruse; the person applied to was his friend; the business spoken of by him is important.” The prepositions used on these occasions are the same that would suit the respective verbs, if they were converted into an active form, e.g. “the subjects which he or some other treated of; the person whom he or they applied to; the business which he spoke of.” (Coote 1788: 248)
e. The preposition is also occasionally understood after an infinitive mode; as, “he is not fit to converse with,” that is, he is not a fit person with whom you may converse; “that is proper to attend to, or, to be attended to.” (Coote 1788: 248)

Some writers mention the end position as an exception to the rule, so that the preposition does not always go before the word it governs but ‘in some sentences [it] is put after’, as J. Wilson (1792: 108–9) explains in (148). So do Daniel Fenning (1771: 79–81, 110–11) and John Carter (1773: 106).

(148) Q. What Rules have you for the proper placing of Words in a Sentence?
A. The general Order of the English Language is as follows, viz. . . . Rule 6. Prepositions come before the Words, which are governed by them; as, to me, for her . . .

Q. What Exception is there to the 6th. Rule?
A. In asking a Question the Preposition is frequently separated from its Case and set after it; and sometimes when a Question is not asked; as, Whom do you dine with? for, With whom do you dine? What Place do you come from? for, From what Place do you come? This is the Boy whom you sent for, i.e. for whom you sent. And here the Relative is frequently understood; as, This is the Boy you sent for.

(Wilson 1792: 108–9)
Eighteenth-century authors are aware of the fact that the use of a stranded preposition is not always a choice, that there are some clauses in which the only grammatical option is P-stranding, as in that-relative clauses: (a) ‘an idiom that our language is strongly inclined to’; (b) ‘an idiom to that our language is strongly inclined’. Some authors comment on the contrast between wh-relative clauses, where the choice is acknowledged, and that-relative clauses, in which case grammarians, willingly or not, state the necessary rule to strand a preposition. For instance, in the early part of the century Michael Maittaire (1712: 33) points to the ungrammaticality of placing a preposition before the relative that. His approach is echoed in late eighteenth-century works such as James Elphinston (1765: II.45), William Ward (1765: 357, 462–3; 1767: 94–5) and John Fell (1784: 130). See the discussion in Ward:

(149) a. If that us’d as a Relative depends
Upon a Preposition, it attends
Somewhere behind the Verb: But which and who
Of Prepositions plac’d before allow.
Yet even when these are us’d, the following train
Of words the prepositions may contain. (Ward 1767: 94)

b. I have placed that, as declined like the other relatives, although the sign of a case never goes immediately before it when it is used as a relative, but the sign is left where the word that is represented by the relative would have stood, if the clause had been a compleat sentence. Thus two sentences, I saw the books, you told me of them, if reduced to one, by substituting that instead of them, become, I saw the books that you told me of, not of that you told me; and so of other instances. (Ward 1765: 357)

John Shaw (1778: 95) and Charles Coote (1788: 215–16) seem to have been directly inspired by Ward’s passage. Joseph Priestley and his followers, Lister Metcalfe (1771: 76) and Alexander Bicknell (1790: II.70), make the same point but with a hedge: ‘if a preposition must precede the relative, there is a kind of necessity to replace who or which; because the pronoun that does not admit of such a construction’ (Priestley 1768: 100–1). This remark appears in the second edition of Priestley’s grammar; although Priestley had advocated the use of P-stranding in the first edition (see (183) in Section 5.4.2.2), in this passage he offers only the alternative construction with P-piping and a wh-relative pronoun, and does not mention the alternative with that-relative and P-stranding (‘His subjects looked on his fate with the same
indifference, to which they saw him totally abandoned). For his part, James Elphinston (1721–1809) explains the stylistic differences concerning the choice of pronoun and preposition placement as follows:

(150) We already know that who or whom, as well as which, continue indefinitely representable by the pronominal that, which could never supply either after a preposition. In the indefinite therefore chiefly do we say, he that loves them, him that is loved by them, they that he loves, them that are loved by him, but in no stile, they or them by that he is loved. Yet, the familiar can substitute that for the relative, even when governed by a preposition, so this interpose not between the antecedent and its explainer, or so it become a postposition to the following verb; as they or them that he is loved by, definitely they or them by whom he is loved; like, the person or thing that he speaks of, the person or thing of whom or which he speaks. (Elphinston 1765: II.45)

For some authors the final position of prepositions is simply not an option, based on the Latin etymology of the word preposition and the ‘logical’, ‘natural’ order of words: ‘as the name implies’, says Thomas Coar in (151) and (49) above. This is also the attitude expressed in Philip Withers (1789: 389, see (146)), James Nicholson (1793: 60, see Section 1.1) and Peter W. Fogg (1796: 105–6) in (152).

(151) A Preposition (as its name implies) is a word put before another to which it is applied, in order to shew the relation of such word to some other word, either expressed in the sentence or understood, as the walls of the city, I went to London, he came from York, (Coar 1796: 129)

(152) art.333. The natural order of a sentence is nearly as follows . . . Prepositions connecting dependent words to the component words of a sentence precede the former and follow the latter. (Fogg 1792–6: I.179)

The common order of words in an English sentence was laid down in art. 333 . . . A preposition frequently precedes the relative, as it is made to do in the rule – To whom John writes many a letter. An interrogative, if employed, has the same place with the relative, and may have a preposition like it; as What and to whom doth John write? So too an indefinite, Whatsoever and to whomsoever John writes, he is improving. (Fogg 1796: 105–6)
P-stranding is sometimes blamed for the incorrect use of nominative who instead of the oblique form whom. Authors who spot this pattern, and who criticise the two ‘errors’, include Caleb Fleming (1766: 85–6), Noah Webster (1784: 78–9), Lewis Brittain (1788: 73; see (153)) and Lady Fenn (1798a: 56–7). Dekeyser (1975: 191–3) observes that nineteenth-century authors still regard the final position as an error which ‘has led to a second’ error, the incorrect pronominal case (Anglophil 1898 [1892]); however, nineteenth-century attitudes gradually become more lenient, with Alexander Bain (1879 [1863]) condemning the excessive zeal of eighteenth-century grammar writers and Alfred S. West (1893) admitting, yet grudgingly, that in interrogative contexts who + stranding is often used in ordinary conversation.

(153) All prepositions govern an objective case: as, between you and me (not you and I). But from a certain familiar Anglicism, which, is too often obscure and inconvenient, the preposition is sometimes separated from the relative which it governs, and is left to bring up the rear of sentences: and hence the relative, appearing before the preposition that governs it, is left undeclined, and is daily mistaken for a nominative.

Errors of this kind. ‘Who [whom] do you speak to?’ Shakesp. ‘Who (whom) civil power belongs to’. Locke. To avoid this vulgar, and almost imperceptible mistake, it is advisable to prefer the regular and natural construction; as, To whom do you speak? To whom does it belong? Of whom was it said? (Brittain 1788: 73)

The precept data include a small number of Latin–English grammars in which, naturally, preposition placement is compared in order to direct the reader in the ‘translating of English into Latine’, as in Nathan Bailey’s English and Latine Exercises for School-Boys:

(154) The English Signs of the Cases are sometimes found at a Distance from their proper Word; Reduce the Words into their natural Order, and it will appear how they ought to be render’d.

Good Instructions are as necessary as Food. Men honour those they received good Advice from, in their tender Years.

Præceptum bonus sum æquèe necessarius ac cibus. Honor afficio is, à qui accipio consilium bonus, annus tener.
Counsel hath its effects according to the Man, which it proceeds from, and the Mind of him it is given to; but chiefly according to God’s Blessing.

Consilium habeo effectus suus secundum homo, à qui procedo, & animus ille, qui do; praecipue autem secundum Beneficium Deus. (Bailey 1713: 193)

In his New Method of Learning Latin, Solomon Lowe (d. 1750) helps the reader to translate from Latin to English. True to the descriptive nature characteristic of early eighteenth-century grammars, Lowe offers the two grammatical variants of preposition placement in \textit{wh}-relative clauses, and the passage with \textit{as}-relative is translated with obligatory P-stranding; interestingly, Solomon Lowe’s alternative with a \textit{wh}-relative pronoun preserves the stranded preposition (155). In contrast, J. Green’s translation of a Latin passage only offers the P-piping alternative (156).

(155) a. \textit{Obs.4}. If a preposition comes at the end of a clause in English, and seems to want a case, it generally belongs to the foregoing relative: as, \textit{Ille in quo considérabam}, The man whom I relied upon, that is, \textit{upon whom I relied}. (Lowe 1736: 54)

b. \textit{Moreover, the relative in English is often expressed by this word as:} Schol quam frequentabam, \textit{the school as I went to, that is, which I went to}. (Lowe 1736: 52.n)

(156) When no Nominative Case, comes between the Relative and the Verb; then the Relative is the Nominative Case, to the Verb: as, \textit{Qui legis}, Who readest. But if there be a Nominative Case, between the Relative and the Verb: then the Relative is governed of the Verb; or some other Word in the Sentence: as, \textit{Panis quem comedis}. The Bread which thou eatest. \textit{Meta ad quam equus currit}. The Mark to which the Horse runneth. (Green 1759: 49)

The discussion of P-stranding in the eighteenth-century works examined seems to follow the general pattern observed by Michael (1970) in the grammatical tradition of this century in that there are, in general, two opposite trends: one based on models of Latin grammar, and the other moving away from such models. On the one hand, end-placed prepositions were often criticised because writers based their principles ‘on the Latin grammar models with regard to terminology and structure’, as Auer (2004: §3.7) pointed out regarding the subjunctive mood. On the other hand, many writers who defended or advocated the construction tried ‘to avoid
the Latin model and account for the English [end position] in its own right (ibid.), as Campbell did in his Philosophy of Rhetoric (see (157); also Fell 1784: 128–9 in Section 5.4.2.1). Whereas for some the ungrammaticality of P-stranding arises from the idiomatic nature of the construction, for others it is the ‘peculiar’ nature of the English language that makes it grammatical.

(157) Now that I am on the subject of the preposition, it will not be improper to consider a peculiarity which is often to be found with us in their arrangement. In every other language the preposition is almost constantly prefixed to the noun which it governs; in English it is sometimes placed not only after the noun, but at a considerable distance from it, as in the following example, “The infirmary was indeed never so full as on this day, which I was at some loss to account for, till, upon my going abroad, I observed, that it was an easterly wind.”* [note* Spectator, no. 440] Here no fewer than seven words intervene between the relative which, and the preposition for belonging to it. Besides, the preposition doth not here precede its regimen, but follow it. One would imagine, to consider the matter abstractly, that this could not fail in a language like ours, which admits so few inflections, to create obscurity. Yet this in fact is seldom or never the consequence. Indeed the singularity of the idiom hath made some critics condemn it absolutely. That there is nothing analogous in any known tongue ancient or modern, hath appeared to them a sufficient reason. I own it never appeared so to me. (Campbell 1776: II.i.1.399–400)

Besides, some English grammars explain the post-position of certain prepositions by establishing a parallel with Latin prepositions, as Michael Maittaire does in (158):

(158) a. The Adverbs and Prepositions go before their case in most Languages; but, as in Latin, so in English, some there are, which ever follow their case; as versus, -ward, tenus, -to. (Maittaire 1712: 181)

b. As cum in Latin follows after, and sticks to the Article Relative, and Pronoun Substantive (quicum, mecum, tecum, &c., with whom, with me, with thee, &c.); so with and the Casual Signs and Particles in English after where-, there-, or here- for which, that. (Maittaire 1712: 182)
5.4 An elegant style

The eighteenth century, as we have seen in Section 4.3, is characterised by a flux in attitudes towards notions of correct English alongside notions of proper style. The chief aim is to speak and write grammatically correct English and to speak and write with stylistic propriety. For the rhetorician Hugh Blair, style is ‘the peculiar manner in which different men employ language for expressing their conceptions’, that is, style and thought are ‘intimately connected’ (1771: III.1.14, III.22.24). The intertwined connection between the order of thought and the order of words comes into play again: style is ‘the proper and elegant Manner of adjusting the Language to the Subject, or a proper Choice of Words, agreeable to the Rules of Syntax’, said James Buchanan (1767: xxvii). Buchanan is avowedly inspired by Lord Kames’ *Elements of Criticism* (1762), one of the most admired eighteenth-century treatises on style. Kames (1762) explains the importance of word order with a metaphor as follows:

(159) In every period, two things are to be regarded, equally capital; first, the words of which the period is composed; next, the arrangement of these words. The former resemble the stones that compose a building; and the latter resembles the order in which these stones are placed. Hence the beauty of language with respect to its meaning, may not improbably be distinguished into two kinds. The first consists in a right choice of words or materials for constructing the period; and the other consists in a due arrangement of these words or materials.

(Kames 1762: II.255–6)

Both John Dryden in the late seventeenth century and Jonathan Swift in the early eighteenth were aware of this guiding principle: ‘Proper words in proper Places, makes the true Definition of a Stile’, said Swift in *A letter to a young clergyman* (1719–20).23 Dryden’s concern with the elegance of the sentence as affected by preposition placement is discussed in Section 5.4.1; attitudes in the eighteenth century are the focus of Section 5.4.2.

---

23 Claridge (2000: 217) reads a number of implications in this passage: ‘(i) there is choice between words (with roughly the same meaning), (ii) words are not all equally adequate for various kinds of uses, but need to be “proper” for the use intended, (iii) the placing and arrangement of the chosen words within the sentence makes a difference (one understanding of “places”), and (iv) the extralinguistic, social situation has an influence on which words are considered proper (the other interpretation of “places”).
As one of the most acclaimed writers of the seventeenth century and one who effectively ushered in the genre of literary criticism, Dryden would no doubt have been well aware of stylistic differences between spoken and written language, between informal and formal expressions, and between prose and verse. His words are carefully crafted according to medium, setting and style. As Samuel Johnson writes in *The Lives of Poets*, ‘every word seems to drop by chance, though it falls into its proper place’ (1783: 418). Johnson, himself an icon of literary style in the eighteenth century, describes Dryden as the father of criticism and Dryden’s work as ‘not a dull collection of theorems, nor a rude detection of faults’; Dryden, in Johnson’s eyes, ‘proves his right of judgement by his power of performance’ (1783: 412).

### 5.4.1.1 Medium

The revisions in the second edition of the *Essay* are said to be partly motivated by Dryden’s discontent with the spoken, informal character of the conversations held amongst the personae in it, which he comes to believe is inappropriate for the kind of literary criticism at which he aims. Simon (1963) argues that the first version is ‘nearer to spoken discourse’ than the revised edition, and that the changes Dryden made respond to a ‘conscious attempt to raise the language of prose above the racy speech of the coffee-house’ (1963: 135). In Simon’s view, Dryden ‘rightly felt that as a piece of more formal criticism’ the *Essay* should be polished so that it ‘might survive in its own right’ (1963: 141). One of the strategies to achieve such a goal is ‘the rejection of more colloquial syntax or words’ and the adherence to ‘the more correct usage’ (ibid.). Naturally, the informal connotations entrenched in the syntax of final prepositions were affected by Dryden’s attitude towards colloquial forms in general. Other constructions that undergo change in a like manner include the *that* relative pronoun, which also falls under fierce criticism in eighteenth-century works (see Simon 1963: 136–8). The result of these alterations is indeed that the conversation of the characters becomes ‘slightly formalized’: ‘a sobering down, a loss of vigour and of idiomatic flavour’; the revised version is, then, ‘a little more controlled’ in style (Simon 1963: 132, 135–8). Dryden is also careful to craft a proper style in other works, prose and verse, drama and non-drama. Indeed, in a dedication to his friend, William Congreve describes how Dryden was ‘equally excellent in Verse, and in Prose. His Prose had all the Clearness imaginable, together with
all the Nobleness of Expression; all the Graces and Ornaments proper and peculiar to it, without deviating into the Language or Diction of Poetry’ (1717–18: I.99). Dryden is critical of the style of his own works as well as those of others, as in this passage on William Shakespeare in the preface to his version of *Troilus and Cressida*:

(160) it must be allowed to the present age, that the tongue in general is so much refined since Shakespeare’s time, that many of his words, and more of his phrases, are scarce intelligible. And of those which we understand, some are ungrammatical, others coarse; and his whole style is so pestered with figurative expressions, that it is as affected as it is obscure. ’Tis true, that in his latter plays he had worn off somewhat of the rust; but the tragedy which I have undertaken to correct was in all probability one of his first endeavours on the stage. (Dryden 1679c: 203)

In a comprehensive study of Dryden’s syntax, Söderlind concludes that preposition placement varies depending on the type of text: plays and letters on the one hand, and essays on the other (see 1951–8: I.24–8, II.218–20). Based on evidence from prose works, Söderlind observes that ‘Dryden unmistakably avoids’ placing prepositions at the end of active sentences ‘in the polished language of his essays’, although not with complete success: a few instances slipped through in the *Life of Lucian, c. 1696* (1951–8: I.26). On the other hand, he notes that instances of stranded prepositions abound in his letters and, especially, his plays, two types of text which are closer to conversational style; for instance ‘This jacobin, whom I have sent to, is her confessor’ (*The Spanish Friar* 1681: VI.441, quoted in 1951–8: I.26). In another study on the same lines, Bately argues that the extent of Dryden’s ‘avoidance’ of end-placed prepositions is mainly ‘determined by such considerations as the closeness to conversation of the medium and the type of subject matter’ (1964: 273–4). Bately carried out a quantitative analysis of Dryden’s use of stranded prepositions in three different types of works – nondramatic prose, prose and verse in plays, and nondramatic verse – focusing on works published after 1672, the year in which Dryden overtly criticises Ben Jonson’s preposition placement.24 The overall conclusion is that after 1672 Dryden ‘ceases to use prepositions at the end of a sentence in prose’; in fact, she remarks, there is a ‘sharp decrease’ of stranded prepositions at the end of the clause too, which intensifies after 1685 (1964: 271–2).

---

24 My survey is focused on the trends observed by Bately regarding Dryden’s usage and avoidance of stranded prepositions. For more precise statistical information, see Bately (1964: 271–3, n5).
Bately only identified four works ‘with exceptionally high percentages’ of P-stranding (1964: 272). One was ‘a series of manuscript notes, never prepared for publication by Dryden’ (Heads of an Answer to Rymer, written after 1678); another was ‘written hastily’ and ‘had not been carefully revised by the author’ either (Life of Lucian, written c. 1696). This suggests that the decrease in Dryden’s use must have been the result of a conscious and careful attempt to avoid the inelegant construction in published compositions.

The highest frequency of P-stranding is linked to ‘prose’ and ‘low or comic subjects’, while low frequency is associated with ‘rhymed couplets or blank verse’, and also ‘serious or tragic subjects’ (1964: 272). In the tragedies and operas before 1672, the number of instances is ‘always small’ in the passive and in the active. After 1672 ‘only three tragedies’ show more than two examples (1964: 273). In tragicomedies, the data seem to be ‘somewhat similar’ (ibid.), but usage in comedies is more varied – whereas in Marriage à la Mode (1673) they are ‘sparking’, The Kind Keeper; or, Mr. Limberham (1691) is the piece with most instances of P-stranding. According to Bately’s data, end-placed prepositions in nondramatic verse, which is written in rhyme, ‘are extremely rare’, as in rhymed plays (ibid.). This again is particularly noticeable in works after 1672, where ‘these forms become virtually non-existent’ (ibid.). Bately’s findings speak for themselves: Absalom and Achitophel (1681) has two prepositional passives in a total of 2,171 lines, both occurring in The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel (1682), which is mainly the work of Nahum Tate, rather than Dryden’s; two prepositional passives are found in the 2,595 lines of The Hind and the Panther (1687); and in the translation of Virgil’s Æneis (1697), amounting to 13,700 lines, there are only one prepositional passive and two stranded prepositions in the active voice.

More evidence comes from my own analysis of epilogues, prologues, prefaces and dedication letters. In 1699 Dryden signed the contract for what would be his final work, the Fables Ancient and Modern (1700). These Fables are a collection of translated poems from Homer, Chaucer, Ovid and Boccaccio, in which Dryden demonstrates ‘his mastery of diverse voices and tones, his narrative and argumentative skills, his philosophical vision and psychological insight’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Dryden, John’). The preface, addressed to the Duke of Ormond, has been described as ‘another example of Dryden’s brilliant comparative criticism’ (ibid.), which stands out as being ‘more full of life than anything else in Dryden’s prose; not inferior even to the essay Of Dramatic Poesy’ (Ker 1900: I.xxii). In the thirty-four pages of this piece, there are no stranded prepositions at the end of clauses or sentences. In contrast, Dryden places the preposition before a
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A relative pronoun on twenty occasions, thirteen of which would have allowed variation. There are, in addition, eight constructions with topicalised prepositional phrases which could have had the preposition in final position. The preface hardly contains any prepositional verbs, let alone phrasal verbs or the preposition upon, two features which Dryden had extensively corrected in the second edition of the Essay. His conscious use of language and style can be seen in his own words, when he tells the reader that on writing Fables he ‘had taken the same care in all [his] former writings’ (1700: 250–1). The absence of stranded prepositions suggests that he did indeed take ‘the same care’ to place the preposition in the correct and elegant order, as he had done in the revision of the Essay: despite ‘the shortness of time’ in which he wrote it, or ‘the several intervals of sickness’ he had gone through, no ‘faulty’ end-placed preposition ‘crept into my verses through my inadvertency’ (1700: 250). The postscript to Æneis, written in prose a couple of years earlier, contains no stranded prepositions either, while there are five fronted prepositions before a wh-relative pronoun, such as ‘those from whom I have received the favours’ (1697b: 242). If we take into account that this work is a translation from Latin, and that he felt obliged to ‘make [Ovid’s] sense intelligible’ and thus was ‘forced to untune our own verses’ (1697a: 232), one would not have expected many, if any, sentences or lines to end with a preposition. The same can be said regarding the satirical poem Absalom and Achitophel (1681). According to Malone, the satire ‘was read with such avidity that the first edition was sold in about a month’; the second edition was issued by the end of the same year; and in 1684 the sixth edition was published in the first volume of the author’s Miscellanies (1800: I.pt.1.142–3). In the second edition Dryden makes ‘the most memorable’ modifications ‘ever’, Malone notes, because ‘beside some verbal alterations, he introduces twelve lines’ (1800: I.pt.1.144); neither among the ‘verbal alterations’ in the revised edition nor in the twelve added lines have I noticed any stranded preposition.

Fables, Æneis and Absalom and Achitophel were written after Dryden’s overt criticism of P-stranding in 1672. There are indications of Dryden’s unease with stranded prepositions even earlier. Tyrannic Love, or The Royal Martyr is a tragedy written in verse which came out in 1670. It was revised by the author for a second edition in 1672, and a third edition appeared in 1677, also ‘review’d by the author’ (title-page). In the preface Dryden expresses concern about the correctness of his compositions, humbly saying that ‘for the faults of the writing and contrivance . . . I pretend not that any thing of mine can be Correct’ (1670b: preface). Malone describes the heroic play as a piece in which Dryden ‘enriched his diction, and improved the
harmony of his numbers’ (1800: L.1.139). The author seems to have taken care, since no stranded prepositions are observed in either the Dedication or the Preface to the poem. There was nothing to be corrected, then, in later editions; the one fronted preposition in the Dedication and the five fronted prepositions in the Preface are preserved as such in the 1672 edition. In fact, the first stranded preposition only appears in the second act in an obligatory construction, it being the only preposition in final position in this act: ‘Your Brother made it to secure his Throne, Which this man made a step to mount it on’ (1670b: II.i p. 11). A yet earlier piece is The Indian Emperour, or, The Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards (1667), of which a second edition was issued in 1668. (Prefixed to this second edition is the Defence, published in the same year.) In this piece Dryden states his concern with the ‘faults’ he committed in the former edition, which, he says, ‘had escaped the printer’ but from which he is ‘willing’ to free the work in a second edition ‘with more care’ (1668: 110). Amongst his careful modifications is the correction of one instance of P-stranding by introducing a wh-relative pronoun: ‘a long time of Youth to flourish in’ is changed to ‘in which to flourish’ (1667: epistle dedicatory; 1668c: epistle dedicatory). The timing is crucial, since this correction precedes Dryden’s explicit criticism of the form in Ben Jonson’s usage by some four years.

5.4.1.2 Style

Apart from correcting his own faults, Dryden is keen to exercise authority on other writers about matters of language and style. A second overt criticism appears in a private letter to William Walsh (1662/3–1708?), of Abberley, in reply to the young poet’s petition to ‘look over’ a discourse about women, A Dialogue Concerning Women (1691), which he had ‘writt in haste’ (1690, Letter 16).25 Dryden judges the style ‘easy and naturall; as fit for Dialogue’, but he singles out end-placed prepositions as ‘not elegant’ (1691, Letter 17). It seems to me that the stigmatisation of end-placed prepositions combines two traditions: grammatical correctness and propriety in style.

(161) In the correctness of the English . . . I remember I hinted somewhat of concluding your Sentences with prepositions or conjunctions sometimes, which is not elegant, as in your first sentence – See the consequences of.

(Dryden to Walsh, early 1691, Letter 17)

25 Passages from Dryden’s correspondence are quoted from Ward’s (1965) edition.
This letter was written twenty years after the critique of the fault in Ben Jonson’s work and seven years after the revisions in the second edition of the *Essay*, and it is clear that Dryden would not let P-stranding pass unnoticed. Neither did Walsh. In his letter of reply, the young poet expresses his ‘infinite thanks’ to Dryden for making him ‘very sensible’ of his faults, and he tells his patron that he will, accordingly, ‘take care to correct those little faults’ (1691, Letter 18). Not surprisingly, the published version of Walsh’s *Dialogue* shows that he ‘was not merely polite in expressing his gratitude’ but he adopted ‘nearly all Dryden’s recommendations’ (Osborn 1965: 229).\(^{26}\) The opening sentence is modified to avoid the preposition at the end, precisely as Dryden suggests, and it is also accompanied by a fronted preposition (‘in which point they cou’d never agree’; see (162)). Also, no instances with end-placed prepositions are found in the first eight pages of the work.

(162)  
'TIS a dangerous thing, Madam, it must be confest, this  
Conversing with fair Ladies; and it draws us into  
Inconveniencies, of which we do not at first see the  
Consequences.  

(Walsh 1691: 1)

Of the eleven extant letters between ‘the grey-haired poet and his elegant young friend’, described by Dryden’s biographer as ‘the best portrait of Dryden in the role of Aristarchus’ (Osborn 1965: 226), this letter stands out as ‘one of the best witnesses to Dryden’s conscious study of the devices of literary craftsmanship’ (1965: 228). In fact, it is a conscious study of both language and style, since, as with his treatment of Ben Jonson in 1672, Dryden’s critique in the letter to Walsh also comments on ‘some imperfections’ of style. He does indeed act as ‘so good a Judge’, as Walsh had requested (1686/90, Letter 12), with regard not only to end-placed prepositions but also to other linguistic features, like monosyllables, contractions and the ‘due distinction’ between *that*- and *wh*-relative pronouns. As Dryden himself puts it: ‘if I were able to undertake’ the critique ‘a man must seeme to exercise a little malice’ (1691, Letter 17). His criticism is more than literary assistance to a friend; he is bringing up a young poet who would improve and attain success.

The terms of criticism used by Dryden in this letter help to illustrate his authoritative role here. They include verbs, nouns and adjectives with strong prescriptive and proscriptive connotations, in a similar fashion to

---

\(^{26}\) Walsh is reportedly sensitive to Dryden’s advice with regard to other features as well, such as relative *who* for *that* (see Bately 1964: 277.n1; Ward 1965: Letter 17.13–4, Letter 18.1n; Watson 1967–8: 52–5).
his attitude towards Ben Jonson; some examples are avoid, cavillings, censure, correctness, criticism/critique, fault, guilt, harsh, ill, imperfection, malice, offend, vitiated, rusticity, tax, and true English. As Ward put it, we are witnessing Dryden’s ‘eager[ness] to aid younger writers with suggestions and criticism’ (1691, Letter 17.n4). One could speculate, then, that either directly or indirectly the literati and other members of the polite society in the mid and late eighteenth century may have followed Walsh’s example of avoiding stranded prepositions and/or the other stigmatised linguistic features (see Raybould’s (1998: 191) remark on Samuel Johnson and Edward Gibbon).

5.4.2 Eighteenth-century precepts: Inelegant and familiar

The inelegance of P-stranding is indeed the most frequent argument against the construction in the eighteenth-century precept sources: the epithet inelegant represents over fifteen per cent of the proscriptive labels, with approximately eighty tokens (see Section 3.2). On giving advice to poets, the eighteenth-century writer Philip Withers echoes Dryden’s overt criticism of final prepositions as ‘awkward’ (163). This epithet can be read as ‘lacking in ease and grace’ and ‘clumsy’ (Vorlat 1996: 177), but could also convey the stronger connotation ‘mean; despicable; contemptible’ (Johnson 1755: s.v. inelegant, sense 2). Withers is aware that in certain clauses the construction is grammatically ‘unavoidable’, as in the prepositional passive of the illustrative example in (163), but nevertheless his recommendation echoes Dryden’s advice to Walsh: ‘vary the Phrase’ in order to avoid the agglutination of prepositions that brings about inelegance. (Ultimately, this was recommended in Poole’s works, too.)

(163) It may be said, it is absolutely unavoidable on particular Occasions, v.g. The Stock was disposed OF BY private Contract . . . But an elegant Writer would rather vary the Phrase, or exchange the “Verb” than admit so awkward a Concurrence of Prepositions, v.g. The Stock was SOLD by private Contract.

(Withers 1789: 391)

Richard Postlethwaite (fl. 1795) also claims that the preposition is less elegant when placed in final position: ‘Whom should I see – (not who should I see, as it is vulgarly said), the very Person whom I was seeking. To whom shall I speak? Or, less elegantly, by separating the Preposition from the Pronoun, – whom shall I speak to?’ (1795: 156). In contrast, the elegance of the construction is occasionally noted by grammarians and
rhetoricians, which testifies to the link between P-stranding and style, but is only advocated in five per cent of the works analysed here. A. Lane’s passage is one of the few explicit comments in these terms (see more below):

(164) Q. Is not the Relative sometimes suppress?  
A. The Relative is often elegantly suppress in English; as, this is the Child I love, or whom I love.

Q. What if the Relative be suppress after a Preposition?  
A. If the Relative be suppress after a Preposition, the Preposition is elegantly put after the following Verb; as, this is the Person of whom I spoke, or this is the Person I spoke of.

(Lane 1705: 93)

Like Dryden, eighteenth-century authors are aware of differences in usage depending on medium, with prose and poetry not necessarily adhering to the same rules. Comments related to P-stranding in these terms appear sporadically, with just three per cent of the total negative tokens, and are most often associated with the topic of transposition, to which we will return in Section 5.3.1. Precept writers generally acknowledge that transposed prepositions are more frequent in verse than in prose, yet Daniel Turner (1710–98) warns the reader that ‘in both, care should be taken, that while we please the ear, we don’t darken the sense’ (1739: 28). Later in the century the precept of John Clarke of Grantham in The Rational Spelling-book is stricter: ‘Though Transpositions are allowable in Poetry, they are as much as possible to be avoided’ (1791: 130). J. Wilson (fl. 1792) is more lenient, provided that the construction with the stranded preposition gives ‘Elegance and Harmony to the Verse’:

(165) the best and clearest Writers in Prose have the fewest transpositions; that, when properly used in Poetry, they give it a pleasing Variety, but shou’d never be used even there, but when they give Elegance and Harmony to the Verse;

(Wilson 1792: 110)

In the analysis of the labelling system in Section 3.2, it was noted that a key label in the dimension of medium and style is style-familiar/conversation and the counterpart style-solemn/writing. Altogether there are sixty-three comments of this type, most of which convey a prescriptive tone; together they amount to a relatively high ten per cent of all critic labels. In contrast, positive attitudes represent just five per cent of the advocate category.
Even authors who advocate the usage passionately in some passages are nevertheless cautious about using the construction in matters of style. For example, just a few lines after rejecting ‘Of the man whom you were so anxious to discover, I have at length got information?’ as ‘stiff and formal’ (see (38) in Section 3.1), George Campbell goes on to say

(166) Ought we then always to prefer this way of placing the preposition after the governing word? By no means. There are cases wherein this is preferable. There are cases wherein the other way is preferable. In general, the former suits better the familiar and easy style which copies the dialect of conversation, the latter more befits the elaborate and solemn diction, which requires somewhat of dignity and pomp. (Campbell 1776: II.iii.IV.403)

Robert Lowth was also acutely aware of these stylistic differences in terms of formality and in conversation versus writing. His stricture, indeed, has often been seen as the source of the stigma against stranded prepositions in literary styles and written registers, which are more elaborate and planned than speech and hence more vulnerable to normative pressure. In what follows I offer a close analysis of the relevant passage from Lowth, plus the context in which it was produced, in order to shed light on the semantic nuances of the stricture, the originality (or lack thereof) of his evaluative comments, and the discourse community of which his grammar was a part. Special attention will be paid to instances of plagiarism or (unacknowledged) borrowing and to Priestley’s grammar (1761a, 1761b). It will be argued that Lowth’s stricture on P-stranding is neither original nor as proscriptive as the literature has often made it out to be.

The precept on P-stranding appears in the discussion of the ‘government’ of prepositions and remains unchanged in all the editions consulted. See quotation (50) in Section 3.2.2, repeated here for convenience in (167):

(167) The Preposition is often separated from the Relative which it governs, and joined to the Verb at the end of the Sentence, or of some member of it: as, “Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with.” “The [2] world is too well bred to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of.” This is an Idiom, which our language is strongly inclined to; it prevails in common conversation, and suits very well with the familiar style in writing; but the placing

of a Preposition before the Relative is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous; and agrees much better with the solemn and elevated Style. [n2] Pope, Preface to his Poems.

(Lowth 1762: 127–8)\(^{28}\)

Lowth describes the construction as an ‘Idiom’ in which the preposition is ‘separated’ from the pronoun it governs and is placed ‘at the end of the Sentence’, noting that this use reflects common practice in conversation and in ‘the familiar style in writing’. The latter addition is a key point in the discussion. As with other contemporary writers, it seems that in his grammar Lowth is ‘sensitive to what suits the conversational style’, and he often condemns colloquial and informal forms while favouring ‘a style of writing which is distinct from speech’ (Finegan 1992: 124). Like many eighteenth-century grammarians, rhetoricians and lexicographers guided by the principles of purity, perspicuity and precision of expression, Lowth is reluctant to admit syntactic variation and treats one variant ‘as more precise, perspicuous or pure than the other’ (see Sundby 1998: 476). The precept in favour of the Latin-derived front position thus comes as no surprise: the end position is contrasted (‘but’) with the position ‘before the relative’, this being the one preferred for the sake of elegance (‘more graceful’), perspicuity (‘more perspicuous’), and in order to attain a ‘much better’ style.

Lowth’s passage has often been subject of discussion in the literature. What has not been pointed out hitherto, to the best of my knowledge, is the similarity it bears to Dryden’s criticisms. First, Lowth describes P-stranding as idiomatic, inelegant, familiar in terms of style, and imprecise – the kind of criticism we have seen from Dryden. For instance, the inellegance of the construction is reminiscent of Dryden’s remark to William Walsh regarding the ‘concludding’ of sentences with prepositions (see quotation (161)). Second, the evaluative terms in Lowth’s discussion are defined in Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary, the authoritative dictionary of the time, with quotations from Dryden’s works. The term imprecision goes hand in hand with the inelegance of P-stranding in Lowth’s eyes (‘more graceful and more perspicuous’). Dryden’s name appears under the definition of style and solemnly, and Dryden is also cited in Johnson’s entry of ungracious and gracefulness. Third, Lowth views P-stranding as an idiomatic construction, one which is disfavoured in certain contexts. It was suggested above

that one of the main reasons for Dryden’s contempt for P-stranding was his ‘awareness of the differences between spoken and written language’ (Brown 1961: 30), and in the revised edition of the Essay Dryden rejected colloquial syntax and words, thereby reaching ‘a sobering down, a loss of vigour and of idiomatic flavour’ (Simon 1963: 132, 135; Section 5.4.1). Dryden is also the writer quoted by Johnson in defining the word idiom, as Dryden himself had used this term to refer to the English tongue when he admitted he was ‘sufficiently sensible in my own English’, and saw himself ‘often put to a stand, in considering whether what I write be the Idiom of the Tongue, or false Grammar, and nonsence couch’d beneath that specious Name of Anglicisme’ (1679b: A3; see (142) in Section 5.3.1). If we take into account that some works of Dryden’s are listed in Lowth’s will,29 it seems safe to assume that the eighteenth-century grammarian was influenced by the seventeenth-century writer in the criticism of P-stranding. Indeed, that Lowth read Dryden and that he was aware of Dryden’s linguistic usage has been shown in Tieken-Boon van Ostade’s study of Lowth’s corpus of quotations: Dryden was one of the ‘best writers’ the grammarian resorted to in the writing of his grammar (1997: 451–2). Among the thirty-three different authors Lowth acknowledges in his quotations, Dryden is the fourth most frequently quoted, illustrating good and bad usage. Crucially, one of the five works by Dryden that Tieken-Boon van Ostade has identified as sources for Lowth is the essay Of Dramatick Poesie (1997: 462). Appendix 5 provides more information on the type of linguistic features illustrated by Dryden’s usage and the strictures imposed by Lowth.

Lowth’s stricture in (167) has been interpreted as conveying a prescriptive connotation, and it is to him and his grammar that the shibboleth against end-placed prepositions is said to ‘go back directly’ (Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Bax 2002;30 see also Aitchison 2001: 11). However, more recent studies have convincingly argued that Lowth’s strictures are not as ‘dogmatic’ as is generally thought; the ‘demonization’ of the grammarian and his grammar has thus been challenged, and an interpretation of this and other passages as less prescriptive in nature has been suggested (Beal 2004: 111; Rodríguez-Gil 2003). Eighteenth-century normative works laid down rules about what speakers ought to say and what they ought not to say; it seems to me that with regard to P-stranding Lowth is prescribing

29 I am grateful to Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade for bringing this to my attention (personal communication).

30 After my work proved the contrary (Yañez-Bouza 2006, 2007), this claim was no longer maintained, for example, in Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2011).
the front position before relative pronouns rather than strictly proscribing the place of a preposition at the end. As Beal put it, his purpose is ‘not to condemn P-stranding outright’ (2004: 83). First, the discussion appears in the main text of the grammar and not in a footnote, which hints at Lowth’s less forthright attitude, for it is in the footnotes that he usually expressed his strongest proscriptions (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1997: 451–2). For instance, he qualifies double superlatives as ‘peculiar to the Old Vulgar Translation of the Psalms’ (1762: 42.n7), the use of worser as ‘barbarous’ (1762: 43.n8), and you was as ‘an enormous Solecism’ (1762: 48.n2); compare the labels used in these strictures with those on stranded prepositions in (167). Second, the presence of a stranded preposition in the wording of the precept (‘which our language is strongly inclined to’) has been interpreted as a slip which would justify the natural character and the high frequency of the vernacular idiom (Finegan 1992: 124). Tieken-Boon van Ostade argues that it is an ‘alleged error’, one in which ‘he must have taken a huge delight’ (2006a: 551; also Beal 2004: 111). In addition, I would argue that Lowth may have stranded the preposition to deliberately for pedagogical reasons. In the preface to his grammar he explains that his purpose is ‘to teach us to express ourselves with propriety’ and his way of doing so is not only by ‘shewing what is right, the matter may be further explained by pointing out what is wrong’ (1762: x). By precept and example he puts the reader on guard against improper usage; that is, by stranding to Lowth is illustrating the improper use, the end-placed preposition. He was not original in doing so: Ben Jonson used the same strategy in his early grammar, and so did James Greenwood in 1711, John Mason in 1749 and Joseph Priestley in 1761. Third, if we compare Lowth’s precepts with those of other grammarians and rhetoricians who imposed the stricture never to close a sentence with a preposition, it becomes evident that Lowth’s tone is milder; compare, again, the epithets used, for instance, Lowth in (167) and Blair in (200) and (201) (Section 5.5.3.2).

It seems to me, then, that Lowth’s precept is not explicitly prescriptive against P-stranding, although perhaps we should not go so far as to say that his attitude is ‘unequivocally’ descriptive (cp. Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011: 135). He is after all prescribing the use of P-piping and one could infer that there is a certain underlying influence from Latin in this. Lowth defines prepositions as ‘so called because they are commonly put before the words to which they are applied, serve to connect words with one another, and to shew the relation between them’ (1762: 91). This definition recalls the Latin etymology of the term, discussed in Section 5.3.1.2. Lowth’s grammar was indeed ‘firmly rooted in the Latin tradition’, as can be inferred
from the title itself – which is reminiscent of Lily’s *Short Introduction to Grammar* (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011: 10). The focus of the passage on prepositions separated from the relative pronouns lies primarily in the inelegance of the construction in ‘the solemn and elevated Style’, but given Lowth’s knowledge of and admiration for Latin, one cannot discount the idea that Latinism was brought in by the back door. We should also recall that the term *familiar* could have a neutral connotation when referring to informal or common/frequent use, but could also allude to inappropriate use in a pejorative way (see Section 3.2.2). That said, in my view, it is in Lowth’s wake that the stricture becomes severely proscriptive: grammarians who borrowed his precept passage added a stronger critical attitude, prescriptive or proscriptive, in line with the development of the normative tradition in the latter half of the eighteenth century.31

5.4.2.1 After Lowth

In my precept data I have traced the influence of Lowth’s passage in at least twenty different texts by fifteen different authors, some of whom adopted a more critical and explicitly negative tone than Lowth’s. In what follows I discuss some of these works, according to the extent to which the stricture is copied verbatim, and I also comment on the reaction against Lowth’s judgement by authors who advocated P-stranding. The influence of Lowth on female authors has already been addressed in Section 3.1.1

Lowth’s passage is quoted verbatim in a large number of works, echoing the view of P-stranding as an English idiom and the subtle stylistic differences. For instance, the anonymous *English Grammar* printed in 1781 copies Lowth’s grammar in many strictures (1781: 40–1); the only difference in the discussion of P-stranding is that the anonymous writer does not acknowledge the source of the second illustrative example, something which we see in many other works too. John Seally (c. 1747–95) also considers Lowth’s work for the section on grammar in *The Lady’s Encyclopedia* with regard to many grammatical features. On preposition placement Seally stresses the colloquial character of stranded prepositions as suiting ‘well enough’ the familiar style (1788: II.44), compared to Lowth’s qualification of ‘very well’. Presumably because of the more emphatic approach, Seally decides to rearrange Lowth’s stranded preposition ‘to’ to the front of the relative pronoun, putting his prescription into practice: ‘an idiom to which our

31 This point was first made in Yáñez-Bouza (2008b). See also Chapman (2008: 36) and later Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2011: 236). This happened as well to the stricture on the omission of the relative pronoun (Fitzmaurice 2000a: 202); I owe this latter observation to Tieken-Boon van Ostade (personal communication).
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language is strongly inclined’. Henry St. John Bullen (1797) reorganises Lowth’s stricture in two different sections of his grammar. In Chapter X, on the ‘construction of prepositions’, he briefly comments on the separation of prepositions from the relative pronoun they govern, describing the order and frequency of the construction in the traditional way and with an illustrative example that reminds us of Lowth’s: ‘The Preposition is often separated from the word it governs, as Gay is an Author whom I am much delighted with’ (1797: 86). He thus prepares the ground for the proscription stated in the appendix, where he refers to P-stranding as ‘a most inelegant construction’ (1797: 132; see quotation (56) in Section 3.3.1). In this passage, Bullen describes the idiomatic nature of the construction, suggesting that the English language is not only ‘inclined’ but rather ‘addicted’ to it: ‘to which the idiom of our Language seems strongly addicted’. John Hornsey (1793) is another follower of Lowth whose discussion is split in more than one passage. The third time he comments on the use of end-placed prepositions in his Short English Grammar is in relation to the ‘wrong position’ of prepositions (1793: 100–1; see quotation (57) in Section 3.3.1); the passage first summarises Blair’s proscription on P-stranding as bad: P-piping is ‘a great deal better’. In a footnote Hornsey recalls Lowth’s preference for the place ‘before the relative’, since it is ‘more graceful, as well as more perspicuous’ and ‘agrees much better’ with the ‘solemn and lofty style’. The two illustrative examples are then turned, in order to show the preposition fronted, i.e., the prescribed correct order, which Lowth had not done: ‘Blair is an author with whom I am much delighted’ and ‘Jesus is a king for whom Christian soldiers fight’. Note also Hornsey’s stronger emphasis on the inelegance of the construction as the preposition is not only said to be ‘separated’ but ‘ungracefully separated’. Unlike Lowth, Hornsey omits the remark on the idiomatic nature of the construction and the association with the familiar style. Similarly, Charles Marriott’s (1780) passage does not comment on the idiomatic nature of the construction and the association with the familiar style. Marriott’s key points are retained: frequency, word order, and the recommendation that the position before the relative pronoun as being ‘more graceful as well as more perspicuous’, that is, more suitable in ‘the solemn and elevated stile’ (Marriott 1780: image 17–18). George Wright (1794: 157) focuses on the order of words in the main text, but then adds a footnote repeating the observation on the idiomatic nature of the construction and the recommendation of P-piping. The message in Thomas Coar’s passage (168) echoes Lowth’s attitudes, too, in a brief and concise way, and with a less lenient attitude towards the order of the preposition.
The preposition should always precede the relative pronoun which it governs, as *To whom does it belong? With whom does he go? To whom dost thou speak?* and not, *whom dost thou speak to?* 

\&c. [note*] This latter way is used in common conversation, but the placing of the preposition before the relative is more proper and clear.

(Coar 1796: 179)

The most obvious case of Lowth’s influence is *English Grammar, adapted to the Different Classes of Learners* (1795) by Lindley Murray (1745–1826). Forty years after Lowth’s grammar was first published, Murray wrote a version of it ‘for the ease and advantage of young persons’ (1795: B2[iii]). According to Tieken-Boon van Ostade, it is precisely the easy methodological presentation and the ‘judiciously arranged “compilation”’ of previous works that made Murray’s grammar so popular in the last years of the century and during the nineteenth century, to such an extent that he has been named the ‘Father of English grammar’, and together with Robert Lowth he is considered the epitome of English prescriptive grammar (see Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000a: 880–1; Nevalainen and Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006: 285; also Görlach 2001: 117). Murray names Lowth as one of ‘the authors to whom the grammatical part of this compilation is principally indebted for its materials’ (Murray 1798: 7), but this acknowledgement was not included in the first edition, a significant omission and one which earned him notoriety as a plagiarist (Vorlat 1959: 109). In Rule XVII about the syntax of prepositions, Murray first addresses the case of the pronoun, then prescribes the use of objective case *whom* instead of nominative *who*, and then criticises the separation of the preposition from the relative, as Lowth did (1795: 121–2, in (169)). Murray reproduces Lowth’s passage, mentioning the end-placed position with relatives, noting the frequency of the construction, referring to it as an ‘idiom’, emphasising the familiar and informal character of the construction, and prescribing the front position as ‘more graceful, as well as more perspicuous’, since it ‘agrees much better’ with formal styles. However, some slight differences can be observed. Like previous grammarians, Murray opts for omitting the footnote acknowledging the source of the second illustrative example, and also he moves Lowth’s stranded preposition to the front of the relative pronoun (‘to which our language is strongly inclined’). Notably, Murray’s passage does not appear in the main text with large type, as is the case with the rules he lays down, but in small font as a second remark to Rule XVII. This implies that the comments on P-stranding are ‘of less consequence’, yet useful and to ‘be perused by the student with more
advantage, after the general system has been completed’ (Murray 1795: iv). Lowth had discussed the separation of prepositions in the body of the grammar, while his severe proscriptions were placed, as we have said, in the footnotes.

(169) The preposition is often separated from the relative which it governs, and joined to the verb at the end of the sentence, or of some member of it: as “Whom wilt thou give it to?” instead of “To whom wilt thou give it?” [“]He is an author whom I am much delighted with;” “The world is too polite to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of.” This is an idiom to which our language is strongly inclined; it prevails in common conversation, and suits very well with the familiar style in writing: But the placing of a preposition before the relative, is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous, and agrees much better with the solemn and elevated style.

(Murray 1795: 122)

Some of Lowth’s followers emphasise the inelegance of end prepositions, but not so much the idiomatic nature of the form or the stylistic differences between the familiar end position and the solemn front position. For instance, James Alderson (fl. 1793–8) condemns P-stranding with reference to the order and frequency of the construction plus the preference for P-piping (’but’) for the sake of elegance and perspicuity. To illustrate the prescription, the example (very similar to one of Lowth’s) is rearranged with the preposition at the front:

(170) The preposition is often separated from the relative; as; “Riding is an exercise which I am delighted with.” But it is more elegant and perspicuous to place the preposition before the relative; as; “Riding is an exercise with which I am delighted”.

(Alderson 1795: 87)

In a similar way, Benjamin Rhodes condemns P-stranding in ‘the chief Rules of Syntax’ of his Concise English Grammar (1795: 38). He notes that prepositions are ‘sometimes placed after the relative’ but that this usage is not acceptable, the place in front position being prescribed as ‘much more elegant’; the single illustrative example, which is not from Lowth, is turned from ‘whom I spake to’ to ‘to whom I spake’ (ibid.). Matthew Raine (1760–1811) makes the usual comments on frequency and order, but in addition to advocating that ‘the preposition always stands most gracefully before the relative’ he censures P-stranding by imposing the rule that it
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‘ought not to be imitated’, a stronger precept than in Lowth’s stricture and others so far discussed (171). Lowth’s passage is borrowed for a second time by Raine in the section on parsing, where he reminds the reader that the preposition stands ‘most gracefully’ in front position (ibid.), and that ‘it is better’ than the end position (172). In the illustrative examples provided in these exercises both the pronoun and the preposition are printed in italics, implying that the stranded prepositions are expected to be corrected.

(171) The Preposition and the Relative that it governs are often parted; the Relative standing in the former, and the Preposition in the latter Part of the Sentence; as, He is a Person whom I am much pleased with. This is the Truth, which you do not like to be informed of. Whom do you speak to? But this Manner of Expression ought not to be imitated, as the Preposition always stands most gracefully before the Relative; as, He is a Person with whom I am much pleased. This is the Truth, of which you do not like to be informed. To whom are you speaking?

(Raine 1771: 142)

(172) Rule 82. The Preposition and the Relative &c.

Example 1. He is a Person with whom I am much pleased. The Relative whom . . . is governed by the Preposition with, placed in the latter Part of the Sentence.

Example 2. This is the Truth, which you do not like to be informed of. The Relative which . . . is governed by the Preposition of, placed in the latter Part of the Sentence.

Rule 83. But this Manner of Expressing, &c. In the Examples under this Rule, the Prepositions are placed, and stand most gracefully before the Relative; as Example 1. It is better to say,– “With whom I am much pleased.” than, “Whom I am much pleased with.” Example 2.– “Of which you do not like to be informed,” is better expressed than, “Which you do not like to be informed of.” Example 3.– “To whom are you speaking,” is better expressed than, “whom are you speaking to.”

(Raine 1771: 191–2)

The impact of Lowth’s precept was such that in some cases it led authors to change their attitudes towards P-stranding in their later works. The case of Ellin Devis has been addressed in Section 3.1, where it was observed
that the first edition of her work exhibited a neutral attitude towards end-placed prepositions, but the third and subsequent editions included a new passage borrowed from Lowth. The case of James Buchanan (fl. 1753–73) involves three works. In his early *Compleat English Scholar*, published a decade before Lowth’s grammar (1753), Buchanan does not comment on P-stranding in reference to pronouns or to transposition. In *British Grammar*, which appeared in the same year as Lowth’s work (1762), Buchanan notes that ‘sometimes’ the preposition is ‘put out of its natural Place’, but he does not censure the end position of the preposition; his main concern in this passage is the correct case of the relative pronoun (173). Thus, the illustrative examples offer both arrangements, P-stranding and P-piping, with *whom*; the reason for turning the sentences seems to be Buchanan’s intention to show that the relative was governed by the preposition, hence requiring ‘the following State’, rather than to show that the preposition should be fronted.

(173) How are the Pronouns placed? The Pronouns have two States, viz. the foregoing and following State: . . . The following State is always set after the Verb and Preposition; as, love me, hear him, teach us, . . . But whom, the following State of who, is, by the best Writers, set before the Verb; as, he is the Man whom I saw yesterday, i.e. he is the Man I saw whom. And sometimes, when the Preposition is put out of its natural Place, whom goes before it; as, whom did you dine with? For, With whom did you dine? Whom shall I give this Apple to? for, to whom shall I give this Apple? This is the Man I sold the Horse to; for, to whom I sold the Horse. (Buchanan 1762: 169–71)

However, five years later, by which time Lowth’s grammar had already gone through various editions, Buchanan overtly criticises P-stranding in the section on the ‘construction of prepositions’ in *Regular English Syntax* (1767). The stricture is in essence a rephrasing of Lowth’s, as we can see in (174). Buchanan talks about ‘this form’ and associates it with the ‘familiar Style’, whilst also censuring it in the ‘solemn Style’. Like Lowth, apart from the matter of style, the main reason for condemning stranded prepositions is the inelegance of the end position. Note, however, the stronger tone of Buchanan’s words: not only is the natural order with pied-piped prepositions ‘certainly more elegant’, but Buchanan further remarks that the ‘inelegant’ transposition is ‘glaring’ and must therefore be

---

amended: the correct, proper place of the preposition ‘ought to be’ before the relative pronoun. As he had announced in the preface, all that ‘affected Words and harsh Transpositions should be noted’ (1767: xxvi).

(174) The Preposition is frequently separated from the Relative which it governs, and is placed after the Verb at the End of the Sentence; as whom do you dine with? for with whom do you dine? Is that the Book which I spoke of, for, of which I spoke? George is a Monarch whom his Subjects delight in, for, in whom his Subjects delight. This Form prevails in common Discourse, and in the familiar Style; but it is certainly more elegant to place the Preposition immediately before the Relative, especially in the solemn Style. “It is the God of the Universe whom we worship, whom there is none like to, and whom we live, move, and have our Being in:” Here the Inelegance of the Sentence is glaring; it ought to be to whom there is none like, and in whom we live, move &c. (Buchanan 1767: 98)

Buchanan’s change of attitude becomes more evident when we compare the sections on ‘false Syntax’. In the examples of the British Grammar it is only the pronoun that is marked in italics as the form to be corrected, not the prepositions, which in fact already appear in front position (1762: 194). However, in the Regular English Syntax we find examples of bad English in which both the nominative pronoun who and the stranded preposition must be corrected, both printed in italics, as explained by Buchanan himself (see (175) and (176)). These passages also show that Buchanan consulted late editions of Lowth’s grammar, since some of the illustrative examples of ‘bad grammar’ appeared for the first time in Lowth’s second edition published in 1763, including ‘Who servest thou under?’ (1763: 97.n1, not quoted in 1762: 126–7.n1). Indeed, Lowth is acknowledged at the end of the section of false syntax (1767: 139). Buchanan also comments on the improper use of the form by ‘the best writers’ and here he refers to Lowth as a ‘learned author’ and to Lowth’s Short Introduction to English Grammar as the source to which he ‘had been obliged’ (1767: 139). Buchanan’s section on praxis repeats the same proscription with similar illustrative examples (see 1767: 224–6, quoted in (145)b in section 5.3.1.2).

(175) He begged an Apple of I, to give to thou. These Oranges were sent to I by he. To who will you give that Cake? With who do you live? And from who did you get that Money? (Buchanan 1762: 194)
The Prepositions govern the following State of the Pronouns. As, with whom do you spend your Time? I gave the Book to him. Send for her. He got it from them.

FALSE SYNTAX . . . † Who did you sup with? Who did you give it to? Who did you serve under? Who do you pursue after? Who did you get it from? Who did he send it by? Who did he buy it for? That is the Man who I spoke of. He is a Person who he ought not to domineer over. That is the Man who he shot at. A People who he would not stay among. “We are still much at a loss, who Civil Power belongs to.” Locke. “Who did you speak to” Shakespeare, As you like it. “I’ll tell you who Time ambles withal, who Time trots withal, who Time gallops withal, and who he stands still withal.” I pray thee, who doth he trot withal? Ibidem.? * [note*] In the Examples after †, I have separated the Preposition from the Case which it governs, and placed it at the End of the Sentence; but it is distinguished by being in Italick, as well as the Word governed by it. The Scholar must observe that who in these Sentences is not governed by the Verb, thou’ a Nominative comes between it and the Verb, but by the Preposition; thus, who do you sup with? right – with whom did you sup? Who did you give it to? right – to whom did you give it? & c. This Rule answers to part of the Latin Rule already mentioned . . . Now the English Preposition naturally goes before the Word it governs as well as the Latin Preposition (a quo facta sunt omnia) though prevailing Custom has separated it in familiar Writing and Discourse. (Buchanan 1767: 137–9)

In addition to Lowth, it seems that Buchanan also consulted other works published between 1762 and 1767; in particular, he acknowledges having ‘extracted’ examples from Lord Kames’ Elements of Criticism in matters of the ‘proper Arrangement of Words and Members in a Period’, which, in turn, might have influenced his view on the ‘proper’ place of prepositions (1767: xxx). The fact that Kames’ rhetorical treatise was published in 1762 may well explain Buchanan’s neutral attitude towards end-placed prepositions in his British Grammar (1762) as opposed to the negative attitudes in Regular English Syntax (1767), in that he became aware of Kames’ (and Lowth’s) negative attitudes towards prepositions in final position (1762: II.318–19). As described by Görlach (2001: 65), Buchanan was a ‘prominent watchdog’ of norms in terms of grammar and elocution: not
only did he teach ‘Speaking and Writing the English Language Grammatically’ but also ‘Inditing Elegantly’ (Buchanan 1762: title-page).

The writers who borrowed from or plagiarised Lowth did not always do so uncritically. Aware of what they were writing about, they took the liberty of altering Lowth’s passage in two ways: fronting the preposition in Lowth’s wording (‘which our language is strongly inclined to’) and modifying the illustrative examples (see Appendix 6). The former change has already been discussed: the more sensitive followers modified the expression to illustrate with their own words the construction they are illustrating. Their attitude, then, is seen as being less tolerant: they are writing a grammar, a serious subject, and therefore P-stranding is not suitable (see Seally 1788: II.44; Story 1793: 48–9; Wright 1794: 157; Bullen 1797: 132). Alterations in illustrative examples can be read as the author’s intention to present something original. For instance, those who are not ‘delighted with’ Horace may instead be said to be delighted with George, Churchill, the poet Gay, or the Scot Blair; Devis, in fact, modifies the original to Shenstone first (1777: 83) and Johnson later (1782a: 82). The prepositional verbs are sometimes changed too, so that delight with becomes delight in in Buchanan (1767) and please with in Raine (1771) and Devis (1777, 1782a). Related illustrative examples are also found in works that advocate the use of P-stranding, such as Priestley (1761a, 1761b), Bayly (1772), Fell (1784), and Campbell (1776). Let us now explore these works.

The view that P-stranding is inelegant, less graceful and less proper than P-piping is indeed most common, but not everyone accepted Lowth’s arguments. James Elphinston is aware of the differences between ‘common’ style, in which one might say ‘what does this amount to?’, and ‘the precise’ style, in which one would say ‘To what does it amount?’ (1765: II.146). But this is not always for the best: ‘the natural question, what are you for? loses all its nativeness and almost its nature (for the very sense may be changed) in For what are you?’ (1765: II.147). Some authors overtly disagree with Lowth and cite his stricture in their discussion of P-stranding, defending the construction and even advocating its usage. For instance, Anselm Bayly (1718/9–94) states in the title of A Plain and Complete Grammar of the English Language that ‘The English Accidence’, a preface to the main text, was deliberately written ‘with remarks and observations on A Short Introduction to English Grammar’ (1772: title-page). In the first page of the preface, Bayly explains that he will improve on Lowth’s grammar by going over matters that ‘require correction’, hoping that Lowth ‘will not be offended, if some other mistakes are publicly and modestly pointed out to him’ (1772: v). Bayly indeed takes the liberty to do so, and disagrees with
Lowth on ‘abundant occasions’, sometimes referring to him explicitly and sometimes implicitly, as in the discussion of end-placed prepositions (177). Bayly also treats the construction as an idiom, since the passage is printed in small letters as one of the ‘particulars’ of the English language (‘in English’; cf. 1772: vi–vii). He focuses on the separation of the preposition from the relative pronoun. The single illustrative example provided is based on Lowth’s quotation ‘Horace is an author whom’, though slightly modified as ‘a book, an author, which, whom’. Thus, briefly and with a different attitude, Bayly paraphrases Lowth in order to advocate the idiom on the grounds of prosody and harmony: in the same context the preposition at the end ‘makes variety and gives a peculiar freedom and harmony to the period’.

(177) In English, the preposition is often placed from the pronoun at the end of the sentence, subjoined to the verb; this, when done with judgement, makes variety and gives a peculiar freedom and harmony to the period; as, “a book, an author, which, whom I am much delighted with.” (Bayly 1772: 84)

A decade later, John Fell quotes from Lowth’s passage in order to criticise the negative attitude towards P-stranding therein, and follows this by providing counter-arguments in favour of its use. The section on prepositions in Fell’s (1784) Essay towards an English Grammar includes several rules where P-stranding and P-piping are discussed in various linguistic contexts; this is one of the ‘idioms’ that Fell considers ‘worthy of particular notice’ (1784: 125–31):

(178) The following idioms are worthy of particular notice: prepositions, in all their different uses, are frequently set at a distance from the word which they belong to. 1. As an adverbial addition: forthwith, up to the clouds with him I flew; in with the river sunk, and with it rose Satan. (2.) As connected with a verb of gesture: for, at your grief, see how my wretched sister weeps. (3.) When governing a relative or interrogative: he brought the nation into those distresses, which it has, at this time, to contend with; but what will not ambition and revenge descend to; it will be the same, whomsoever I happen to deal with. (4.) And also, when they govern substantives: but such employment as this I have no mind to; thee and thy virtues, here, I seize upon; for all these things do the nations of the world seek after, and the times of this ignorance God winked at*.
This mode of ending a sentence, or clause, with a preposition, is an idiom that our language is strongly inclined to; yet it seems to be studiously avoided of late by many respectable authors; and, indeed, it is censured by one of our best grammarians. It is said to be a violent transposition, but, perhaps, untruly; for if we examine this idiom we shall find it to be perfectly consistent with the greatest simplicity of arrangement. The preposition, when thus placed, is always used to express the relation which the word governed bears to the word governing; and it appears that, to make the preposition follow the word governing, is more suitable to the genius of our language, than to place it next to the word governed. It is true that the contrary custom is followed in the learned languages; but this can never be urged as a rule in English grammar. The idiom in question universally prevails, even at present, in conversation, and is every where to be found in the writings of our best authors.

(Fell 1784: 128–9)

Fell presents four instances in which the preposition is ‘frequently set at a distance’ from the element governed, among which (3) and (4) illustrate P-stranding. The related footnote is based on Lowth’s passage, but with important additions in which Fell, like Bayly, paraphrases Lowth’s words. In Fell’s view, Lowth’s censure is ‘untruly’, that is, unjust. The separation is not a deviation, as implied in the words of Hugh Blair, who censured the use of ‘insignificant particles’ as a ‘violent transposition’. On the contrary, it is ‘perfectly consistent’ with the arrangement of words in English. The separation does not go against the perspicuity of the sentence, because the preposition ‘always’ expresses the relation between the word governed and the word governing. In fact, the place at the end ‘is more suitable to the genius of our language’ than the place at the front. Fell is aware that the front position of the preposition is ‘the custom in the learned languages’, but analogy with classic languages such as Latin is not sufficient reason to despise the English idiom. In opposition to the ‘best grammarians’, who elaborate their rules based on the grammar of Latin, Fell states that this analogy ‘can never be urged as a rule in English grammar’. Given Fell’s positive attitude, it is not surprising that he preserves the stranded preposition from Lowth’s passage: ‘an idiom that our language is strongly

33 See illustrative examples in Section 5.5.3. Fell seems to be echoing this passage from Blair: ‘What is called splitting of particles, or separation of a preposition from the noun which it governs, is always to be avoided... In such instances, we feel a sort of pain, from the revulsion, or violent separation of two things, which, by their nature, should be closely united’ (Blair 1783: I.xii.272).
inclined to’. In fact, there are two stranded prepositions, the other one being in the main text: ‘frequently set at a distance from the word which they belong to’.

Fell’s (1784) discussion on P-stranding is copied almost verbatim by George N. Ussher in *Elements of English Grammar* (1785); in fact, the entire grammar is based on Fell’s work. The account given above for Fell, then, also applies to Ussher, notwithstanding some differences (179). In Ussher’s passage there are two references to Lowth’s precept. The first is taken verbatim from Fell’s footnote in (178); the second appears in the text of the rule about prepositions (Rule 15, pp. 77–83). In this latter addition Ussher shows his preference for the front position of prepositions ‘in compositions of a grave kind’, but he allows the usage in the ‘familiar turn’ (‘may follow the verb’). Second, in a footnote, when the two constructions are compared, Fell considers that in English the place at the end is ‘more suitable’, whereas Ussher downgrades the emphasis and says ‘as suitable’. Finally, concerning the use of stranded prepositions in the passage, Ussher keeps Fell’s stranded preposition in the rule (‘or after the verb which they belong to’), but turns the stranded preposition from Lowth’s wording to the front position (‘an idiom to which our language is strongly inclined’).

Prepositions may be placed either before the relative they govern, or after the Verb which they belong to, or the Adjective which they connect to the relative; as, *What can this be good for?* or, *For what can this be good?* *Whom did people laugh at?* or, *At whom did people laugh?* *Whom shall I give this to?* or, *To whom shall I give this?* In compositions of a grave kind the Preposition is generally placed before the relative, but in conversation and writings of a familiar turn it may follow the Verb.*

[note*] This mode of ending the sentence with a Preposition is an idiom to which our language is strongly inclined; yet it seems to be studiously avoided of late by many respectable authors; and indeed it is censured by one of our best grammarians. It is said to be a violent transposition; but, perhaps, untruly: . . . it appears that, to make the Preposition follow the word governing is as suitable to the genius of our language, as to place it before the word governed. (Ussher 1785: 80–1, n)

5.4.2.2 *Joseph Priestley*

Like John Fell, there are other precept writers who advocated P-stranding as elegant and suitable to the genius of the language. Alongside George

*An elegant style*
Campbell and Anselm Bayly, Joseph Priestley stands out not only because of his positive attitude in this respect but because of the relationship with Robert Lowth’s grammar and Lowth’s attitudes. This subsection offers a comparison of the passages in Lowth’s and Priestley’s grammars and complements the account with some observations on the two grammarians’ use of P-stranding and P-piping.

Lowth, we have said, is often presented as the representative figure of the doctrine of correctness and ‘feature[s] prominently in most accounts of English prescriptive grammar’ (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000a: 876). Priestley is ‘the supreme descriptivist of his age’, representative of the doctrine of usage (Beal 2004: 111; also Baugh and Cable 2002: 253–95). As might be expected, the two men are often cited and discussed together ‘because of their contrasting attitudes to the importance of usage’ (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2000a: 883). As far as the discussion on P-stranding is concerned, both grammarians document usage and point to the stylistic distinction between formal and informal language, P-stranding being less suitable in formal styles. The difference between them is then said to be ‘one of emphasis only’, in Beal’s words, ‘far from the prescriptive–descriptive polarization which we have been led to expect’ (2004: 111). Based on this and other features, Rodríguez-Gil (2002a: 54–6) reaches the conclusion that Lowth’s grammar is prescriptive, but in that it is based on usage, it is also descriptive. Let us compare the two grammarians’ texts directly: Lowth’s in (180) and Priestley’s in (181) (repeated here for convenience):

180 The Preposition is often separated from the Relative which it governs, and joined to the Verb at the end of the Sentence, or of some member of it: as, “Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with.” “The [2] world is too well bred to shock authors with a truth, which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of.” This is an Idiom, which our language is strongly inclined to; it prevails in common conversation, and suits very well with the familiar style in writing; but the placing of a Preposition before the Relative is more graceful, as well as more perspicuous; and agrees much better with the solemn and elevated Style. [n2] Pope, Preface to his Poems. (Lowth 1762: 127–8)

181 With respect to real harmony [of style], it is absolutely indifferent whether a period close with a monosyllable, or otherwise, provided the monosyllable, considered as connected with the words adjacent, have no disagreeable cadence; for it is not the ear, but
the understanding, that perceives the distinction and interval between words in the same clause of a sentence, when they are regularly pronounced. It is often really diverting to see with what extreme caution words of such frequent occurrence as *of* and *to* are prevented from fixing themselves in the close of a sentence; though that be a situation they naturally incline to, where they favour the easy fall of the voice, in a familiar cadence; and from which nothing but the solemnity of an address from the pulpit ought to dislodge them; as in any other place they often give too great a stiffness and formality to a sentence. (Priestley 1761b: 50–1)

Note the similarities in the wording of the key sentences:

- **Priestley**: situation they naturally **incline to**
- **Lowth**: idiom which our language is strongly **inclined to**
- **Priestley**: in a **familiar** cadence
- **Lowth**: suits very well with the **familiar** style in writing
- **Priestley**: the **solemnity** of an address from the pulpit [..]
  - [P-piping] too great a stiffness and formality to a sentence
- **Lowth**: [P-piping] agrees much better with the **solemn** and elevated style

Priestley’s passage appears in the essay ‘Observations on Style’, appended to his grammar, and which is removed in later editions. On discussing the ‘real harmony’ of style, Priestley introduces the topic of P-stranding in relation to the monosyllables *of* and *to*. To him ‘it is absolutely indifferent whether a period close with a *monosyllable*’ because it has ‘no disagreeable cadence’. On the one hand, Priestley ridicules the rule of preposition fronting (‘diverting to see’), since to his eyes the front position is stiff and too formal, appropriate only for the solemnity of the pulpit. On the other hand, P-stranding is advocated because the end position is natural and idiomatic (‘naturally inclined to’), and it favours the prosody and cadence of the sentence (‘favour the easy fall of the voice’). In Priestley’s passage there are two stranded prepositions: ‘that the delicacy of the ear shall plead for’ and ‘a situation they naturally incline to’. If we believe that the stranded preposition in Lowth’s stricture was deliberately placed in order to draw the reader’s attention, one may argue that Priestley also did so in order to show how harmonious and natural the end position was (cf. comments on Fell above).
Like Lowth, Priestley is aware of the different norms for writing and speech, and is mindful that style is ‘an important factor in determining grammaticality, acceptability or correctness of utterances’ (Straaijer 2011: 196). Unlike Lowth, Priestley seems to discourage P-piping and advocate P-stranding. Priestley is of the opinion that ‘written forms of speech have a greater degree of precision and perspicuity than is necessary in colloquial forms’, but he also argues that ‘[t]he ease of conversation seems, in some cases, to require a relaxation of the severer laws of Grammar’ (1761b: 45, 45.n). The similarities between the two passages have been interpreted in two ways: (a) Lowth is not so proscriptive, because his attitude shares certain nuances with Priestley’s and Priestley is acclaimed as an advocate of the construction; and/or (b) Priestley is not so descriptive, because his attitude shares certain nuances with Lowth’s and Lowth is known for disliking the construction. Chapman (2008: 33) concludes that, in general, ‘Lowth is not as prescriptive nor Priestley as descriptive as they have been made out to be’. Based on a thorough analysis of use of the deontic and epistemic modals in Lowth’s and Priestley’s grammars – first and second editions, main text and footnotes – Straaijer also concludes that ‘these grammars are neither completely prescriptive, nor completely descriptive’ (2011: 257–8, also pp. 373–4). This lends support to Beal’s earlier view of a prescriptive–descriptive continuum, rather than a dichotomy (2004: 90).

P-stranding is also discussed in the body of Priestley’s grammar, if only briefly in a footnote to the section on ‘order or disposition of words’ in the sentence. Priestley’s precept is explicitly positive: ‘sometimes a verb more elegantly parts’ the preposition and the substantive it governs (182). It thus contrasts with one of Lowth’s critical positions here, that the front position is ‘more graceful’. It may or may not be coincidental that the illustrative example used by Priestley in this passage is remarkably similar to Lowth’s: ‘Horace is an author whom I am much delighted with’ ~ ‘This is the thing which I am pleased with’:

(182) Prepositions generally precede their substantives; as, He went to London: but sometimes a verb more elegantly parts them; as, This is the thing with which I am pleased; or, This is the thing which I am pleased with. (Priestley 1761a: 34.nl)

The question inevitably arises at this point as to whether Lowth had read Priestley’s work. Smith (1998: 438) has hinted at ‘a possible case of

34 In Straaijer’s view, Priestley uses the term colloquial in a way similar to familiar, that is, in reference to conversation and in contrast with writing (2011: 198).
plagiarism’, and Schofield (1997: 99) believes that Lowth ‘took over substantial parts of Priestley’s descriptions and evaluations of usage, while retaining their stricter logical sense of the language’, though only in the editions printed after 1764.35 There is still much uncertainty and controversy about which grammar appeared first. It seems that Priestley’s was printed ‘late in 1761’ (Schofield 1997: 83), while Lowth’s first edition was published on 8 February 1762. It is true that Priestley’s ‘Observations on Style’ are included in Lowth’s second edition, published two years after Priestley’s (1763: 137–56), but it was the publisher’s practice to do so, not Lowth’s. From what we learn in Priestley’s prefaces to the different editions of his grammar, it seems that he avoided ‘the charge of plagiarism’ by acknowledging that ‘use hath been made of other Grammars’, among which he names ‘Mr. Johnson’s’, but not Lowth’s (1761a: iv). In the second edition, published in 1768, Priestley does acknowledge his ‘obligations to Dr Lowth’, but makes clear that Lowth’s grammar ‘was first published about a month after the former edition of mine’, hence absolving himself of ‘the charge of plagiarism’ (1768: xxiii). Note also Priestley’s insistence on their different approaches: ‘our plans, definitions of terms, and opinions, differ very considerably’, and the ‘few’ illustrative examples he borrows from Lowth are ‘generally’ taken ‘for a purpose different from his’ (ibid.).36 In Hodson’s view, ‘acknowledging a few borrowed “examples” from Lowth, rather than suggesting that Lowth had any new ideas worth borrowing, is a case of damning with faint acknowledgement’ (2008: 185; also Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011: 81–2). If we think of this in relation to P-stranding, one may argue that the difference between the two authors lies more in attitude than in content (see Rodríguez-Gil 2002a: 56). The focus of their discussion is the same, namely the vernacular idiom and stylistic differences; the approach differs in that Lowth places the emphasis on P-piping and Priestley on P-stranding.

Priestley’s footnote advocating P-stranding is removed in the second and third editions of his grammar, like the essay of ‘Observations on Style’, but late editions contain a new remark on the use of P-stranding in that-relative clauses, pointing to the ungrammaticality of P-piping in this context:

\[(183) \text{The pronoun that also follows the same more naturally than who or which. He is the same man that you saw before. But if a} \]

---

35 The references to Schofield (1997) and Smith (1998) are taken from Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2008d).

36 A good example of this appears in the discussion of the subject form who for the object whom in Priestley (1768: 107).
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preposition must precede the relative, there is a kind of necessity to replace who or which; because the pronoun that does not admit of such a construction. *His subject looked on his fate with the same indifference, to which they saw him totally abandoned.*

(Priestley 1768: 100–1)

Hodson (2006, 2008) and Straaijer (2011) have observed important changes in Priestley’s attitudes from the first to the second edition, with ‘substantial alterations’ to the original text after he changed ‘his attitude towards the process of grammar writing’ (Hodson 2008: 185). Regarding P-stranding, Straaijer argues that the change is ‘congruent with the general development of increasing prescriptivism and proscriptivism between the first and second editions’ (2011: 357). This may account for the low frequency of stranded prepositions in Priestley’s own writings. In a sample text from a scientific treatise written by him in 1775 (as documented in ARCHER), there is only one instance, one which obligatorily requires the position at the end (‘since no fluid, that I am acquainted with, is capable of confining it’; 1775prie.s4b). In contrast, there are nine pied-piped prepositions and Priestley always opts for the front position of prepositions whenever the use of a *wh*-relative pronoun allows the choice (five tokens). Changes in his life and social status might help explain a possible change in language attitude. After 1761 Priestley published two treaties on rhetoric: *A Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language, and Universal Grammar* (1762) and *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism*, also written in 1762 but not published until 1777. As a scientist, he became a fellow of the Royal Society in 1766, after which ‘Priestley could, and usually would, style himself J. Priestley LLD FRS’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Priestley, Joseph’). In 1772 he published ‘Observations on different kinds of air’ in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, which ‘richly deserved the Copley medal conferred by the Royal Society for 1773’ (ODNB, ibid.). By 1775 he was a renowned scientist and would, presumably, be under pressure to comply with contemporary norms and standards in scientific writing. Long gone was the time, in the late seventeenth century, when scientific writing aimed at plain style. As reported in the analysis of the usage corpora, the late eighteenth century followed new aesthetic norms and showed a drastic decline in the use of stranded prepositions, and this continued into the early nineteenth century (see Section 4.3).37 Priestley
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was, after all, writing in a formal style, and addressing a formal audience, members of ‘polite’ society.

Straaijer argues that the low frequency of P-stranding in Priestley’s scientific writing may well be a matter of idiolect, on the grounds that Priestley’s private correspondence also documents a low ratio of stranded prepositions, and those attested appear primarily in grammatically obligatory contexts. Besides, the low trends are consistent across time and regardless of the formality of the context (2011: 353–67). In my view, that P-piping is significantly predominant cannot be taken as indicative here, since, as reported in Chapter 4, the front position has always been the preferred variant. One must also be cautious in that Priestley’s correspondence starts after the publication of the first edition of his grammar in 1761, in 1762, the year in which Robert Lowth’s grammar and Lord Kames’ treatise on rhetoric appeared. These were followed by other popular works which show a certain aversion to stranded prepositions, such as the grammar by James Buchanan (1767) and the rhetorical treatise by John Rice (1765). Buchanan, we have seen above, explicitly criticised P-stranding; Kames and Rice also condemned the splitting of prepositions and their objects in structures such as ‘He would neither separate from, nor act against them’ (Kames 1762: II.296–7). Priestley’s passage in the second edition of Rudiments evidently echoes Kames’: for Kames the disjunction of prepositions ‘never has a good effect’ (Kames 1762: II.297), for Priestley it has ‘a disagreeable effect’ (see 1768: 172–3). One can thus speculate that Priestley’s change of attitude towards stranded prepositions might have been influenced by these works and, consequently, the positive views expressed in the first edition were omitted in later editions of the grammar. Straaijer also takes note of a couple of instances of self-correction in Priestley’s correspondence; they date from 1791 and 1803, years after stranded prepositions had been severely criticised in grammar books and treatises on rhetoric.

For the sake of comparison, it should be mentioned that whereas Priestley’s epistolary use did not correlate with his attitudes towards stranded prepositions in informal styles, Lowth’s epistolary use did match the stylistic norms set out in his grammar. According to Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2011: 39), the frequency of P-stranding in Lowth’s formal letters is rare, especially in letters to his Patrons, as they ‘represented the linguistic norm he strove after’ and thus he would consciously try to avoid stigmatised features. In contrast, stranded prepositions occur frequently in informal

---

38 It should be recalled that Tieken-Boon van Ostade’s study is based on a selected list of prepositions only (2011: 236).
letters addressed to his wife and to his closest friends; in fact, the letters to his wife are the only context in which P-stranding outnumbers P-piping. Tieken-Boon van Ostade also observes that the frequency of P-stranding decreases over time, parallel to the increase of P-piping and the gradual increase in the criticism of end-placed prepositions (see 2011: 236–9; also 2006a: 551).

5.5 The art of rhetoric

5.5.1 A facet of prescriptivism

Görlach defines style as ‘the selection an author makes from the linguistic varieties available, correlated with the genre and his personal idiosyncrasies’; ‘this interdependence’, he adds, ‘is to be judged by the criterion of appropriateness/decorum, a central concept of the discipline of rhetoric’ (2001: 212). The role of style in the normative tradition has received due attention in the literature, including the level of formality, register variation, idiolect, precept versus author’s own usage, etc. The role of rhetoric, however, has been largely overlooked in the history of eighteenth-century prescriptivism. As far as P-stranding is concerned, it is well known that writers such as George Campbell and Hugh Blair made prescriptive and proscriptive comments on the use of stranded prepositions, and that they were rhetoricians, rather than grammarians, yet their rhetorical background has never been considered as a significant factor in their prescriptive attitudes. This section aims to shed light on the importance of rhetoric in the stigmatisation of P-stranding in particular, and in the context of the normative tradition in general.

Rhetoric, in the words of Daniel Fenning (1715–71), is ‘the art of speaking and writing, not merely with propriety, but with elegance, spirit and dignity, in order to instruct, persuade, and please’ (1771: 183), a definition that echoes the classical orators Cicero (106–43 BC; also known as “Tully”) and Quintilian (35–100 AD). As an art, rhetoric had long been ‘complementary’ to the study of grammar, the third branch of the trivium grammar–logic–rhetoric: grammar would teach how to write and speak correctly, logic would focus on the accurate expression of ideas, and rhetoric would be concerned with good and beautiful expression of ideas, stylistic appropriateness and what we understand today as text syntax (Görlach 2001: 21;

39 Previous work considering rhetoric as a determining factor includes McIntosh (1998), Fitzmaurice (2000b), Oldireva Gustafsson (2008) and Yáñez-Bouza (2011c).
Elocation is a key element in rhetoric, and thus the latter is often described as ‘the art of speaking eloquently’, that is, ‘in an appropriate way, given a certain subject matter’ (Vorlat 1979: 130). Grammar becomes not only ‘the art of writing correctly’ but ‘the art of speaking and writing with propriety’, as defined in Lindley Murray’s *English Grammar* (1795: 1). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, grammar and rhetoric often overlap, with grammarians writing treatises on rhetoric and rhetoricians writing about grammar – Joshua Poole, discussed earlier, is an example. Classical rhetoric was part of liberal and professional education. During the eighteenth century more rhetorical material is gradually incorporated into grammar books with sections devoted to composition and the elegant delivery of language (for instance, gestures, facial expressions, voice modulation and tone). It is in the latter part of the century, fostered by influential works such as the treatises of George Campbell (1776) and Hugh Blair (1783), that the study of rhetoric regains importance in its own right, appearing ‘in fresh forms’ and separate textbooks (Michael 1970: 195–7; Sundby et al. 1991: 10–12). Similarly, Hickey (2009: 95) explains that elocation also gains importance as ‘a means of teaching speakers ostensibly correct diction’, which was at first concerned with delivery but over the course of the eighteenth century came to be concerned ‘with instructing non-standard speakers in how to pronounce the standard variety’. Given the importance of one’s public acceptability at the time, rhetorical grammars and pronouncing dictionaries readily developed into the genre of prescriptive books, and were in great demand. Rhetorical grammars are ‘quite discursive with much text on and discussion of side-issues’, and pronouncing dictionaries are ‘clearly reference works’; the ultimate aim and ideology of both is the same: to purify nonstandard speech in pursuit of social acceptability (Hickey 2009: 96).

McIntosh (1998: 142) points to the ‘New Rhetoric’ (1748–93) in particular as a school of thought that ‘allied itself with prescriptive grammar’ and thereby contributed to the standardisation of the English language. The New Rhetoric refers to a body of published works and lectures by authors committed to the revival of ancient rhetoric as an ‘art’ that could be taught. The new rhetoricians ‘formed a well-patronized cohort... highly visible in the intellectual world of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen and increasingly respected in London and on the Continent’ (Short 2000: 252). They belong to different schools of rhetoric, from ‘belletristic rhetorics’

---

40 The term ‘New Rhetoric’ was coined by W.S. Howell in *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (1971). New approaches have emerged in recent years; in my work I follow Carey McIntosh (1998, 2000).
(e.g., Hugh Blair, Lord Kames) to elocution (e.g., Thomas Sheridan, John Walker), and psychological–philosophical theories of rhetoric (e.g., George Campbell, James Beattie), but they all share certain common goals and guiding principles (see Moran 1994), amongst them stylistic propriety, decorum and correctness.

Rhetoric becomes in the eighteenth century ‘a frame’ for language consciousness which, alongside dictionaries and book reviews, ‘reinforced’ the notion of correctness characteristic of late eighteenth-century normative grammar books, and also ‘encouraged both polite usage and the precision and explicitness’ characteristic of late eighteenth-century prose style (McIntosh 1998: 142–3, italics in the original). The recommendations laid down in treatises of rhetoric would be intended to be as influential as those in grammar books.41 These recommendations can be summarised as the five P’s: purity, propriety, precision, perspicuity, proportion (Görlich 2001: 216). The early eighteenth century is influenced by John Hughes’ essay ‘Of Style’ (1698), where good prose style is based on good sense and polite learning (Görlich 2001: 213). In the late eighteenth century, George Campbell ‘humbly proposed’ a number of canons of criticism ‘in order to assist us in assigning the preference’ in language use, of which the main criteria are perspicuity, purity, propriety, unity, vivacity, energy, elegance, strength, harmony and music (1776: I.ii.II.373, see I.ii.II.367–496). As Oldireva Gustafsson (2008: 102) observes, Campbell’s canons ‘provided a set of arguments against the use of words and phrases that were not approved by the rhetorical precept’:

(184)  [On grammar and criticism.] In language, the grammarian is properly the compiler of the digest; and the verbal critic, the man who reasonably notifies the abuses that are creeping in. Both tend to facilitate the study of the tongue to strangers, and to render natives more perfect in the knowledge of it, to advance general use into universal, and to give a greater stability at least, if not a permanency, to custom, the most mutable thing in nature . . . it will probably appear, that these arts, by assisting to suppress every unlicensed term, and to stigmatize every improper idiom, tend to give greater precision, and consequently more perspicuity and beauty to our style.

(Campbell 1776: I.ii.II.369–70)

---

41 See, for instance, Oldireva Gustafsson (2008) on phonoesthetic prescriptions related to the arrangement of words in sentences and periods.
The central virtue of good style is perspicuity, in the choice of words and in the arrangement of words: ‘it permeates the whole aesthetics of literary style’ (Adamson 1999: 600; see pp. 599–617). As John Hughes (1677–1720) says in his influential essay, ‘[l]ittle need be said of the second Qualification, viz. Perspicuity. If your Thoughts be not clear, ’tis impossible your Words shou’d, and consequently you can’t be understood’ (1698: 250). For Hugh Blair, highly influential in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in both Britain and America, the choice of words requires ‘Purity, Propriety, and Precision’ (1771: III.1.14); for ‘a perfect Sentence’ the most important virtues are ‘1. Clearness and Precision. 2. Unity. 3. Strength. 4. Harmony’ (1783: I.xi.247). Regarding preposition placement, the view is that P-piping is the perspicuous form, as it provides a clearer relation between words and thought. James Elphinston (1765) explains this with regard to interrogative clauses and zero-relative clauses, as follows:

(185) Common stile says therefore, what does this amount to?: whom do you aim at?: what is he proud of?: &c. and the precise, To what does it amount?: at whom do you aim?: of what is he proud?: But the familiar what amounts to is – the person I aim at is – the thing he is proud of is – become precise only by resolution or suppletion: That to which it amounts is – the person at whom I aim is – the thing of which he is proud is –

(Elphinston 1765: II.146–7)

In classical discussions by Quintilian and Cicero, Adamson (1999: 593, also pp. 584–8) notes that the period is considered ‘as much a unit of prosody as of sense’ in which ‘the ending was the high point’ of suspension and force: a grammatically complete sentence keeps the rhetorical conclusion until the end, after parenthetical elements, subordinate clauses, etc. In the early seventeenth century, John Brinsley gives precise instructions about this in his Ludus Literarius: for ‘most exquisite observation of placing and measuring sentences, Rhetorically’, scholars must follow a number of precepts, including ‘That the ending of sentences bee specially weighed, which are chiefly marked of all; and therefore are to bee carefully varyed, that they may not be displeasing’ (1612: 162). In the eighteenth century we can see this in John Mason’s (1749) Essay on the Power and Harmony of Prosaic Numbers, one of the works critical of P-stranding:

---

42 According to Carr (2002) and Schmitz (1948), Blair’s lectures had a huge success beyond the British Isles, soon becoming a textbook ‘which half the educated English-speaking world studied’ (Carr, quoted in Schmitz 1948: 96).
Cicero ‘often postpones to the very last, that Verb or emphatical Word on which the whole Sense of the Period depends’ (1749: 66; see also *OED* s.v. *period* III.16.a). Thus a periodic sentence is one which ‘saves key semantic and syntactic components for last’ (McIntosh 1998: 31), which we still find in the principle of end-focus in present-day grammatical structures.\(^{43}\)

Since the means to achieve these effects are partly prosodic and partly syntactic, the word occupying the final position in the sentence becomes the object of special attention in matters of eloquence and rhetoric. Short or semantically light words such as prepositions carry no strength and no suspense and lack semantic sense. Placing a preposition at the end of a sentence results in an unemphatic ending with a harsh rhetorical effect. This naturally leads to the stigmatisation of P-stranding.\(^{44}\) The discussion of stranded prepositions is thus often related to the cadence of the sentence, to the rhythm and ‘the flow of verses, or periods’, as Johnson defined it (1755 s.v. *cadence* 3) – in poetry called ‘the numbers’. For John Hughes cadence is ‘that which makes a Style smooth, and not merely the avoiding of harsh Words’ (1698: 252); for Campbell, the canon of euphony advocates that ‘[w]hen the terms or expressions are in other respects equal, that ought to be preferred which is most agreeable to the ear’ (1776: I.ii.II.382). Cadence and euphony will feature prominently when preposition placement is judged, alongside the related canons of vivacity and strength, as illustrated in John Ward’s passage (186) (see also Leonard 1929: 153–63).

\[(186)\] But to add no more, if a sentence end with a monosyllable, it is apt to hurt the cadency, and disappoint the ear; whereas words of a moderate length carry a greater force with them, by the fullness of their sound, and afford the ear what it expected. And there is one sort of monosyllables more especially, which never stands well at the conclusion of a period, tho we frequently find it there; and that is the signs of cases. Thus we say: *Avarice is a crime, which wise men are too often guilty of*. But the cadency would doubtless be more agreeable, if it was altered thus: *Avarice is a crime, of which wise men are too often guilty*. Every one must perceive, when the accent falls upon the last syllable in the

\(43\) In reference to multiword verbs, Claridge (2000: 261) reflects that ‘the final position carr[jes] both most stress and most information value, but a kind of front-focus is also possible, cf. the process of fronting, for instance. In this case, focusing is much more a question of emphasis, not of high information value, the fronted item usually being marked theme’.

\(44\) In a comparison of my early work on attitudes to P-stranding with Wild’s research on attitudes to phrasal verbs, Wild concludes that the criticism of phrasal verbs often derived from the particle of the phrasal verb being misunderstood and classified as a preposition (2010: 110–11, 118).
sentence, as it does, if it end with *of*, the sound is not so pleasant, as when it rests upon the preceding syllable in the word guilty.

(Ward 1759: I.xxiv.381–2)

5.5.2 Dryden’s flow of the sentence

The ‘close link between periodicity and closure’ in rhetoric derives from Quintilian’s principles in *Institutio Oratoria*, which, together with Erasmus’ *De Copia*, ‘codified and theorised the practice of Cicero’, and both are regarded as ‘the main ancestors of manuals of English eloquence’ (Adamson 1999: 588). Dryden received a formal education at Oxford and Cambridge, and in the seventeenth century (as well as in the eighteenth century) this would have involved the trivium of grammar, logic and rhetoric. The underlying principles of the latter are ‘elementary rhetorical ideas’ shared by poet-critics such as Joseph Addison, lexicographers such as Samuel Johnson, and ‘new rhetoricians’ such as Lord Kames, Hugh Blair and George Campbell (McIntosh 2000: 231). As poet laureate, Dryden masters the stylistic norms of verse and composition. He is at times unhappy with the deficiencies of the language and complains that English had no ‘prosodia’; it is thought that he wrote a draft work about it, ‘the lost prosodia’ (Jameson 1923; Emerson 1966). Dryden often expresses admiration for classical orators such as Virgil and Ovid, who, he says, ‘seem to have pitched on propriety of thought, elegance of words, and harmony of numbers’ (1697a: 214).

Along with correctness, Latin, and matters of formality, another reason behind Dryden’s reluctance to conclude sentences with prepositions arises from the field of rhetoric: his concern with the due order of words and the effect on harmony and sense. As Smith (1950: 89) put it, somehow Dryden ‘realized that a sentence had better not end with an unaccented monosyllable’. In my view, the principles of classical rhetoric are the chief reason for the stigmatisation of P-stranding in Dryden’s time, as well as in the eighteenth century.

In the dedication to one of his last works, a translation of the Latin epic poem *Æneis*, Dryden comments on the importance of the syntactic arrangement of words and the effect on the rhyme and harmony of the composition, as follows:

45 John Ward’s *A System of Oratory* (1759) is not included in the precept sources studied in this monograph, given that I only became aware of it after the compilation of the database. An analysis of Ward’s treatise lends further support to the claims made in this chapter.

46 See, in particular, ‘his dependence on Cicero’ analysed in Feder (1966).
[Virgil] is everywhere elegant, sweet, and flowing in his hexameters. His words are not only chosen, but the places in which he ranks them for the sound. He who removes them from the station wherein their master set them, spoils the harmony... I have endeavoured to follow the example of my master, and am the first Englishman, perhaps, who made it his design to copy him in his numbers, his choice of words, and his placing them for the sweetness of the sound.

(Dryden 1697a: 215)

The same principles had guided Dryden since as early as 1668: ‘the due choice of your words expresses your sense naturally, and the due placing them adapts the rhyme to it’, says Dryden in the Essay (1668a: 95). It is in another piece of criticism in 1672 that Dryden proscribes Jonson’s stranded preposition as a ‘fault’, as discussed in Section 5.3.1 with regard to Latin and grammatical correctness. In the same piece Dryden condemns a second instance of P-stranding, but this time the ‘fault’ not only is incorrect because it appears in the end of the sentence, but is ill-sounding because it is ‘placed last in the verse’ and it is improper for it to be thus hanging ‘at the half of the period’, qualities and terms which are associated with rhetoric and poetry. The passage in full, also quoted in (127), reads as follows:

And be free
Not heaven itself from thy impiety.
A synchysis, or ill-placing of words, of which Tully so much complains in oratory.

The waves, and dens of beasts could not receive
The bodies that those souls were frightened from.

The preposition in the end of the sentence; a common fault with him, and which I have but lately observed in my own writings.

What all the several ills that visit earth,
Plague, famine, fire, could not reach unto,

The sword nor surfeits, let thy fury do.

Here are both the former faults: for, besides that the preposition unto is placed last in the verse, and at the half period, as is redundant, there is the former synchysis in the words the sword, nor surfeits, which in construction ought to have been placed before the other.

(Dryden 1672a: 167–8, my emphasis in bold, italics in original)
Cadence, pause and end-stop are to be treated with exactness in the prosody of the composition. In this particular instance with P-stranding, Dryden does not excuse its use for the sake of rhyme, as he does a few pages later when the monosyllabic verb form be appears at the end of a line: ‘Be there is false English for are; though the rhyme hides it’ (Dryden 1672a: 169). For Dryden it is not only a matter of attaining correct language but also a matter of a ‘more proper’ and ‘more sounding’ language (1672a: 164). Harmony is a vital target: it is about the effect, the harsh effect, caused by a misplaced preposition – by a stranded preposition. It is no coincidence that this censure on P-stranding comes after a remark on ‘the ill-placing of words’, which was a particular source of complaints ‘in oratory’ by classic rhetoricians such as Tully (188). As Hughes described it a few years later, cadence ‘consists in a Disposing of the Words in such Order, and with such Variation of Periods, as may strike the Ear with a sort of musical Delight, which is a considerable Part of Eloquence’ (1698: 252). It is no coincidence either that the preposition of is here well placed before the who-relative pronoun (‘of which Tully so much complains’). Along with Tully, the Defence contains numerous references to other influential rhetoricians like Quintilian, Horace, Ovid and also Mr Waller, a contemporary of Dryden’s whom he admired highly. Notice again Dryden’s emphasis on the ‘well-placing of words’ and again in relation to harmony:

(189) Well-placing of words, for the sweetness of pronunciation, was not known till Mr. Waller introduced it; and, therefore, it is not to be wondered if Ben Johnson has many such lines as these:

(Dryden 1672a: 169)

These attitudes can also be traced in the analysis of the revised edition of the Essay (1684). Dryden himself would ‘deny not’ that ‘sometimes there may be a greatness in placing the words otherwise; and sometimes they may sound better’ (1668a: 98), but he also believes that the words must be ‘so ordered that the rhyme naturally follows them, not they the rhyme’ (1668a: 98).

Bergh and Seppänen (2000: 298, n4) suggest that metrical considerations might have already played a decisive role in the choice of preposition placement in the ME period. This is not to say that the choice was conscious at the time, but that rhyme and rhythm were taken into account.

Tully is highly commended by seventeenth-century grammarians, such as John Brinsley in his recommendations of how to construe Latin and how to translate from English to Latin:

This booke I doe acount of all other to bee the principall; the Latine of Tully being the purest and best, by the generall applause of all the Learned: and because that booke is as a most pleasant posie, composed of all the sweete smelling flowers, picked of purpose out of all his works. (Brinsley 1612: 153)
This suggests that the deliberate revision of end-placed prepositions in the Essay is aimed at achieving a rhythmical effect, that ‘of knitting the periods more closely, and in some instances of adding weight and sonority to his sentences’ (Summers 1931: I.341). Smith (1950: 89) likewise argues that Dryden’s alterations aim at ‘improving the rhythm by giving a firmer ending to a sentence or a clause’; as Dryden says, ‘after all, our language is both copious, significant, and majestical, and might be reduced into a more harmonious sound’ (1693: 12). For Simon, in the Essay ‘a slight syntactical change’ or ‘a slight change in the word-order’ makes for ‘a smoother rhythm’ of the sentence, especially with members placed at the end (1963: 138–9); the syntax ‘may be a little more formal, but the flow of the sentence is more continuous’ (ibid.). Simon gives abundant evidence of other strategies aiming at a greater accuracy, clarity, precision and strength; for example, Dryden also substitutes nouns for pronouns in order to eliminate weak endings (e.g., ‘Ours’/’Our plays’, 1668a: 70; ‘to get it up again’/’to get up again what he had lost’, 1668a: 66). According to Bately’s (1964: 272) data, the smallest numbers of end-placed prepositions are associated with rhymed couplets or blank verse, thus implying that stranded prepositions are avoided not only because they are grammatically incorrect but also because they destroy the harmony and cadence of the period.

Dryden’s reputation earns him a place in the curriculum of the teaching of rhetoric. (Recall that Joshua Poole’s grammar and treatise on rhetoric were also popular schoolbooks.) Michael (1987: 158–60, 164–7) observes that in the eighteenth century ‘the emphasis of teachers was no longer directed almost solely to composition; they began to look on literature as more than a source of models for teaching of expression’. One of these literary models was Dryden, from as early as 1702 in Edward Bysshe’s The Art of English Poetry, throughout eighteenth-century miscellaneous works such as William Gordon’s (1765 [1755]) The Young Man’s Companion, and also in nineteenth-century school anthologies such as Lucy Aikin’s (1801) Poetry for Children. It is probable, then, that Dryden reached a wide range of readers, and that these were likely to have been influenced by his style, in which he avoided stranded prepositions, and one could speculate that readers might have been aware, too, of his metalinguistic comments against ending sentences with prepositions. (See further Section 6.1.)

5.5.3 Eighteenth-century canons

In my view, the stigmatisation of P-stranding, in Dryden and in general, combines two traditions: grammatical correctness and rhetorical propriety. As rhetoric was gradually incorporated into grammar books, the passages
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on the inelegant and imprecise transposition of words typical of treatises of rhetoric were mirrored in grammar books. Classical rhetoric continued to be a vital part of liberal and professional education during the eighteenth century, and so it is hard to say whether eighteenth-century rhetoricians were inspired by Dryden’s attitudes directly or by the classical tradition of rhetoric in general; yet the fact remains that Dryden’s seventeenth-century ideals are readily traced in the eighteenth-century normative tradition. In this section I offer an account of the understanding of prepositions as transposed elements and attitudes towards them in relation to the canons of rhetoric.

5.5.3.1 Transposed prepositions

The link between grammar and rhetoric is best illustrated in the discussions of stranded prepositions as ‘transposed prepositions’, already noted in Sections 5.2 and 5.4.2. Before Dryden, the grammarian and rhetorician Joshua Poole prescribed the turning of the order of prepositions in translations from English to Latin because they were out of order. Shortly after Dryden, Christopher Cooper included in his (prescriptive) grammar a passage on the transposition of words in which the order must be that which makes ‘poesie’ sound harmonious but unaffected, fluent and pleasant, but without rendering the sense obscure, as is the general principle in the art of oratory. The principles of rhetoric and grammar are intertwined to the extent that rhetoric ‘involved itself explicitly in grammar’ and ‘went into unprecedented detail in its pursuit of grammatical accuracy’ (McIntosh 1998: 158). According to Görlach (2001: 21), the ideal of correctness has an impact on rhetorical matters of ‘proper use’ of words ‘in the proper place’, ‘the adequate use of figures of speech’ and ‘the effective arrangement of words in sentences including cadence’. The definition of style in Buchanan’s grammar echoes Dryden’s attitudes: ‘the proper and elegant Manner of adjusting the Language to the Subject, or a proper Choice of Words, agreeable to the Rules of Syntax’ (1767: xxvii).

Transposition is commonly defined as ‘the Placing of words in a Sentence out of the natural order of Construction’ (Lane 1705: 104), and it is often treated as an artificial order, a figure of rhetoric, figurative syntax, or a grammatical figure of syntax. As defined by Samuel Saxon (1737: 79), ‘figurative syntax’ is the art that ‘teacheth the artificial Order or Disposition of Words’ and has a wide scope from pleonasm, ellipsis and transposition to minor figures such as aphaeresis and syncope (see Sundby et al. 1991: 10–12). The topic is already raised in seventeenth-century works of Latin as well as of English, usually as the figure hyperbaton or anastrophe, understood in essence as the inversion of natural order (see Section 5.2). John Brinsley,
for instance, makes explicit reference to the link between grammar and rhetoric in his directions for constructing sentences: ‘1. Of the Analysis or resoluing a sentence; first the resoluing it out of the Rhetorickall order of the Author, into the first proper, naturall and Grammaticall order. 2. Construing, turning or translating it into English, according to the same order; giuing the true sense and force of each word and phrase. 3. Parsing as we construe.’ (1612: 104). The comments on transposition and other grammatical figures in eighteenth-century works are mainly ‘descriptive and appreciative’ (Sundby et al. 1991: 12), but insofar as the idea of correctness is implied in the definition of syntax as the ‘proper’ ordering, joining or placing of words, transposition is considered a departure from the natural order of ideas (Michael 1970: 130–1; Vorlat 1996: 170; see Section 5.3.1.2). Transposed prepositions are doomed to be censured precisely because of the positional change: ‘putting words before which should come after’ (Lane 1705: 104). In order to preserve the true sense and meaning of any sentence (perspicuity), the shared precept is that ‘the words ought not to be transposed’ (1705: 105). In his grammar Lane does not offer examples of transposed prepositions explicitly, or of any other transposed element, but his lengthy discussion is borrowed by later grammarians who do indeed illustrate transposition with stranded prepositions. One of these is James Greenwood (1711) in Essay towards a Practical English Grammar, a grammar which had ‘an enormous influence’ throughout the eighteenth century (Vorlat 1975: 436). The discussion goes as follows:

(190) The natural Order also of the Words is chang’d or transplac’d: For in English as well as in Latin, the Words of a Sentence are not always plac’d in their natural Order, as they lie in Sense, but are put into such an Order, as will sound sweetest to the Ear, but so that the Sense be not thereby darkned or render’d obscure: For Perspicuity or Clearness is the chief Excellence of Speech. If so, we may take Notice of a very great Fault some Persons are too guilty of, who are for writing of Phrases, before they are acquainted with common expressions . . .

Transposition is the putting the Words in a Sentence, or Sentences, out of their natural Order, that is, in putting Words or Sentences before, which should come after, and Words or

49 Note that Sundby et al. (1991) discuss P-stranding as one of the four types of ‘positional errors’ classified in DENG as ‘transposition’.

50 Amongst the works which discuss the transposition of words in the same terms as A. Lane and James Greenwood but do not provide illustrative examples with stranded prepositions are Charles Gildon and John Brightland (1712: 126) and Ralph Harrison (1777: 45–7).
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Sentences after, which should come before. The Substantive is often put out of its Place, especially when There or It is set before the Verb; As, There was a Man, i.e. A Man was; It is the Custom, i.e. The Custom is. So, God’s Glory, for the Glory God’s, &c. And always in an Interrogative Sentence. So Adjectives, especially if a Verb come between the Substantive and the Adjective; as, Happy is the Man, for, the Man is a happy [Man]. The Preposition is frequently transposed; as, Who do you Dine with? For with whom do you Dine? What Place do you come from? For, From what Place do you come? . . .

Whence our Youth may consider how that is not in the Latin alone, that Words and Sentences are thus transpos’d, but that we are somewhat guilty of this Custom, tho’ not in so great a degree: All this by the direction of their Master may serve to put the Lads upon reducing the English, that is given th[em] for their Exercise; into its natural Order before they attempt to turn it into Latin. But we shall first observe one Thing; which is, that, the best and clearest Writers have the fewest Transpositions in their Discourses: And that they are more allowable in Poetry than in Prose, because it is there generally sweeter and more agreeable to the Ear. (Greenwood 1711: 217–18)

The main reason for disapproving of transposed elements is, again, the aim to attain ‘Perspicuity or Clearness’; it is ‘a very great Fault some Persons are too guilty of’ – notice here Greenwood’s own stranded preposition. Like Dryden, Greenwood understands this arrangement as a syntactic deviation: his advice is to learn the peculiarities of the English language and then reduce the sentence to its natural order in English before attempting to translate it into Latin. Greenwood might have been influenced by Dryden’s attitudes directly, since the latter is one of the writers ‘most frequently represented among the 126 pieces’ compiled in Greenwood’s anthology The Virgin Muse (1717), and indeed Greenwood’s advice reminds us of the strategies set out by Dryden in the Essay to avoid stranded prepositions. Greenwood’s attitude is not fiercely against transposed prepositions, however, and he even concedes to the transposed order of words for the sake of euphony: ‘as will sound sweetest to the Ear’ (1711: 217). Greenwood also reminds us of Dryden’s awareness of differences in medium between poetic and nonpoetic use, which many authors also refer to during the eighteenth century: stranded prepositions are ‘more allowable in Poetry’ where transposition ‘render[s] the Words more Harmonious and agreeable to the Ear’ (1711: 220). Chaucer, to give an example, is said to have used P-stranding
twice as frequently in his verse as in his prose (Kivimaa 1966: 10, quoted in Bergh and Seppänen 2000: 298, n4; see Section 5.4.2). Nonetheless, the point is made that this sort of disposition of words is not preferred: the fewer the better, the main reason being the canon of perspicuity and clearness, as is also inferred from Dryden’s quotations above. By implication, P-stranding is to be avoided.\footnote{Oldireva Gustafsson also notes that grammars interpreted apostrophised contractions as poetic spelling ‘even at the time when such contractions were marginalised from prose and epistolary practice’ (2002: 233–4).}

Plagiarism and acknowledged borrowing of Lane’s and Greenwood’s passages becomes a common practice during the century, as in Isaac Barker (1733: 25–6), the anonymous A New English Accidence (1736: 84–6), Daniel Turner (1739: 28), Ann Fisher (1753: 122–3, revised in J. Wilson 1792: 108–11), Daniel Farro (1754a: 334–5), John Carter (1773: 108–10), John Clarke of Grantham (1791: 129–30), and the shortened version of the latter in John Hornsey (1793: 54). Importantly, some of the works in which Greenwood’s discussion is repeated are very popular in their own right, for example Fisher’s grammar. Isaac Barker (fl. 1733) acknowledges his indebtedness to Greenwood in the preface to his English Grammar, and this is indeed obvious in the many passages where he plagiarises Greenwood’s words verbatim (1733: ii, pp. 25–6 on P-stranding). Daniel Turner describes transposed prepositions as being ‘often put out of its place’, and he turns the sentences into the ‘natural order’ with a fronted preposition (191); in addition to the explicit mention in observation 6, there are comments on transposition both in the section ‘of figurative construction’ and in the preface to the grammar. Turner advocates the transposed order on account of prosody and harmony, for it makes the sentence ‘run easy’ and ‘please the ear’, but he also warns the reader to be careful not to ‘darken the sense’. As for differences related to medium, Turner points to the higher frequency of the form in verse. In the preface, transposition is considered beautiful and elegant, for Turner understands rhetoric, its figures and tropes, as ‘the beauty and elegance of his native language’ (192); his positive view is made clearer still when he states that ‘the turns of words’ (i.e., figures, transposition) are correct and elegant. Yet he is also of the opinion that transpositions should be regulated, that is, put into natural order.

\footnotesize{(191) \textit{Of Figurative Construction.}}

5. \textit{Transposition} places words out of their natural order; thus, \textit{now came still evening on}; i.e. \textit{now still evening came on}.

6. The \textit{Preposition} is often put out of its place; as \textit{what be ran for}; i.e. \textit{for what}, and \textit{whom did you give it to}, i.e. \textit{to whom did}, &c.
Remarks. 5. *Transposition*, is used only to make the sentence run easy: it is more frequent in verse than prose; in both, care should be taken, that while we please the ear, we don’t darken the sense.

(Turner 1739: 28)

I have also, to make the English Scholar yet more complete, and introduce him to an Acquaintance with the Beauty and Elegance of his native Language, annexed a short Abstract of Rhetoric, wherein the most usual Tropes and Figures are explained in two-line Verses; the first giving the Definition, the other the Example; by which the Matter is comprehended in a very little Room, and consequently less burthensome to the Memory, than otherwise it would have been.

(Turner 1739: Preface)

In his *Royal Universal British Grammar and Vocabulary*, Daniel Farro (1754a: 334–5) comments on the frequency of out-of-place prepositions. P-stranding is, by implication, advocated for the sake of harmony (‘to render, if possible, the Words more harmonious and agreeable to the Ear’, ‘sweeter and more agreeable to the Ear’); but Farro is also aware of differences between poetry and prose (‘more allowable in Poetry than in Prose’) and advises caution in both cases: ‘the best and clearest Writers have the fewest Transpositions’. Overall the connotation is not strongly negative, but as the century goes on attitudes become more proscriptive. For instance, John Clarke of Grantham (1791) disapproves of ‘the Transposition of Words or Sentences’, and his position is clear: they ‘should be carefully avoided’ (193). Although transposed elements are ‘allowable in Poetry’, he is still of the opinion that they are ‘as much as possible to be avoided’. As regards prose, he seems to allow transposition if ‘it be found absolutely necessary’ but, at the same time, after illustrating transposed elements with stranded prepositions he places the prepositions at the front as ‘most harmonious’ and ‘most grammatical’. He also seems to be complaining about ‘how frequently’ these expressions are used.

In Prose the Transposition of Words or Sentences should be carefully avoided, unless it be found absolutely necessary to render the Sound more harmonious and agreeable to the Ear: How frequently do we hear these Expressions used, *Who do you walk with?* *Who do you dine with?* instead of, *With whom do you walk?* *With whom do you dine?* which, as they are the most grammatical, seem to me to be the most harmonious Expressions.

(Clarke of Grantham 1791: 129–30)
In John Hornsey’s *Short English Grammar*, grammatical figures are described as ‘deviations from the ordinary rules of speaking and writing’ (1793: 51). On transposition he briefly adopts the ‘out of natural order’ stance and illustrates the deviation with stranded prepositions, which he turns into fronted prepositions: ‘A transposition is the placing of words in a sentence out of their natural order; as, here am I, for here I am; who did you ride with? for, with whom did you ride?’ (1793: 54). It is in the concluding remarks to the grammar that Hornsey states the rule proscribing any transposition: it ‘should never be used’ (1793: 94). Yet again the exception would be for the sake of elegance or prosody: ‘Figures and transpositions should never be used, except they evidently tend to adorn the principal subject, and to exhibit it in a stronger point of view’ (ibid.).

The discussion of P-stranding in relation to figurative constructions usually appears under the heading ‘transposition’, or ‘hyperbaton’, but on a couple of occasions it appears under the heading ‘enallage’, most often understood as ‘transformation’ of words. See, for instance, the following passage from Ann Fisher, which would be echoed almost verbatim in Lister Metcalfe (1771: 98):

(194) Q. *What is an Enallage?*  
A. An Enallage is in the like Manner either of a Letter or a Word: The former denotes the Change of one or more Letters in a Word; the latter the Change of one or more Words in a Sentence...

4. When a Preposition is set after its Name; as, *We went homewards, for we went towards home; the Women who we were talking of, for the Women of whom we were talking.*

(Fisher 1753: 125)

Another grammatical context related to word order is ‘topicalisation’ (to use a modern term), the thematic structure whereby some element of the sentence is fronted for reasons of emphasis. Eighteenth-century writers do not use this term, but the fact that some illustrative examples include instances of topicalisation shows awareness of the use of P-stranding in contexts other than relative and passive clauses. Sometimes the structure involves topicalisation with P-piping, that is, the fronting of the entire prepositional phrase: ‘two months had now passed, and of Pekuah nothing had been heard’ (Bicknell 1790: I.104). Sometimes it is topicalisation with P-stranding, whereby only the governed element is fronted, and the

52 See also Michael Maittaire (1712: 211) and Peter W. Fogg (1796: 108–9).
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preposition stranded: ‘but such employment as this I have no mind to’ (Fell 1784: 128). Attitudes vary. We have seen John Fell advocate the usage in point (4) of his discussion: ‘thee and thy virtues, here, I seize upon’ (see quotation (178) in Section 5.4.2.1). Hugh Jones describes the arrangement of words in a neutral way as an instance of enallage (‘this I approve of’, 1724: 47). But Noah Webster condemns these stranded prepositions as ‘improperly separated’ (1784: 78–9). The reason here lies in the principle of unity, which for the rhetorician Lord Kames (1762) is also affected when there is topicalisation with P-piping; the arrangement is censured as ‘a violent disjunction of words’ which ‘recedes farther from a natural style’, as he argues in (195):

(195) In the sincerity of my heart, I profes, &c. By our own ill management, we are brought to so low an ebb of wealth and credit, that, &c. On Thursday morning there was little or nothing translated in Change-alley. The interjecting a circumstance betwixt a relative word and that to which it relates, is more properly termed inversion; because, by a violent disjunction of words intimately connected, it recedes farther from a natural style. (Kames 1762: II.292)

5.5.3.2 Harmony, perspicuity and strength

When the transposition of prepositions is discussed in relation to figurative syntax, attitudes towards P-stranding show a mixture of neutral, negative and positive judgements. When the discussion appears in terms of rhetoric and style, the recommendations acquire a more proscriptive tone, and this can already be observed in the mid century. In the preface to his essay, the rhetorician John Mason reminds us of the importance of both the choice and the disposition of words, for ‘[t]he Truth is, the Position of Words seems to bear the same Proportion to the Choice of them, as the Words themselves have to the Sentiments’ (1749: v–vi). His treatise is ‘a critical Regard to the Structure of their Periods; or such a Care in the Choice and Disposition of their Words as will give them that agreeable Flow’ (1749: iii); he intends to establish rules and principles, as he feels that ‘very few have any Knowledge of or Concern about [them]’ (1749: iv). Mason’s words on Tully and Quintilian remind us of Dryden’s views on the close link between harmony and word order:

(196) In this then the Ear is a better Judge than Guide . . . But as Tully somewhere tells us that the Laws of Verse were originally invented, by reflecting upon and attending to that Order and
Position of Words and Quantities which were most pleasing to the Ear, so all the Rules for attaining a true Rhythm in Prose Compositions have the same Original . . . which at once conveys Pleasure to the Ear and Improvement to the Mind; by which we are to judge of all Composition in general, whether of Verse or Prose. (Mason 1749: vii–viii)

And so he proposes the following rules later in the treatise:

(197) a. Rule V. A Transposition of Words is very frequently used for the Sake of a good Rhythm and emphatical Close. (Mason 1749: 65) [but]

b. Rule VI. Let the Sentence always close, if possible, not only with a good Number, but an emphatical Word . . . Nor are the Words for the Sake of this Elegance to be unnaturally transposed, so as to darken the Sense or spoil the other Numbers: But you should keep it in View, and when it is natural nothing is more beautiful. (Mason 1749: 66–7)

c. [Rule 5] Do not often conclude a Sentence with the Sign of the Genitive or Ablative Case; because that precludes an Elegance you should always aim at, viz. closing with an emphatical Word. e.g. *Perfect Vertue is the highest Happiness Mankind are capable of*, and *Reason the Rule they are to walk by*. Better thus, *Perfect Vertue is the highest Happiness of which Mankind are capable*, and *Reason the Rule by which they are to walk*. (Mason 1749: 72)

Mason censures the use of end-placed prepositions for the sake of harmony and elegance at the close of the sentence. Since prepositions are nonemphatic signs, the sentence should not end with a preposition because this is not elegant, as Dryden had previously judged. Elsewhere Mason cites Dryden explicitly, suggesting that he had read Dryden’s work: ‘And in whatever other respects Mr. Dryden may give the Preference to Plutarch before Seneca, (which he does with much Zeal in his Preface to Plutarch’s Lives)’ (Mason 1745: 100). Mason warns the reader that ‘you will there observe not only the best Words but their best Places; for a good Word misplaced spoils the Harmony as much as a good Word misapplied does the Sense’ (1749: 67). Importantly, Mason’s rule is worded with an imperative: ‘do not often conclude a sentence’ with prepositions, a proscriptive tone unusual in early eighteenth-century works. He then turns the two illustrative examples with stranded prepositions into ‘better’ examples with front position, as Joshua Poole had recommended in 1646 and as Dryden had advised
William Walsh in 1691. As with several other cases that we have seen in previous sections, the stricture here contains a stranded preposition: ‘an Elegance you should always aim at’; whether Mason did this deliberately or not is subject to interpretation.

Mason’s treatises on rhetoric were very popular during the second half of the century and his sermons ‘for both young and old also appeared in numerous volumes and editions’ (ODNB s.v. ‘Mason, John’). If he, like Blair, taught his precepts by example, his sermons might have acted as a source disfavouring end-placed prepositions for reasons of rhetoric and style. Whether directly or indirectly, Mason’s views can be traced in later rhetoricians such as Lord Kames and Hugh Blair. Blair’s account is extensive and strongly proscriptive, censuring P-stranding for many reasons, primarily because of the bad effect of the arrangement of final prepositions on the harmony of the period. The Heads in his lectures were first explained in 1771, where he divides the qualities of a good style ‘under two heads, perspicuity and ornament’, and under the umbrella of the former he includes ‘Purity, Propriety, and Precision’ (1771: III.1.14; see further Leonard 1929: 146–8). Like Mason and Dryden, Blair believes that ‘Sense is never to be sacrificed to sound’, that is, for the sake of harmony or prosody (198). Perspicuity presents itself as the ‘primary virtue’ of good style in the works of many rhetoricians, as a ‘self-censorious control’ over the choice of words and their grammatical arrangement in the sentence (see McIntosh 2000: 245.n17). ‘Serious art follows the rules of perspicuity’, Adamson (1999: 601) observes. Blair also makes the point that the ‘musical arrangement’ of the period depends on the ‘distribution of the members, and rests . . . in the close or cadence of it’ (198). If sense and sound go together and P-stranding disturbs the sense of the period, it follows that it will also disturb the harmony of the period, as he indeed argues in the published Lectures (1783).

(198) The Harmony of a sentence consists either in agreeable sound or modulation in general, or in the sound being so ordered as to become expressive of the sense. Agreeableness of sound depends, first, on the choice of words, and next on the arrangement of them. The Greeks and the Romans, for several reasons, attended to musical arrangement more than the moderns. Musical arrangement is sensible chiefly in the distribution of the members, and rests, of a period; and in the close or cadence of it. Monotony is always to be avoided. Sense is never to be sacrificed to sound. Sound may be rendered expressive of the sense, either
by adapting it to the general tenor of the discourse; or by accomplishing a particular analogy between the sounds, the motions, and the sensations, which are described, and the words employed in describing them. (Blair 1771: III.9.17–18)

The same principles are stated in Lord Kames’ (1762) treatise, which Blair acknowledges as one of the main sources for his own work (1783: I.xi.247.n):

I give notice to the reader, that I am now ready to enter upon the rules of arrangement; beginning with a natural style, and proceeding gradually to what is the most inverted. And in the arrangement of a period, as well as in a right choice of words, the first and great object being perspicuity, it is above laid down as a rule, That perspicuity ought not to be sacrificed to any other beauty whatever. (Kames 1762: II.297)

P-stranding breaches four principles of good style and good structure: strength, harmony, unity and perspicuity. The first direction that Blair gives to his pupils in order to attain the ‘most full and complete’ impression and ‘the Strength of a sentence’ is the rule not to terminate a sentence ‘by particles, prepositions, or inconsiderable words’ (200). Blair specifically proscribes P-stranding by stating the rule ‘to avoid concluding’ sentences with a preposition, and this rule is emphasised twice (201). He argues that ‘it is a great deal better’ to use a fronted preposition, as shown in the examples cited (‘which...of’ is corrected to ‘of which’). The end position is said to hurt the harmony and the musical arrangement of the period, ‘as the mind cannot avoid resting, for a little’ on the stranded preposition, which is ‘disagreeable’. Besides, P-stranding harms the principle of clarity and unity because prepositions are ‘little words’ of little significance and a stranded preposition ‘does not, by itself, produce any idea’. To this, Blair adds the inelegance of the construction by referring to these endings as ‘always enfeebling and degrading’.

The Strength of a sentence arises from such a disposition of the several words and members of it, as shall render the impression which the sentence is designed to make, most full and complete. This requires all redundant words and members to be rejected; particular attention to be given to copulative and relative particles; the capital words to be disposed of in the most proper place, and to be kept clear from circumstances that would clog them; the members of the sentence to be made to grow in their
importance; the sentence not to be terminated by particles, prepositions, or inconsiderable words; and objects compared or contrasted, to be expressed in resembling terms.

(Blair 1771: III.8.16–17)

(201) A FIFTH rule for the strength of the sentences; which is, to avoid concluding them with an adverb, a preposition, or any inconsiderable word. Such conclusions are always enfeebbling and degrading. These are sentences, indeed, where the stress and signification rest chiefly upon some words of this kind. In this case, they are not to be considered as circumstances, but as the capital figures; and ought, in propriety, to have the principal place alloted them . . . I speak now of those inferior parts of speech, when introduced as circumstances, or as qualifications of more important words. In such case, they should always be disposed of in the least conspicuous parts of the period; and so classed with other words of greater dignity, as to be kept in their proper secondary station.

AGREEABLY to this rule, we should always avoid concluding with any of those particles, which mark the cases of nouns, – of, to, from, with, by. For instance, it is a great deal better to say, “Avarice is a crime of which wise men are often guilty,” than to say, “Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of.” This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun; and with reason. For, besides the want of dignity which arises from those monosyllables at the end, the imagination cannot avoid resting, for a little, on the import of the word which closes the sentence. And, as those prepositions have no import of their own, but only serve to point out the relations of other words, it is disagreeable for the mind to be left pausing on a word, which does not, by itself, produce any idea, nor form any picture in the fancy.

(Blair 1783: I.xii.285–7)

Blair’s attitudes again remind us of Lord Kames’ (1762) words:

(202) In arranging a period, it is of importance to determine in what part of it a word makes the greatest figure, whether in the beginning, during the currency, or at the close. The breaking silence rouses the attention to what is being said; and therefore deeper impression is made at the beginning than during the currency. The beginning, however, must yield to the close; which
being succeeded by a pause, affords time for a word to make its deepest impression. Hence, the following rule. That to give the utmost force to the period, it ought if possible to be closed with that word which makes the greatest figure. The opportunity of a pause should not be thrown away upon accessories, but reserved for the principal object, in order to make a full impression.

(Kames 1762: II.318)

In Lecture XIII Blair insists on the arrangement of the elements of the sentence and the effects on the harmony of the period (203). He cites and translates Quintilian’s principle on the close and cadence of the sentence; in Quintilian’s opinion this is ‘the most material part in the structure of discourse’, and in Blair’s it is ‘always the part most sensible to the ear, [which] demands the greatest care’. He then applies the principle to prepositions and concludes that ‘a sentence should not be terminated with [those] little words’. The solution for Blair, as it was for Dryden and Mason, is transposition, and the closing of a phrase or sentence, for the sake of elegance and prosody, should be reserved to ‘the longest members’. Blair links the disruption of the harmony to disruption in the strength of the sentence (‘inconsistent’), reminding us that P-stranding ‘always hurts greatly’; it is ‘ungracious to the ear’ and ‘injurious to melody’, that is, harsh. This point also relates to the principle of perspicuity: ‘that which really degrades the sense... appears also to have a bad sound’. The illustrative example provided shows ‘disagreeable’ stranded prepositions in a relative clause, which he ‘mended’ by means of the ‘transposition’ of the preposition to the front.

(203) The next thing to be attended to, is, the close or cadence of the whole Sentence, which, as it is always the part most sensible to the ear, demands the greatest care. So Quintilian [sic]: [“Let there be nothing rash or abrupt in the conclusion of the sentence, on which the mind pauses and rests. This is the most material part in the structure of discourse. Here every hearer expects to be gratified; here his applause breaks forth.”]53 The only important rule that can be given here, is, that when we aim at dignity or elevation, the sound should be made to grow the last; the longest members of the period, and the fullest and most sonorous words, should be reserved to the conclusion...
The same holds in melody, that I observed to take place with respect to significancy; that a falling off at the end, always hurts greatly. For this reason, particles, pronouns, and little words, are as ungracious to the ear, at the conclusion, as I formerly shewed they were inconsistent with strength of expression. It is more than probable, that the sense and the sound have here a mutual influence on each other. That which hurts the ear, seems to mar the strength of the meaning; and that which really degrades the sense, in consequence of this primary effect, appears also to have a bad sound. How disagreeable is the following sentence of an Author, speaking of the Trinity! “It is a mystery which we firmly believe the truth of, and humbly adore the depth of.” And how easily could it have been mended by this transposition! “It is a mystery, the truth of which we firmly believe, and the depth of which we humbly adore.” In general, it seems to hold, that a musical close, in our language, requires either the last syllable, or the penult, that is, the last but one, to be a long syllable.

In the second volume of his lectures Blair sets out to correct Joseph Addison’s style and, among other features, strongly censures Addison’s use of stranded prepositions: they result in an ‘ungraceful close’, one ‘which grate[s] harshly on the ear’ (204). Congruent with the principles in volume I, Blair turns the arrangement into a sentence with a fronted preposition ‘in order to give proper correctness and polish to our language’, and this is ‘better’. In a third remark, Blair corrects the ‘inaccuracy’ rendered by the stranded preposition with, which offends against the principle of clearness and precision; he thus changes the sentence to include a fronted preposition, prescribing the place before as ‘more proper’ (1783: II.xxii.117).

(204) a. I therefore thought it necessary to fix and determine the notion of these two words, as I intend to make use of them in the thread of my following speculations, that the reader may conceive rightly what is the subject which I proceed upon. [Addison/Spectator No 411] . . . . . – the subject which I proceed upon, is an ungraceful close of a sentence; better, the subject upon which I proceed.

(Blair 1783: II.xx.69, 71)

b. It serves us for a kind of refreshment, and takes off from that satiety we are apt to complain of in our usual and ordinary entertainments.
The Style in these Sentences flows in an easy and agreeable manner... It is fit, however, to observe that... towards the end, there are two of’s, which grate harshly on the ear, in that phrase, takes off from that satiety we are apt to complain of; where the correction is as easily made as in the other case, by substituting, diminishes that satiety of which we are apt to complain. Such instances show the advantage of frequent reviews of what we have written, in order to give proper correctness and polish to our Language. (Blair 1783: II.xxii.91–2)

c. AMIDST this blaze of beauties, it is necessary for us to remark one or two inaccuracies. When it is said, towards the close of the first of those Sentences, what a rough unsightly sketch of nature should we be entertained with, the preposition with should have been placed at the beginning rather than at the end of this member; and the word entertained, is both improperly applied here, and carelessly repeated from the former part of the Sentence... Here, it would have been more proper to have changed the phrase, and said, with what a rough unsightly sketch of nature should we be presented. (Blair 1783: II.xxii.117)

Proscriptions to do with the harsh and imprecise position of prepositions at the end of a sentence have their foundations in the field of rhetoric, but can also be found in works on the philosophy of language, such as Philip Withers’ Aristarchus (1789), and in grammar books, such as those by John Hornsey (1793) and Benjamin Dearborn (1795). Withers’ criticism has been mentioned earlier in relation to the influence of Latin and to inelegance in composition. His stricture is imperative and the criticism is based on the canon of strength and harmony: ‘At all Events, never close a Sentence with a “PREPOSITION,” for it destroys the Strength and Harmony of the Period’ (1789: 391). Benjamin Dearborn (1754–1838) concludes a two-page section on the etymology of prepositions with the proscription against P-stranding, and this is also presented as a ‘direction’: ‘Never close a sentence, or member of a sentence, with a preposition, when it may be conveniently avoided’ (1795: 74). John Hornsey censures P-stranding several times in his grammar, and in the concluding section he adds some rules intended to be applied for the sake of ‘ease, plainness’ and ‘harmony’ (1793: 93). The second of these rules proscribes ending a period with a preposition because it is not in accord with the canons of strength and harmony of the period, and it also ‘enfeebles and degrades it much’:
[Rule 2.] In long sentences, the members should rise one above another in a harmonious swell, and the period should never be closed except with an important or high sounding word+. [note+] Instead of giving strength to a sentence, it enfeebles and degrades it much, to conclude it with an adverb, a preposition, or any inconsiderable word. (Hornsey 1793: 93)

There is one particular context in which the cacophony of the sentence really does grate on the audience’s ears, and that is a stranded preposition in prepositional passives followed by a prepositional phrase.54 In the passage quoted in (163), we saw Withers complain about the inelegance of the construction, which he advises the poet to vary. The agglutination of prepositions in this context also moves George Campbell to comment, a writer who we have seen elsewhere advocating the idiomatic construction (see (38) in Section 3.1). The construction breaks the canons of simplicity, of euphony and also of perspicuity. In other words, P-stranding not only is inelegant but also renders the meaning ‘obscure’, and it creates ‘a certain confusion of thought’. Campbell’s advice is ‘not to multiply’ this ‘awkward, disjoint sort of compounds’:

54 In the context of passive clauses, grammarians tend to discuss the effects of the active–passive transformation but not the place of the preposition, as in Robert Lowth (1763: 77–8.n2), James Elphinston (1765: II.147–8), John Burn (1766: 97–8.n7), and Charles Coote (1788: 224–5, 248). This is often misinterpreted in the literature.
Campbell continues the discussion with the passives of phrasal verbs and phrasal-prepositional verbs, and in this case he admits that ‘there is no solecism’; yet he dislikes the use of the passive voice as inelegant and imprecise, the reason being the agglutination of three prepositions together: ‘it is not after some painful attention’ that the hearer works out which words are related to each preposition, as he argues in (207):

(207) in giving a passive voice to these there is no solecism. We may say, “She was gone up to by him,” “They were fallen out with by her.” But it must be owned, that the passive form, in this kind of decomposite verbs, ought always to be avoided as inelegant, if not obscure. By bringing three prepositions thus together, one inevitably creates a certain confusion of thought; and it is not till after some painful attention, that the reader discovers two of the prepositions to belong to the preceding verb, and the third to the succeeding noun. (Campbell 1776: Lii.IV.494)

Campbell’s opinion is echoed in George N. Ussher’s (1785) grammar book a few years later. Ussher’s attitudes towards P-stranding are in general a clear instance of copying from John Fell’s work, as noted in Section 5.4.2.1. However, on the particular topic of the co-occurrence of prepositions in passives, Ussher disagrees with Fell and shares Campbell’s view. The passages are borrowed from Fell, but Ussher adds proscriptive remarks to reiterate the kind of contempt expressed by Campbell. He argues that these sorts of constructions ‘may be corrected’ by turning the final preposition to the front position so that the construction is ‘better expressed’, and the ‘amendment’ of the erroneous P-stranding will help to ‘avoid the inelegance’ of the cluster (see Rule 17 in (208)). Ussher also censures the use of prepositions with transitive verbs: they ‘ought to be used in preference without the preposition’, ‘particularly’ so in the passive voice, the context in which the co-occurrence of prepositions is again amended by fronting the stranded preposition (Rules 85, 86, 94). At the end of the section on syntax Ussher provides examples of ‘bad English’ with P-stranding due to the co-occurrence of two prepositions (1785: 117, 119).  

In her study of phrasal verbs, Wild (2010: 119) concludes from these passages that phrasal verbs were not condemned explicitly ‘but rather certain syntactic uses of them’; however, the comments themselves ‘might have led wary readers to avoid them altogether’.
(208) a. Rule 17. The following sentence may be corrected in the same manner: *These are pursuits which I was never inclined to at any period of my life.* It is better expressed thus; *These are pursuits to which I was never inclined at any period of my life.* By this amendment we avoid the inelegance of the Prepositions *to* and *at*, which meet together in the first Example. (Ussher 1785: 81)

b. Rule 86. This preference [i.e., verbs without preposition] is particularly eligible in the passive voice; as, *His present was accepted of by his friend; the magistrates were addressed to by the townsmen*; are better expressed thus, *His present was accepted by his friend; the magistrates were addressed by the townsmen.*

(Ussher 1785: 57–8)

c. Rule 94. We must remark, however, that these Passive Verbs are sometimes very inelegant; as, *The rock was split upon by the ship. They were fallen out with by her. She was gone up to by him.* On these occasions Transitive Verbs are to be preferred; as, *The ship split upon the rock. She fell out with them. He went up to her.*

(Ussher 1785: 59)

While Campbell and Ussher censure the cluster of prepositions in terms of euphony, John Fell does not see any problem with such sequences. In Rule 16, final placement is not condemned on account of the cacophony when two prepositions ‘occur together’; he simply describes the frequency of the expression (209)a. Fell also does not frown at the use of stranded prepositions with phrasal-prepositional verbs in his Rule 17, where in fact he makes no comment on preposition placement (Fell 1784: 129–30). Moreover, he ‘will also admit’ of end-placed prepositions with neuter verbs in passive form whereby the co-occurrence of two prepositions involves the first being the stranded preposition and the second ‘a real preposition before the case of the agent, or doer’, as stated in (209)b.

(209) a. [Rule 16] Next, two prepositions frequently occur together, while yet each has its own attendant case somewhere or other in the sentence: he brought the nation into those difficulties *which* it has now to contend *with, under an oppressive* weight of taxes; but these are pursuits *which* I never was inclined *to at any period* of my life; *whomsoever* I may meet *with in that business.*

(Fell 1784: 129)
b. [Rule 6 on neuter verbs] will also admit a real preposition before the case of the agent, or doer; thus, “he laughed at all his acquaintance which received that opinion.” Put the verb into the passive form, and *he*, the agent, will be separated [sic] from *laughter*, the object implied in the verb; each will be put into a new situation, and the reference of each will be different from what it was before: he was *laughed at, by all* his acquaintance; the thing was *spoken against*; wouldest thou be *spoken for, to the* king; the event was *hoped for, by all* good men.

(Fell 1784: 113)

5.5.3.3 Harmony, naturalness and variety
In the context of transposition, attitudes are largely proscriptive, and quite fiercely so, we have seen: the inversion of words is said to destroy clarity and unity and to offend against a number of other canons. Nonetheless, some of the critic authors concede the fact that euphony and ease of articulation may improve with a preposition at the end of the sentence, which hence accords with the canons of naturalness and variety. A. Lane, James Greenwood and followers hedge their remarks here with ‘unless’ and ‘but’, when the change is ‘in order to render them more Musical and Harmonious’, or ‘when nature and harmony require it’. For instance, Greenwood concludes his chapter on transposition as follows:

(210) But we shall conclude this Chapter of *Transposition* with this *Caution*, that he who would write, clearly and plainly must observe natural Order as much as in him lies; yet not so strictly, as wholly to neglect the Transposition of Words since sometimes he will be oblig’d to transplace them in order to render them more Musical and Harmonious. But the Imitation of those Writers who write the most sweetly and agreeably will be the best Guide and Director in this case. (Greenwood 1711: 220)

The grammarian Ann Fisher (1753) evidently paraphrases Greenwood’s ideas, and it is from him that she also takes her two illustrative examples. Fisher makes the point that transposed prepositions are ‘frequently’ placed ‘out of natural Order’, and warns the writer to be careful not to ‘hurt’ the perspicuity of the sentence and not to overuse transpositions (211). Transposition is in general advocated for the sake of harmony: ‘to render the Sound more harmonious and agreeable’ and so that words are ‘placed in
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The manner most graceful to the Ear. Even in poetry they can be permitted if ‘Nature and Harmony of the Verse require it’.

(211) a. Chap ii. Of the order of the English language, and of transposition. [sic]

Q. Have you any Thing farther to observe with respect to the Words in, or Beauty of, a Sentence or Paragraph?

A. The particular Words of a Sentence ought generally to be as different from one another, both in Sense and Sound, as a due Preservation of the Subject and Harmony of the whole will permit; and placed in the manner most graceful to the Ear, provided the Sense be no way hurt by it. Agreeable to this, our best Writers, for Ease and Elegancy, observe, that the Beauty of a Sentence consists chiefly of the Smoothness of the Words in general, and in the Choice of Qualities suitable to the Subject in Hand.

(Fisher 1753: 122)

b. Q. What is Transposition?

A. Transposition is the placing of Words in a Sentence, or Sentences, out of their natural Order, to render their Sound more harmonious and agreeable to the Ear; . . .

2. The Preposition is frequently transposed; as, who do you dine with? for, with whom do you dine? What Place do you come from? for, from what Place do you come?

Q. May Words in Sentences be placed in what Order we please?

A. No; we must in English as well as in other Languages follow the Use of the best Speakers and Writers. The clearest and best Writers in Prose, have the fewest Transpositions in their Discourses; and, in Poetry, they are never used, but when the Nature and Harmony of the Verse require it.

(Fisher 1753: 123)

Some authors only see the positive effect of ending sentences with prepositions in terms of euphony, vivacity or the natural cadence of the period. In ‘Observations on Style’ Joseph Priestley elaborates on the harmony of style and sees no disagreeable cadence in sentences with final monosyllables; on the contrary, stranded monosyllables ‘favour the easy fall of the voice, in a familiar cadence’ (1761b: 50–1; see (44), (181)). Once again, perspicuity should not be sacrificed, but transpositions can be made as ‘delicacy of
the ear shall plead for’ (212). In the main text of his grammar Priestley again shows his concern ‘to avoid ambiguity’, yet if the harmony of the periods ‘requires’ alterations, then these are allowed (213). A footnote then expresses his positive view that ‘sometimes a verb more elegantly parts’ the preposition and its substantive (1761a: 34.nl; see quotation (182)).

(212) 

Regard is also to be had to what is called the *Harmony of Style*, or the agreeable musical sound of the words when well pronounced... In the first place, therefore, in all kinds of composition, let every word stand in such a place and connection, as that its meaning shall be in no danger of being mistaken; and let all the subsequent alterations, that the delicacy of the ear shall plead for, be made consistent with it. (Priestley 1761b: 49–50)

(213) 

Q. By what rules is the *order or disposition* of words in a sentence adjusted? 

A. English words, having few changes of termination to denote their mutual relations, to avoid ambiguity in a sentence, the situation of words cannot be so arbitrary as in some other languages: e.g. this sentence, *Alexander conquered Darius*, admits of no other disposition of the words without either entirely altering the sense, or leaving it ambiguous:... Adjectives generally precede their substantives, except the epithet be rendered complex by the addition of other words to the adjective; as, *a generous man, a man generous to his enemies*. In any other case, provided that ambiguity be avoided, the disposition is arbitrary; and every writer or speaker gives his words those places which he imagines the harmony of his periods requires them to have. (Priestley 1761a: 33–4)

For George Campbell it is vivacity that sometimes promotes the end position of prepositions. Although the ‘most proper’ or ‘most common’ arrangement with the front position is sometimes ‘unexceptionable’, this is clearly discouraged for the sake of prosody: it destroys the vivacity of the expression, rendering it ‘unanimated’, whereas the end position ‘displays an ardour’ (1776: II.iii.IV.402–3; see (38) in Section 3.1). The importance of vivacity alongside elegance is expressed elsewhere in his treatise too:

(214) 

he must take care in the first place that his style be perspicuous, that so he may be sure of being understood. If he would not only inform the understanding, but please the imagination, he must
add the charms of vivacity and elegance, corresponding to the two sources from which, as was observed in the beginning of this work, the merit of an address of this kind results. By vivacity, resemblance is attained; by elegance, dignity of manner. For as to the dignity of the subject itself, or things imitated, it concerns solely the thought. If he purposes to work upon the passions, his very diction, as well as his sentiments, must be animated. Thus, language and thought, like body and soul, are made to correspond, and the qualities of the one exactly to co-operate with those of the other. (Campbell 1776: II.ii.V.2–3)

Harmony and variety are the key virtues in favour of stranded prepositions in Anselm Bayly’s grammar, as expressed in (215). Oldireva Gustafsson (2008: 92) observes that variety as an aesthetic category in rhetoric is ‘as important as strength and harmony’, and, in fact, in some contexts ‘the requirement of variety complemented and, at the same time, delimited this prescription’.

(215) In English, the preposition is often placed from the pronoun at the end of the sentence, subjoined to the verb; this, when done with judgement, makes variety and gives a peculiar freedom and harmony to the period; as, “a book, an author, which, whom I am much delighted with.” (Bayly 1772: 84)

In the preface to his grammar, John Fell also expressed his discontent with how early grammarians had laid down rules detrimental to the variety and idiomaticity of the language, as we have seen in his passage on P-stranding in Section 5.4.2. He wonders:

(216) Perhaps they may have cleared it of some cant terms, low phrases, and awkward constructions: but what they may have gained in accuracy, have they not lost in variety? Have they not reduced all kinds of composition to an insipid uniformity? Is not the spirit of our language lowered, its freedom cramped, and its range of expression narrowed? (Fell 1784: x)

Another passage in the context of the cadence of the period comes from James Elphinston’s Principles of the English Language Digested: or, English Grammar Reduced to Analogy (1765). In his discussion of prepositional verbs he observes the difference between the active and the passive, the latter resulting in P-stranding. Elphinston first points to some potential...
criticism of the passive because it is ‘both less easy and somewhat circumlocutional’ and thus ‘can on few occasions be objected to’ (217). The passive with P-stranding, though weak in energy and strength, can nonetheless be harmonious, and he argues that sometimes the alteration into P-piping is ‘for the worse’. Elphinston deliberately plays with language in this passage by choosing to use prepositional verbs in passive sentences that illustrate the structure he is talking about.

(217) Cases doubtless there are in which a preposition may, nay must, cease to be such, and become a directive adverb, as with a passive participle, a thing to be aimed at, to be met with, &c. but even here as well as with an active verb, in a thing to aim at, to meet with, &c. the ellipse supplied restores the preposition: a thing at which it is to be aimed – with which it is to be met; no less that – at which to aim – with which to meet, &c. But the active ellipse this observation speaks of, being easily supplied, is therefore less necessary, whereas the passive being both less easy and somewhat circumlocutional, can on few occasions be objected to: and so, even in the roundest periods, when absolutely or relatively feeble, it may most harmoniously be paused at, though it cannot be with energy relied on. Not but that, where this termination is offensive, as where it can neither be absolutely feeble, nor secondary strong, as in a thing one is sensible of, for a thing of which one is sensible; or even where it is superstitiously dreaded, though harmony seem not in danger, and resolution may not be obvious, as synonymy may be found. But, however easy were the change, it were, surely for the worse, to alter

St. Mark x. 45. For even the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. or 2 Cor. vii. 10. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented to. or even St. Mark x. 38. Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with? (Elphinston 1765: II.147–8)

As a final note, it is worth observing that twentieth-century grammars and usage guides also point to these sorts of canons of rhetoric in defence of the idiom: stranded prepositions are ‘an important element in the flexibility of the language’ (Fowler 1965: 474) which ‘afford an invaluable means to promote conciseness, smoothness of diction, and diversity in metre and rhythm’ (Poutsma 1914–29: VIII.§86). A similar case, in which the canons of harmony, variety, strength and vivacity are called for, involves
phrasal verbs. Wild (2010) drew a parallel between attitudes criticising end-placed prepositions and phrasal verbs with particles in final position, and observed that after eighteenth-century attitudes shifted in the nineteenth and, mainly, the twentieth century, authors started to show favourable attitudes to the strength and expressiveness of the native phrasal verbs: they were considered stronger and more vivid than their Latinate counterparts, and authors realised that they could not always be replaced with Latinate words (see, for instance, Wild 2010: 101–3, 107, 110).

5.5.3.4 A community of practice

The strictures discussed in this section in relation to the canons of rhetoric are the kind of recommendations that most severely censure P-stranding in the precept corpus: the writers make their contempt explicit by strictly imposing the rule with imperatives such as ‘avoid concluding’, ‘never close’, ‘should never be closed’ and the slightly less absolute ‘do not often conclude’. In grammar books, however, the strictures tend to be milder, with more emphasis on the level of formality and the transposition of words. This suggests that the stigma attached to P-stranding in the eighteenth-century normative tradition lies primarily in principles related to rhetoric and style, rather than in purely grammatical rules. The analysis of the semantic labels documented in the precept corpus confirms the strong link with the realm of rhetoric. Explicit proscriptions of transposed prepositions as wrongly placed out of their natural order total eleven per cent of negative comments, and are said to break the principle of unity. Following closely is the epithet harsh, attested in eight per cent of all the negative comments, while imprecise and inaccurate together constitute thirteen per cent of the critic comments, the second most frequent reason for proscription after inelegance. These labels relate directly to the canons of perspicuity, clarity and euphony; the canons of cadence, strength and vivacity are all affected as well. Considered together, the labels associated with rhetoric outnumber any other type of criticism (31%, 156 comments).

These data are borne out by the analysis of comments by type of work, as reported in Yáñez-Bouza (2011c). In this study it is observed that overall there are more comments on P-stranding in grammar books than in rhetorical treatises (there are more grammar books than rhetoric treatises), but the ratio of criticism about P-stranding is much higher in the latter group: approximately ten comments per rhetorical treatise compared to five comments per grammar book. The distribution of semantic labels shows that

56 This includes the totals for harsh plus harsh in relation to prosody and to medium pros/poetry.
harsh, censurable and inaccurate appear with a higher frequency in rhetorical treatises. Through a comparison between English and Scottish works, Yáñez-Bouza (2011c) reports that there is also a relatively stronger preference for grammatical judgements in English authors, in contrast to a relatively stronger preference for matters of rhetoric in Scottish authors. First, most of the comments made by English authors appear in grammar books (85%), whilst most of the comments made by Scottish authors appear in works related to rhetoric (51%). Second, the vast majority of English positive comments are found in grammar books (92%), while none of the Scottish grammars document positive comments. And third, criticism of stranded prepositions totals eighty-two per cent in English grammar books and only forty-two in Scottish grammar books, whereas treatises of rhetoric show reverse trends: seven per cent of prescriptive precepts in English authors but nearly fifty per cent in Scottish authors. Yáñez-Bouza (2011c) also concludes that attitudes in material related to Scotland are more prescriptive than in the case of England, and that this is consistent across authors, works and comments. In essence, Scottish authors are more evaluative and more negative towards P-stranding than their English counterparts: they comment on this structure more often, and when they do, they criticise it more often as well. In the group of works containing criticism we find on average eight comments per work in the case of Scottish authors compared to only four comments per work for English authors. There is criticism in more works (63% for Scottish vs. 34% for English) and in more detail too (comments: 68% Scottish vs. 30% English). Conversely, the relative frequency of advocate comments is slightly higher in English works (13% for English vs. 10% for Scottish). Scottish authors offer more critical comments qualitatively as well: they provide a greater array of reasons for criticising P-stranding (13 vs. 8 critic labels), and the semantic nuances in their comments convey fiercer criticism, for instance offensive, ungrammatical. The main difference emerges in terms of the claimed prosodic effect of placing prepositions at the end of a sentence: harsh vs. harmonious. For Scottish authors, stranded prepositions are ‘ungracious to the ear’ because ‘a falling off at the end, always hurts greatly’, this being the most common criticism amongst their censorious labels. In contrast, the harsh, disagreeable effect of stranded prepositions is mentioned only occasionally by English authors. The label bad also shows notable differences: while it stands out as the second most frequent criticism by Scottish authors, it is among the least frequent label in English works.

Scottish writers were particularly sensitive to the norms of standard English, given the frequent attacks on the peculiarities (i.e., deviations) of
the Scottish variety. As the Scottish orthoepist William Kenrick (1725–89) writes in *A Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language*, ‘[i]t is indeed more natural for foreigners and provincials to see the use and necessity of such criterion’ (1784: i, quoted in Görlich 2001: 31). However, Yáñez-Bouza (2011c) has shown that the criticism of P-stranding is not strongly associated with features of provincial English or with Scotticisms (see also Section 3.2.2 here). What is crucial is that the majority of the leading figures of the New Rhetoric are Scottish and that these Scottish new rhetoricians seem to have formed a ‘community of practice’, that is, a group of individuals who display ‘mutual engagement, a joint enterprise and a shared repertoire’, and who were involved in social networks (Watts 2008: 42, 50–2). As part of the Scottish Enlightenment, the works of the new rhetoricians show common attitudes towards *belles lettres* and *ars rhetorica*; they build upon the same foundations, express ‘the same concern for propriety and decorum in figurative language’, and have a common repertoire of instructions ‘for avoiding vulgarity and achieving elegance in language’ (McIntosh 1998: 157, 154, 143). That these authors knew of each other’s writings and often commented on each other’s works has already been observed (see for example the passages from Blair and Kames), and there is also contemporary evidence that these Scottish rhetoricians, along with other Enlightened intellectuals, belonged to the same social networks, such as the Wise Club in Aberdeen, the Literary Society in Glasgow, and the Select Society in Edinburgh. This ‘highly social nature’ of the New Rhetoric, and Scottish Enlightenment in general, is indeed a crucial aspect of the movement (see Broadie 2003: 1, and for details Sher 2006: 97–125). Their common enterprise is to purify the English language, to provide the ‘middling orders of society’ with the means to learn ‘polite language’, leading to the ‘improvement’ of society in general (Watts 2008: 50). The importance of Scottish codifiers in defining and establishing a standard norm should therefore not be underestimated: had my precept corpus been restricted to English normative works only, the findings would have pointed to a much milder stigmatisation of this particular syntactic feature. It remains to be seen whether Scottish codifiers are as sensitive to other linguistic features as they were to end-placed prepositions.57

57 According to McIntosh (1998: 9–10), the major figures of the New Rhetoric were ‘outsiders’, that is, provincials and dissenters; more precisely, the ‘foremost proponents’ were six or seven Scots, a Dissenter, and one or two Irishmen. For a checklist of classical and native rhetoricians and schoolbooks, see McIntosh (1998: 149–54).
5.5.4 Grammatica and rhetorica

McIntosh rightly observes that we ‘cannot truly understand eighteenth-century language attitudes or usage without the perspectives not only of linguistics and literature but also of rhetoric’ (2000: 231). From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century ‘grammar’ embodied grammatica and rhetorica (Görlach 2001: 107); hence there is an overlap between precepts in grammar books and precepts in treatises of rhetoric. The data in the ECEG database indicates that around sixty per cent of stand-alone grammars include sections on rhetorical matters, and that these grammars often have prosody as a primary division (Yáñez-Bouza and Rodríguez-Gil 2013). Beal (2013) confirms that discussions of phonology in eighteenth-century grammar texts become more frequent towards the end of the century, parallel to the growing importance of elocution, with grammars such as George Wright’s The Principles of Grammar (1794) showing the influence of elocutionists such as John Walker (1732–1807). Principles of rhetoric came to guide the anti-variationist approach of normative grammarians and resulted in criticism of grammatical features. For instance, the semantic distinction shall/will with the first person, the criticism of that as a relative pronoun and conjunction, and the criticism of the levelling of the past in past participle position in strong verbs (e.g., have wrote/written) are all influenced by the canons of perspicuity, precision and purity of expression: the sense of the sentence in such cases is said to become obscure and ambiguous. Likewise, the canons of harmony, euphony, vivacity and strength play a role in the criticism of phrasal verbs, monosyllables, contractions in auxiliary verbs and in -ed weak verbs: they sound harsh and have insufficient weight, and are thus deemed inelegant. The words in John Hornsey’s Short English Grammar illustrate the blending of the grammatical and rhetorical traditions, plus the importance of rhetoric:

(218) But the mere grammatical knowledge of a language does not ensure accuracy and perspicuity in writing. In every composition, besides a strict attention to grammar, ease, plainness, and some degree of harmony are absolutely necessary. The following rules will, therefore, be found very useful for the attaining of these ends. (Hornsey 1793: 93)

It is no surprise that stranded prepositions came to Hornsey’s attention, in that they are ‘little words’ with a harsh rhetorical effect on the choice and arrangement of words. Like Hugh Blair, Hornsey condemns end-placed prepositions because the construction violates the principles of strength
and harmony: ‘Instead of giving strength to a sentence, it enfeebles and degrades it much’ (1793: 93; see (205) above). Rhetoric is then a ‘special facet’ of eighteenth-century prescriptivism: correctness is ‘a goal that grammars and rhetoric shared’ and the New Rhetoric (1748–93) in particular acted ‘as a force for language change in the eighteenth century because it allied itself with prescriptive grammar’ (McIntosh 1998: 181, 142). In what follows I present two case studies in which rhetoric and grammar run side by side. First, I summarise the views on P-stranding in two influential grammars, Noah Webster’s *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language* (1784) and Lindley Murray’s *English Grammar* (1795). Then, I discuss the views on another type of ‘disjunction’ of prepositions and their objects, here referred to as splitting of prepositions (e.g., ‘true Religion is connected with, and productive of, Happiness’, Postlethwaite 1795: 180).

5.5.4.1 Rhetoric in grammar(s)

Noah Webster (1758–1843), American grammarian and lexicographer, censures P-stranding in a remark to Rule XI on prepositions, where he states outright that prepositions are ‘improperly separated’ in this type of construction, with examples of interrogative clauses and topicalisation (219). Webster is aware of the stylistic relation between P-stranding and the familiar style, but to him this is nevertheless ‘generally inelegant’; furthermore, ‘in the grave and sublime styles’ the construction is ‘certainly inadmissible’:

(219) Remark 2. Prepositions are improperly separated from the words which they govern; as, Whom did you give it to? whom did you come with? him I will attend to. Grammarians seem to allow of this mode of expression in conversation and familiar writings; but it is generally inelegant, and in the grave and sublime styles, is certainly inadmissible. (Webster 1784: 78–9)

Later in his grammar, stranded prepositions are proscribed in the discussion of the ‘proper arrangement’ of words. Hugh Blair’s influence on the American tradition had been almost immediate (Manning 2000), and indeed Blair’s lectures (1783) are soon echoed in Webster’s (1784) grammar. Webster states the rule that ‘sentences ought not to close’ with ‘little unimportant words’ such as prepositions if we aim to preserve the strength of the sentence (‘without force’) and its perspicuity (‘feeble impression upon the mind’). The passages in (220) recall Blair’s rule for promoting the strength of a sentence and the effect on the cadence of the period seen in (201):
a. As the principal object to be considered in any composition whether prose or verse, is perspicuity, and as this depends much on a proper arrangement of the members of the period; it is necessary to lay down some general rules with respect to this point and illustrate their propriety by examples of wrong arrangement. (Webster 1784: 104)

b. It may also be remarked in general, that sentences ought not to close with adverbs, relatives, or particles. Little unimportant words; as, to, for, with, it, &c. close a period without force and leave a feeble impression upon the mind. Important words, such as nouns, verbs, participles and adjectives, make the best figure in the conclusion of periods – they add dignity of style and energy to sentiment. (Webster 1784: 111)

In addition, Webster discusses the transposition of elements (221). Although he does not provide illustrative examples with stranded prepositions in this passage, his wording and attitude echo James Greenwood’s views. Transposition or inversion is defined, as usual, as natural order opposed to ‘out of natural order’, when words do not ‘follow each other in the same manner as the conceptions of the mind’. Artificial order is thus discouraged: ‘it ought to be avoided’. Although in poetry it is ‘more necessary’ than in prose, transposition ‘ought not to be indulged’ in either context. On the other hand, Webster finds inversion favourable if it results in a sentence which is ‘more elegant and harmonious’. He has his reservations, nonetheless: as Blair and Greenwood argued, perspicuity is a vital virtue and sense ‘ought not to be sacrificed to any other ornament’.

Transposition or inversion, is the placing of words out of their natural order. The order of words is either natural or artificial. The natural order of words in a sentence is when they follow each other in the same manner as the conceptions of the mind. Artificial order is when words are so arranged as to render the sentence harmonious and agreeable to the ear, without obscuring the sense . . . In the foregoing examples, the artificial order of the words, is as perspicuous as the natural, and more elegant and harmonious. But when an inversion serves to embarrass a period, it ought to be avoided; for perspicuity ought not to be sacrificed to any other ornament . . . Transposition is more necessary in poetry than in
prose; but in either it ought not to be indulged, unless to acquire some ornament which cannot be compassed in a natural order.

(Webster 1784: 102–4)

Lindley Murray (1745–1826), an American lawyer, moved to England in 1784 and settled in Yorkshire, where he wrote his English Grammar, ‘intended for an English audience’ and ‘based on previously published English grammars’ (Fens-de Zeeuw 2011: 13). Indeed, the stricture on P-stranding is taken almost verbatim from Lowth’s grammar, as mentioned in Section 5.4.2 — compare Lowth’s passage in (167) and Murray’s wording in (169). The appendix to Murray’s grammar was, however, based on rhetorical treatises written by the Scottish rhetoricians Hugh Blair (1771, 1783) and George Campbell (1776), as Murray acknowledges in the preface (222). Like John Hornsey, Murray highlights the importance of the study of perspicuity as ‘a proper addition’ to grammar. Vorlat (1996) indeed identifies a number of strictures laden with epithets derived from rhetorical principles: Murray is most concerned with clearness, accuracy and terseness, but rules bearing on aesthetics (e.g., elegance, ease of conversation, strength) also rate highly, especially in terms of word order. The ‘digest of recommendations’ concerning P-stranding appeared almost always verbatim as in his sources; overall, they followed Blair’s condemning attitudes rather than Campbell’s advocate views, in particular on the topic of harmony and cadence of the sentence (Blair 1783: I.xiii.308ff. Murray 1795: 185ff.) and on the rule for the strength of the sentence (Blair 1783: I.xii.285–7; Murray 1795: 200, 208). See, for instance, Murray’s passage in (223) and Blair’s in (201). It might be added that Murray’s English Exercises likewise include rules of ‘false’ English in relation to the passage based on Lowth’s grammar and to the passages borrowed from Blair’s treatise (for instance, 1797: 79, 167).

(222) The Rules and Observations respecting Perspicuity, contained in the Appendix, and which are, chiefly, extracted from the writings of Blair and Campbell, will, it is presumed, form a proper addition to the Grammar. The subjects are very nearly related; and the study of Perspicuity appears naturally to follow that of Grammar. A competent knowledge of both, will prepare and qualify the student for prosecuting such additional improvements in language, as may be judged useful and proper.

(Murray 1795: v)

(223) A fifth rule for the strength of the sentences, is, to avoid concluding them with an adverb, a preposition, or any inconsiderable word.
Agreeably to this rule, we should not conclude with any of those particles, which mark the cases of nouns, of, to, from, with, by. For instance, it is a great deal better to say, “Avarice is a crime of which wise men are often guilty,” than to say, “Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of.” This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun; and with reason. For, as the mind cannot avoid resting, for a little, on the import of the word which closes the sentence, it must be disagreeable to be left pausing on a word, which does not, by itself, produce any idea. (Murray 1795: 208)

5.5.4.2 Disjunction of prepositions
A minor digression is relevant at this point. The primary focus of this monograph is the study of the construction P-stranding, whereby a preposition is separated from the word it governs and is placed at the end of the clause or sentence. The separation of a preposition and its complement can be approached in terms of the splitting of the sequence preposition + noun due to the insertion of one or more intermediate elements, or when two prepositions happen to govern the same object, as illustrated in (224):

(224) a. Being in no sense capable of either intention or remission.
   (Priestley 1768: 172)

b. He repined at, and lamented for, his great loss.
   (Coar 1796: 179)

This kind of ‘disjunction’ of prepositions is a splitting of prepositions, not an instance of P-stranding, as explained in Section 2.2.3. The two types of structure are often discussed separately in eighteenth-century works. What they have in common is that the splitting of prepositions is also severely criticised in this century, in grammar books as well as in treatises of rhetoric. As with end-placed prepositions, the reasons for the proscription lie primarily in the canons of perspicuity, unity and harmony: the disjunction renders the sentence obscure and weakens its flow. The canon of unity also features highly, since, as Murray explained, a preposition ‘is a word set chiefly before nouns or pronouns, to connect them with other words, and to shew their relation to those words’ (1795: 77). These views are shared in a number of works: Lord Kames’ Elements of Criticism (1762) and followers John Rice in An Introduction to the Art of Reading with Energy and Propriety (1765) and James Buchanan in A Regular English Syntax (1767); Joseph Priestley in the second edition of his Rudiments of English Grammar (1768) and in his lectures on rhetoric (1777), later copied in Alexander Bicknell’s The Grammatical Wreath (1790); Blair’s lectures on rhetoric (1771, 1783);
and John Walker’s *Elements of Elocution* 1781. Let us consider some of these.

On discussing the advantages and disadvantages of natural versus artificial order (i.e., transposition/inversion), Lord Kames reflects at length on the principle of unity between words, from which he establishes the rule that ‘words expressing things connected in the thought, ought to be placed as near together as possible’ (*1762: II.307* in (225); see also (195)). It follows then that ‘violent separation’ of words that are ‘intimately connected’ will be viewed as ‘a sense of disorder’ and will cause a ‘bad effect’:

(225) This rule is derived immediately from human nature, in which there is discovered a remarkable propensity to place together things that are in any manner connected. Where things are arranged according to their connections, we have a sense of order: otherwise we have a sense of disorder, as of things placed by chance. And we naturally place words in the same order in which we would place the things they signify. The bad effect of a violent separation of words or members thus intimately connected, will appear from the following examples.

(Kames *1762: II.307–8*)

In an earlier passage Kames concedes to the beauty of inversion in some contexts, and shows awareness of its frequency, but in his view the ‘violent disjunction’ of prepositions ‘never has a good effect’:

(226) Language would have no great power, were it confined to the natural order of ideas. A thousand beauties may be compassed by inversion, that must be relinquished in a natural arrangement. I shall soon have an opportunity to make this evident. In the mean time, it ought not to escape observation, that the mind of a man is happily so constituted as to relish inversion, though in one respect unnatural; and to relish it so much, as in many cases to admit a violent disjunction of words that by the sense are intimately connected. I scarce can say that inversion has any limits; though I may venture to pronounce, that the disjunction of articles, conjunctions, or prepositions, from the words to which they belong, never has a good effect. The following example with relation to a preposition, is perhaps as tolerable as any of the kind. He would neither separate *from*, nor act against them.

(Kames *1762: II.296–7*)

---

58 See also Sundby *et al.* (1991: 437).
A few years later, James Buchanan borrows Kames’ passage almost verbatim, stating the shared view that ‘the Disjunction of Adverbs, Conjunctions, or Prepositions, from the Words to which they belong, has very seldom a good Effect’ (1767: 166). As mentioned above with regard to Buchanan’s attitudes to P-stranding, Buchanan does not censure the splitting of prepositions in his earlier grammar of 1762, but he does so in the later grammar book. The same principles are found in other grammars. Robert Lowth’s is a good example. The quotation on stranded prepositions (167) is preserved in all editions (same wording, same section, same illustrative examples), but in the 1774 edition there is an additional footnote which proscribes the splitting of prepositions in coordination structures (227). As mentioned earlier, Lowth tends to state proscriptions in footnotes rather than in the main text of the grammar. Whereas the censure of stranded prepositions was more a matter of stylistic differences, the separation of the preposition and its noun ‘should never be admitted’, regardless of style, because it is ‘always inelegant’. It is only to be accepted ‘in forms of Law’ on account of perspicuity.

(227) The Preposition is often separated from the Relative which it governs, and joined to the Verb at the end of the Sentence, or of some member of it . . . [note 3] Some writers separate the Preposition from its Noun, in order to connect different Prepositions with the same Noun; as, “To suppose the Zodiack and Planets to be efficient of, and antecedent to, themselves.” Bentley, Serm.6. This, whether in the familiar, or the solemn style, is always inelegant; and should never be admitted, but in forms of Law, and the like; where fulness and exactness of expression must take place of every other consideration.

(Lowth 1774: 117–18, n3)59

Thomas Coar’s criticism in A Grammar of the English Tongue (1796) is less severe, simply focusing on the inelegance of the construction:

(228) It is inelegant to separate the preposition from its noun, in order to join other prepositions with the same noun, as he repined at, and lamented for, his great loss: in such cases we should say, he repined at his great loss, and lamented for it. (Coar 1796: 179)

The proscription in Lowth’s grammar is picked up by later authors such as Philip Withers (1789), Richard Postlethwaite (1795) and Patrick Lynch (1796). Of course it also appears in Murray’s grammar (229) and in his book of exercises, where the arrangement is proscribed twice: once by copying Lowth (1795: 123) and a second time by copying Blair’s passages on rhetoric (cf. Blair 1783: I.xii.271–2):

(229) After removing superfluities, the second direction for promoting the strength of a sentence, is, to attend particularly to the use of copulatives, relatives, and all the particles employed for transition and connection. . . . What is called splitting of particles, or separating a preposition from the noun which it governs, is to be avoided. As if I should say, “Though virtue borrows no assistance from, yet it may often be accompanied by, the advantages of fortune.” Here, we are put to a stand in thought, being obliged to rest for a little on the preposition by itself, which, at the same time, carries no significance, till it is joined to its proper substantive noun. (Murray 1795: 202–3)

Joseph Priestley condemns the split in the second edition of his grammar published in 1768 and also in his Lectures of Oratory published a decade later (1777), but not in the early edition of the grammar from 1761. Priestley seems to have been influenced by Lord Kames’ precepts, whether directly, or indirectly through the works of John Rice, James Buchanan or Hugh Blair. In the grammar Priestley briefly refers to the separation of the genitive marker of, which affects the harmony of the sentence and results in ‘a disagreeable effect’ (230). In the lectures of oratory Priestley elaborates on the importance of the canon of unity for the sense of the sentence, and argues that cadence must run parallel to perspicuity (231).

(230) The preposition of will not bear to be separated from the noun which it either precedes or follows, without a disagreeable effect . . . Being in no sense capable of either intention or remission. Harris’s three Treatises. (Priestley 1768: 172)

(231) If we pay any regard to the sense, we must make no pause in the middle of the word, or between two words which together present only one idea, and separately are of no signification; as between prepositions, or adjectives, and their substantives, which are as inseparable in pronunciation as if they were single words. The greater is the coincidence of the metrical pause with the pause of the sense, and the more distinguishable is verse from
prose: and verses grow less and less distinguishable as a regard to the sense throws the pause farther and farther from its natural place. (Priestley 1777: III.xxxiv.300–1)

A proper pause is vital in matters of elocution. This is further discussed by John Walker, who became known as ‘elocution Walker’. In *Elements of Elocution* (1781), Walker argues that among ‘those words which admit of no pause’ we have ‘the prepositions and the words they govern’ (1781: I.73). A pause between the connected words will render the pronunciation ‘languid and embarrassed’, and it will in fact be ‘unsuitable and repugnant to the sense’ (1781: I.74). Walker explains that pause and strength are ‘very different things’ (1781: I.103) and thus should be considered separately; that is, a subtle difference exists between the split in the syntactic arrangement and the split in elocution. He concedes that a need may arise which ‘will sometimes oblige us to separate words that are the most intimately united’, for reasons of emphasis or contrast, as in ‘To suppose the zodiac and planets to be efficient of, and antecedent to themselves, would be absurd’, but Walker states the rule that ‘we shall never be obliged to break in upon the sense when we find ourselves under a necessity of pausing’ – again, perspicuity and harmony taking precedence over cadence (see 1781: I.106–7, I.109). Walker summarises his view as follows:

(232) To sum up the whole in a few words, as those classes of words which admit of no separation are very small, and very few, if we do but take the opportunity of pausing where the same will permit, we shall never be obliged to break in upon the sense when we find ourselves under a necessity of pausing; but if we overshoot ourselves by pronouncing more in a breath than is necessary, and neglecting those intervals where we may pause conveniently, we shall often find ourselves obliged to pause where the sense is not separable, and, consequently, to weaken and obscure the composition. This observation, for the sake of memory, may be conveniently comprized in the following verse:

*In pausing, ever let this rule take place,*

*Never to separate words in any case*

*That are less separable than those you join:*

*And, which imports the same, not to combine*

*Such words together, as do not relate*

*So closely as the words you separate.*

(Walker 1781: I.108–9)
5.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter sought to trace the stigmatisation of P-stranding and its development from the end of the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. The investigation has shed new light on the issues and has challenged the traditional account given in the literature, hitherto without empirical evidence. The main conclusions are summarised in the paragraphs that follow.

The understanding of prepositions and preposition placement in EModE grammars is strongly influenced by the Latin school tradition, which is concerned with the relation established between the preposition and the part of speech it governs, and which unanimously defines prepositions as a part of speech ‘set before’ other parts of speech. Latin grammars acknowledge the grammatically required post-position of a defined set of particles (tenus, venus, etc.) and, exceptionally, some also take note of transplaced prepositions in figurative syntax. Modelled in this tradition, the majority of English grammars echo the same concerns. Awareness of variation in preposition placement in the English language is scarce but can be traced to the first grammar of English, William Bullokar (1586), followed by a few other English grammars – Ben Jonson (1640), Christopher Cooper (1685) and Guy Miege (1688). Attitudes are predominantly neutral: there is awareness but there is little evaluation of whether usage was proper or improper.

Two early sixteenth-century grammarians – John Hewes (1624) and Joshua Poole (1646) – recommend turning sentences with end-placed prepositions into constructions with fronted prepositions. The context in which these precepts first appear is in the teaching of Latin through English, yet the stricture comes to influence the teaching of elegant and perspicuous English. Their remarks are not as overtly proscriptive as in the eighteenth century, but the topic in relation to which they appear, that of transposition, becomes one of the most frequent contexts in which P-stranding is criticised in eighteenth-century precept works. There is, in addition, a grammar of Latin with additional comments on English, which shows an overtly negative attitude towards stranded prepositions in relative and interrogative clauses, namely R.C. (1685). We can, then, regard the seventeenth century as a period of latent awareness.

John Dryden is, to the best of my knowledge, the first author to proscribe the use of P-stranding in negative terms (‘fault’, ‘not elegant’), besides showing his preference for P-piping in the line of Hewes and Poole. Yet
I suspect that Dryden’s aversion to prepositions in final position was not original. Given the salient role of classical rhetoric in late eighteenth-century criticism of P-stranding, and also given Dryden’s profound knowledge of classical rhetoric and the Latin language, we might speculate that he was inspired by the principles of rhetoric and style and subsequently materialised his awareness into explicit attitudes in censure of certain grammatical features. Further research is needed to identify more sources in the EModE period that might have drawn explicit attention to end-placed prepositions. It is known, for instance, that Dryden admired the poets Edmund Waller (1606–87), William D’Avenant (1606–68) and John Denham (a.1614–69); he might have been influenced by them, just as he might have been influenced by the classical orators Cicero, Quintilian, Horace and Ovid.

This chapter has presented evidence that challenges the myth of Robert Lowth’s influence on the stigma on P-stranding. First, the precept against P-stranding does not originate in Lowth’s grammar, as is often assumed: explicit criticism of the construction can be found in early eighteenth-century and late seventeenth-century works, in grammar books, treatises on rhetoric and various writings by literary authors. Also, Lowth’s stricture is not original, as similar judgements had been made in the early eighteenth century and in Dryden’s works. In light of the evidence (e.g., the resemblance to Dryden’s attitudes, the prominence of Dryden’s works in Lowth’s grammar), it is probable that Lowth was aware of Dryden’s criticism of stranded prepositions. Second, Lowth is not as proscriptive as has often been depicted in the literature. His stricture implies awareness of stylistic differences in terms of formality and medium, and he does not lay down a rule with negative wording. Yet, in my view, he is not purely descriptive either, as he shows a preference for P-piping in prose and formal styles, the target of eighteenth-century standard norms. His stricture is picked up by later normative authors, who endorse it and lend it a stronger, more negative connotation by altering the original wording and adding evidently proscriptive statements. It is thus through a process of ‘enhanced’ borrowing that Lowth’s recommendation becomes a strict proscriptive rule in the late decades of the century.

In essence, the stigma against P-stranding is related to three topics: (i) grammatical correctness as influenced by the Latin model; (ii) awareness of stylistic differences in terms of level of formality (informal/familiar, formal/solemn) and medium (spoken—written language, verse—prose); and (iii) the canons of rhetoric. These three realms of criticism can be identified in Dryden’s explicit and implicit criticism, and can be traced in a variety
of works in the early and late eighteenth century. Whether directly or indirectly, Dryden stands as a forerunner of the stigmatisation of P-stranding in particular and of (at least some) ideals of the normative tradition in general. The timing is crucial: Dryden’s precepts postdate John Hewes (1624) and Joshua Poole (1646), but antedate Christopher Cooper’s (1685) prescriptive grammar.

(i) Normative authors are aware that P-stranding is an idiomatic expression in English which has no parallel structure in Latin (albeit grammatical post-position is observed in some Latin prepositions). As Latin is the model for grammar – and proper style – syntactic and morphological features which do not match the classical language are doomed to be criticised. The logic of the etymology of the term *preposition* also plays a role: stemming from the principle that the order of words reflects the order of thought, stranded prepositions are seen as out of order. Nevertheless, the comparison with Latin does not always lead to negative attitudes, and proscriptions/prescriptions related to Latin, to idiomaticity of the construction, and to grammatical correctness are in the minority in an analysis of the semantic labels documented in the corpus. This suggests that Latin is in fact not the primary reason for the stigma attached to P-stranding, as has traditionally been argued in the literature.

(ii) Normative authors are aware of differences between conversation and writing, between informal and formal contexts. The target in the codification of standard English is written, formal prose. It naturally follows that features characteristic of informal and spoken language would be objected to: P-stranding is inelegant and improper in such contexts. In this respect, it is not so much the incorrectness of the construction as its inappropriateness in the context that codifiers are concerned with in their strictures. Quantitatively, precepts associated with inelegant and informal connotations are very frequent in the precept data, but there is more to it than this.

(iii) The study of rhetoric is an important part of education in the early and late ModE periods, as a complement to grammar. In the eighteenth century the two traditions fuse to the extent that some judgements of grammatical features are based on the canons of rhetoric and proper style in literary language. Rhetoric becomes a special facet of English prescriptivism and treatises of rhetoric reinforce the notion of correctness characteristic of normative grammars. Stranded prepositions are censured because prepositions are seen as little words lacking strength and emphasis, improper for the end of a period, this being a maxim of composition. Thus P-stranding does not meet the canons of strength, harmony, vivacity
and energy: it is feeble and harsh. P-stranding also contravenes the canon of unity, perspicuity and accuracy, given that it separates the preposition from the word it governs; the structure is therefore imprecise and inaccurate because the preposition is out of its natural order. These attitudes are already seen to abound in treatises of rhetoric in the middle decades of the century, with John Mason (1749) and Lord Kames (1762), followed by Hugh Blair (1771, 1783). Importantly, precepts from the field of rhetoric are incorporated into grammar books, whether in the discussion of figurative syntax in terms of transposition (transposed prepositions), as in James Greenwood (1711), or in the main body of the grammar, usually borrowing precepts from rhetoricians, as in James Buchanan (1767), Noah Webster (1784) and Lindley Murray (1795). The fact that influential grammarians combine criticism from grammatical and rhetorical approaches testifies to the contribution of rhetoric to eighteenth-century prescriptivism. We must therefore be cautious in the study of the normative tradition and prescriptivism not to limit our sources to stand-alone grammar books. The role of rhetoric stands out qualitatively and quantitatively. Proscriptive comments are documented more frequently in treatises of rhetoric than in grammar books: it is the inelegant and harsh effect of the end position on the cadence of the period that causes concern. After inelegant, the most frequent proscriptive epithets are harsh and imprecise/inaccurate, all associated with the field of rhetoric. In addition, it has been shown that as time goes on recommendations become more proscriptive, especially in works on rhetoric, in which strictures tend to be expressed with negative terms and imperatives. A fresh look at grammar books in the realm of rhetoric offers new insights into the evolution of prose style in English. After all, early comments come primarily from this field: Joshua Poole was a grammarian and a rhetorician, and John Dryden’s writings on literary criticism were primarily concerned with propriety in style and principles of rhetoric, rather than with grammatical purity.

The comparative study of works written by Scottish and English authors has further revealed the key role of Scottish rhetoricians, in terms of both positive and condemnatory attitudes. The New Rhetoric (1748–93) in the context of the Scottish Enlightenment is the framework to which most Scottish codifiers, and also some English authors, belong. Overall, Scottish authors provide more negative comments than English authors, and their comments are more nuanced, offering a wider range of proscriptive labels with subtle semantic differences; they are also more aggressive, in that many of their labels carry stronger negative connotations. It has been argued that it is no coincidence that we find so many of the major
writers are from Scotland, as they were part of the same community of practice, that of the Scottish Enlightenment and the New Rhetoric. While I see this group of ‘new rhetoricians’ as a community of practice, I agree with Watts (2008) that eighteenth-century codifiers on the whole constituted a discourse community, and, in my view, at least as far as the treatment of P-stranding is concerned, the discourse community comprised both grammarians and rhetoricians. Normative authors, consciously or unconsciously, had ‘common interests, goals and beliefs’ and their ‘oral and written discourse practices’ showed a notable ‘degree of institutionalisation’ (Watts 2008: 41). In other words, writers had a common enterprise and they were ‘commonly engaged rather than mutually engaged’ (2008: 54).

Naturally, if we are dealing with a discourse community that shared principles and a common repertoire, in which writers are aware of each other’s work, plagiarism or borrowing of passages is likely to occur. In the evidence based on the illustrative quotations provided in Section 3.3 and throughout Chapter 5, we have seen many instances of verbatim plagiarism, sometimes acknowledged, most often unacknowledged. From grammar books we have discussed passages from Robert Lowth and James Greenwood. In rhetoric, the principles in John Mason’s treatise are found similarly in that of Lord Kames, who is later echoed by rhetoricians such as Hugh Blair, as well as grammarians such as Joseph Priestley and James Buchanan. Lindley Murray’s grammar stands out here: he borrows from Lowth’s grammar and from Blair’s lectures on rhetoric. A close analysis of the various passages shows that some authors did not copy strictures uncritically; they are careful to make alterations, which often lead to more proscriptive attitudes, and some authors are selective in their borrowing; for example, George Ussher largely adopts John Fell’s positive attitudes, but shows some caution by also borrowing from Lowth. It is also worth recalling cases in which authors change their mind over time, so that they come to adopt a critical view on P-stranding only in late editions, after having been influenced by proscriptive works published in the interim. We observe that Buchanan (1767 vs. 1762) seems to have been influenced in this way by both Lowth (1762) and Lord Kames (1762), and Priestley (1768) by Kames.

The existence of a discourse community is not incompatible with the existence of communities of practice, as Watts (2008: 52) explains.
The century of criticism of P-stranding is fundamentally the eighteenth century, but it has been shown in this study that the seventeenth century is vital for understanding the stigma on this construction. Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 traced attitudes to preposition placement from the sixteenth to the late eighteenth century, with special emphasis on the link between the literary writer John Dryden and late eighteenth-century precept writers, grammarians as well as rhetoricians. In light of the evidence examined, I regard the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century as periods of ‘latent awareness’ of the stigma against P-stranding, and I see the early eighteenth century in particular as the period in which language norms were ‘hibernating’, with evidence of some incipient proscriptions, yet to be strengthened as ‘more definite awareness’ as the century progressed. This chapter reflects further on the role of John Dryden (Section 6.1) and the context during the early eighteenth century (Sections 6.2–5).

6.1 John Dryden

Though all is easy, nothing is feeble; though all seem careless, there is nothing harsh; and though since [Dryden’s] earlier works more than a century has passed they have nothing yet uncouth or obsolete. (Johnson 1783: 418)

The investigation presented in this book contributes to the field of normative linguistics on two fronts: as far as the roots of the stigmatisation of P-stranding are concerned, and as regards the roots of (some of) the ideals of the eighteenth-century prescriptive tradition. John Dryden plays a role in both of these, without this necessarily implying that he was the earliest critic of all. Whereas one might think that criticism against end-placed prepositions was ‘no more than a quirk of his’ (Simon 1963: 136), it has been shown in this monograph that this is not so. Given the importance of Dryden as an early proscriptive writer, I have examined the link
between Dryden’s attitudes to language in the seventeenth century and the eighteenth-century norms characteristic of the prescriptive tradition. Although the existing literature contains some remarks in this regard, it is in the current investigation that the various bits and pieces have been brought together in a systematic way, providing an analysis which is both qualitative and quantitative.

As shown through Chapter 5, the ideals behind Dryden’s strictures are echoed in early and late eighteenth-century works in which P-stranding is overtly proscribed or at least less preferred. A contextual analysis of Dryden’s criticism, explicit in 1672 and 1691 and implicit in the revised edition of the Essay (1684), has shed more light on the reasons behind his dislike of stranded prepositions: it is a matter not only of grammatical correctness and the influence of Latin, as traditionally argued, but also of stylistic awareness in terms of the level of formality and medium and, above all, of the canons of rhetoric. Somehow, Dryden came to the conclusion that end-placed prepositions are incorrect because they do not fit in Latin syntax, they are inelegant in certain styles, and they hurt the harmony and perspicuity of the period/sentence because they are (often) unaccented monosyllables. The findings are further borne out by a frequency analysis of the semantic nuances conveyed in the labels of the precept corpus, such as *inelegant* and *harsh*—they are characteristic of Dryden’s critiques and they are the most frequent epithets for criticism in eighteenth-century precept works.

In Section 5.5.2 we hinted at Dryden’s legacy in the field of rhetoric in the eighteenth and also the nineteenth century. As literature gained a prominent place in the teaching of composition and expression, the figure of John Dryden featured as one of these literary models for school as well as home instruction (see, e.g., Michael 1987: 158–60, 164–7). Edward Bysshe (1615?–1679) lists Dryden alongside Waller, Denham, Cowley and Milton as one of ‘the best English poets’ from whom he draws ‘a collection of the most natural, agreeable, and noble thoughts’ in The Art of English Poetry, published in 1702 (see Culler 1948). Importantly, we have seen that Bysshe also lists Joshua Poole’s treatise on rhetoric. Dryden’s rhymes are taken up again among ‘our most celebrated poets’ in Bysshe’s later collection The British Parnassus, which he says has ‘endeavour’d likewise to adapt it to the brightest Capacities, not without some Regard to the Institution of Youth, and to render it useful for Schools’ (1714: preface). Anthony Blackwall (1672–1730), a grammar-school headmaster and a reforming rhetorician, chooses for his Introduction to the Classics illustrations from English writers, ‘which it must be assumed he considered in some sense classical’ (Michael
among them, over twenty quotations from Dryden’s translations of Virgil and Juvenal stand out, ahead of Milton, Tillotson, Spenser, Shakespeare, Prior, Addison, Cleveland, Roscommon and Congreve. Likewise, Dryden’s translations appear as ‘substantial and wide-ranging verse illustrations’ in William Gordon’s The Young Man’s Companion (1765 [1755]), along with Milton, Pope, Gray, Cowley and Shakespeare. More evidence comes from John Newbery (1713–67), who draws from Dryden’s satire Mac Flecknoe to teach The Art of Poetry (1746) in a ‘conventional’ manner: ‘in question and answer, with rhyme, metrics and types of poem’ (Michael 1987: 165). Later in the century, John Walker (1732–1807) draws on original texts written by Dryden (e.g., Alexander’s Feast, an Ode for St. Cecilia’s Day, 1697) in his Exercises for Improvement in Elocution (1777), along with other ‘best authors’ such as Milton, Pope, Shakespeare, Steele, the magazine The Spectator, and classical rhetoricians such as Cicero. Dryden might have played a part in influencing nineteenth-century readership, too. He is still well represented in school anthologies at the time, as in Lucy Aikin’s (1801) Poetry for Children, where seventeen ‘short pieces’ of Dryden’s works are included, Dryden being the second most frequent author after Pope (Michael 1987: 196–7). The nineteenth century pays more attention to home reading than the previous period, with ‘many more books designed almost solely’ for reading at home; these are relevant in that ‘they influenced the development of children’s literary taste and linguistic skills’ (1987: 212–13). Dryden’s texts are also used in the teaching of rhetoric and belles lettres, as in John Aiken, who ‘writes amiably about Pope, Milton, Dryden, Swift, Young and others’ in his Letters to a Young Lady on a Course of English Poetry (1804). From 1802 to 1870, Dryden is listed in works such as Readings in English Poetry. A Collection of Specimens from our Best Poets (1865), and John Wesley Hales’ Longer English Poems with Notes (1872), in both cases being the third most frequently cited author (Michael 1987: 224–37). In addition, among the outstanding poets of the Romantic movement, Coleridge, Keats and Byron in particular held Dryden in high esteem; Tennyson and Hopkins read him attentively; and Sir Walter Scott’s ‘magisterial edition of Dryden’s works (1808), with a judicious life and learned historical notes, re-established Dryden for the nineteenth-century public’ (ODNB, s.v. ‘Dryden, John’). It is probable, then, that Dryden reached a wide range of readers, and that these were likely to have been influenced by his style and metalinguistic comments.

In relation to the realm of rhetoric, the conjecture should be recalled as well that John Dryden might have been the J.D. that wrote the preface
to Joshua Poole's treatise of rhetoric *The English Parnassus* in 1657 (Section 5.2.4). There is evidence that this J.D. shared Dryden's views on linguistic matters such as the dislike for 'clog'd' monosyllables; most important, J.D. recommends the reading of Poole's *The English Accidence* (1646), one of the earliest grammar books in which P-stranding is explicitly the dispreferred position of prepositions, while P-piping is strongly recommended instead.

Dryden is also recommended by writers on education. In the mid eighteenth century, for example, he is recommended by John Williams in *Education of Children and Young Students in all its Branches* (1752a) alongside essays by Sir William Temple and other writings by Bolingbroke, Swift and Addison (Michael 1987: 203). Similarly, in the early nineteenth century Joshua Collins, a retired headmaster of a grammar school, recommends some of Dryden's writings in *A Practical Guide to Parents and Guardians, in the Right Choice and Use of Books* (1802). In this work Dryden is listed among the 'English classics' suggested 'for the library (by implication at home rather than at school)' (Michael 1987: 211–12). One might suppose, then, that Dryden had reached a wide and diverse readership, who were likely to be influenced by his style and his metalinguistic comments: children and adults, gentlemen and ladies, at home and at school.

Dryden's popularity also becomes evident if we look at the tradition of teaching literature. According to Michael (1987: 159), after the end of the seventeenth century 'secular recreational reading was beginning to be provided, as never before, for schools'. One of the writers most representative of secular reading material at the time was indeed Dryden, a prolific author of poetry, drama, critical essays (such as *Of Dramatick Poesie*), satires, fables and lyrical pieces, and an author who also excelled in translations of the classics. Some of his works were included, for instance, in S. Harland's *English Spelling-book Revis'd* (1719 [1714a]), a good illustrative example of the change of teaching methods in the early century. Harland is aware that 'children are influenced by what they read', and to that end he chooses secular passages from Dryden as being 'of the highest quality'. The selections of Dryden's literary works, Harland added, 'may be of use to older people' too (Michael 1987: 158–60). Michael also observed that 'writers on education were urging schools to encourage the reading of literature; anthologies for school use were beginning to appear' and that during the eighteenth century they become 'the clearest evidence for the teaching of English literature in school' (1987: 160, 167). Dryden is at the time one of the literary writers who were read and taught in school as well as at home. For instance, he is one of the authors 'most frequently represented'
among the pieces compiled in *The Virgin Muse* by James Greenwood (1717), an anthology which has been described as ‘if not a landmark, at least a benchmark in the development of the teaching of English’ (Michael 1987: 171). This work is also relevant in that it is ‘dedicated to nine “young ladies”, and its tone is in many ways that of the home, not the school’, thus reaching a wider range of readers (*ibid*). The author of this anthology is James Greenwood, who had censured transposed prepositions in his 1711 grammar. In *The Virgin Muse* 17 of the 126 pieces are Dryden’s, behind only Cowley and Milton. In his grammar, Greenwood tells the reader that ‘we shall first observe one Thing; which is, that, the best and clearest Writers have the fewest Transpositions in their Discourses’ (Greenwood 1711: 218).

For him, Dryden was certainly one of ‘the best and clearest writers’ and Dryden was indeed one who revised and corrected his compositions to have the fewest transposed (i.e., stranded) prepositions in them.

Crucially, Dryden is cited in eighteenth-century grammar books as one of the ‘best writers’ whose language must be imitated and/or corrected. He appears in the ninth position in Sundby et al.’s frequency list with nearly one hundred citations (1991: 35–7); for instance, Dryden’s language is corrected in Peter W. Fogg’s (1796) ‘promiscuous examples’ and James Alderson’s appendix (1795), alongside Addison, Steele, Shakespeare, Swift, Pope and the periodicals *Tatler, Spectator* and *Adventurer*. Dryden’s writings illustrate good as well as bad usage in William Ward’s *Essay on Grammar* (1765), in which the writer is cited thirty-one times (Wright 1994: 244). In his *Compleat English Scholar* (1753: viii), James Buchanan acknowledges having collected examples from the ‘ablest Pens’ of the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century for the part devoted to the improvement of English, among whom we find Dryden, Addison, Pope and the authors of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. The grammarians Joseph Priestley (1761b: 60–1) and John Fell (1784: x, xii) are also amongst those who looked up to Dryden for their ‘collection of observations’. Clearly, Dryden was read by eighteenth-century codifiers.

Moreover, Dryden is a source of inspiration to the most important lexicographer in the eighteenth century. Samuel Johnson (1709–84) knew Dryden’s life and work well. He ‘delineated’ the *Life of Dryden* as one of the greatest English poets, one whom he portrays as ‘a man, whom every English generation must mention with reverence as a critick and a poet’ (1783: 410), a great figure in matters of language and style (e.g., 1783: 418–19). It has been observed that Johnson drew on Dryden’s essay *Of Dramatick Poesie* as a model of literary criticism (Nist 1966: 286) and that Johnson expressed his admiration for Dryden’s poetical diction (Görlich 2001: 188).
It is not surprising, then, to find that Dryden played a part in the writing of Johnson’s *Dictionary*. For a century, at least, literary men had been calling for some standard, and Johnson did what Dryden, Waller, Pope, Swift and others had talked about (Sledd and Kolb 1955: 41). With authority, Johnson made remarks on those aspects of language that were ungrammatical or improper in his eyes in the definitions of the words and in the illustrative quotations of the *Dictionary*. Here we can find Dryden’s mark: under letter C alone Dryden features 935 times, second only to Shakespeare, and ‘more than double’ any other author except Bacon (see Walker 1998: 106). In Walker’s view, Johnson regarded Dryden as ‘an authority in matters of language and style’, and in fact Dryden was ‘[p]erhaps the authority for modern English’ (1998: 107, italics in the original). An analysis of the illustrative quotations and the semantic labels of the precept data reveals that many entries indeed cite works from Dryden. Thus Dryden’s views could have filtered down into the eighteenth-century prescriptive tradition indirectly: Johnson’s *Dictionary* was the must-have reference book of polite society in the mid and late eighteenth century. Taking the epithets listed in Section 3.2, Dryden is named in Johnson’s definition of the term *barbarous* (‘unacquainted with arts’, sense 2); *grammatical* (‘taught in grammar’, sense 2); *harmonious* (‘musical’, sense 2); *harsh* (‘rough to the ear’, sense 2; ‘unpleasing; rigorous’, sense 5); and also *cadence/cadency* (‘the flow of verses, or periods’, sense 3). He is cited in the meaning of *idiom* (‘a mode of speaking peculiar to a language or dialect’) and *improper* (‘not just; not accurate’, sense 3), as well as the adverb *improperly* (‘not justly; not accurately’, sense 2). Sometimes Dryden is mentioned in the entries of related terms, such as *error* (‘a blunder, a mistake committed’, sense 2; see *erroneous*) and *vulgarity* (‘specimen of meanness’, sense 2; see *vulgar*). Dryden is not cited in the definition of *inelegant*, but he does appear in the definition of the semantically related terms *ungracious* (‘offensive, unpleasing’, sense 2) and *gracefulness* (‘elegance of manner, dignity with beauty’). Crucially, these are key terms used in Lowth’s grammar. The same applies to the terms *style* (‘course of writing’, sense 4) and *solemnly* (‘with affected gravity’, sense 4; see *style-solemn/writing*). We can also trace Dryden’s criticism of Ben Jonson’s ‘fault’ in eighteenth-century precept writers, particularly with regard to the term *erroneous*. According to Johnson’s *Dictionary*, something *faulty* is something ‘wrong; erroneous’ (sense 2); as shown in Section 3.2.1, *erroneous* is a frequent term of criticism in the precept sources. This also relates to the labels *censurable* and *offensive* (s.v. *fault*: ‘offense; slight crime; somewhat liable to censure’, sense 1). The definition of *faultily* (‘not rightly; improperly’) can be linked to a fourth
label, *improper*, which indeed represents five per cent of the *critic* terms in my precept corpus.

It must also be noted that in addition to these labels related to P-stranding, Dryden is quoted in the definitions of other terms of great relevance to the codification of English: *grammar* (‘propriety or justness of speech’, sense 2); *correction* (‘act of taking away faults; amendment’, sense 2); *to authorize* (‘to give authority’, sense 1); *to proscribe* (‘to interdict’, sense 2) and *proscriber* (‘one that dooms to destruction’); *favourable* (‘averse from censure’, sense 2); *uncorrupted* (‘not vitiated, not depraved’); *uncorrected* (‘inaccurate; not polished to exactness’); *averse* (‘not favourable’, sense 1); *gentleness* (‘elegance; gracefulness; politeness’, sense 1), the last being closely associated with the (prescriptive) ideal of politeness. Interestingly, the *OED* also includes illustrative quotations from Dryden in the definition of a number of these terms, either exactly the same term or a related one, e.g., *barbarous, harsh, idiom, authorize*. In addition, the *OED* cites from Dryden in some entries in which Johnson did not carry a quote from him, such as *solecism* and *ungrammatical*.

Other than through the *Dictionary*, Dryden had additional influence on Johnson’s attitudes to style in verse and prose. Of Dryden’s style Johnson says that ‘every word seems to drop by chance, though it falls into its proper place’ (1783: 418); of his own style in the *Rambler* Johnson admits that he ‘laboured to refine our language to grammatical purity, and to clear it from colloquial barbarisms, licentious idioms, and irregular combinations’, and that he takes care that his essays would add ‘to the elegance of its construction, and something to the harmony of its cadence’ (*Rambler*, no 208, quoted in McIntosh 1998: 127–8). Two issues caught my attention here: that Johnson is aware of Dryden’s taking care to ‘drop’ every word ‘into its proper place’, such as prepositions in front position, perhaps, and that Johnson gives great importance to the harmony of style – key topics prompting the fierce criticism of P-stranding in the eighteenth-century precept data sources. That Johnson consciously avoids the end position of prepositions in his own writings thus comes as no surprise; it was noted by Raybould (1998: 191), and is supported by evidence from the sample of Johnson’s letters in *ARCHER* (1755–69), in which only one stranded preposition has been found, this occurring in a passive clause with no syntactic choice; in contrast, seven fronted prepositions would have permitted the preposition in end position. A more systematic analysis is needed here, but one might speculate that Johnson contributed indirectly to the contempt for stranding prepositions in the late eighteenth century.
The discussion offered in this monograph also points to the influential role of Dryden beyond the domain of P-stranding, on various fronts. Notably, the *ipse dixit* attitude typically associated with (late) eighteenth-century normative authors is apparent a century earlier in Dryden’s meta-language, both in the critique of Ben Jonson’s plays and in the letter to William Walsh, in which he takes upon himself the role of judge, of linguistic lawgiver. For Görlich (2001: 29), Dryden is a forerunner of this practice in the eighteenth century. Crucially, this happened even before the first prescriptive grammar was written, that of Christopher Cooper (1685). Cooper’s approach is said to be at times descriptivism but ‘prescriptivism nonetheless’ (Vorlat 1975: 30–2), thus paving the way for the eighteenth-century prescriptive tradition. It is perhaps no coincidence that Cooper’s grammar bears similarities to Dryden’s approach on issues such as the transposition of words, harmony and perspicuity. Furthermore, the reading of Dryden’s works reveals criticism of a number of other later-to-be-stigmatised features, that is, features that Dryden criticises explicitly and that are also criticised by codifiers in the early and late eighteenth century. These include double comparatives (*Defence* 1672a), monosyllables, conjunctions and phrasal particles (*Troilus and Cressida* 1679a; *Essay* 1684; Letter to Walsh 1691), contractions (Letter to Walsh 1691), *that*-relative pronoun (*Essay* 1684; Letter to Walsh 1691), and the lack of concord (*Defence* 1672a; *Essay* 1684). This is not to say that Dryden initiates the stigmatisation of (all of) these features – I have not traced their origin – but the parallel with P-stranding is certainly worth further investigation in the future. What can be observed here is that some of these features are explicitly censured by Joseph Addison in the early eighteenth century. It may not be coincidence that Addison was a literary protégé of Dryden’s.

### 6.2 Joseph Addison and the Spectator

Joseph Addison (1672–1719) was a well-known essayist, poet and dramatist, and was the father (with Richard Steele, 1672–1729) of the popular periodicals the *Spectator* (1711–12) and the *Tatler* (1709–11); he was also a habitual visitor of the Kit-Cat Club, a London coffeehouse with literary and political associations. In relation to the codification of the English language, Wright suggests that ‘the early part of the century is pre-eminently important as a source for the prescriptive enterprise’ and ‘the roots of the standard may perhaps be no more than a body of texts situated mainly at the beginning of the early eighteenth century’ (1994: 244–5). Addison is considered a ‘trend-setter’ of late eighteenth-century prescriptive norms,
and the *Spectator* a community of practice which represents a key source in which the norms are inspired (see Wright 1994, 1997; Fitzmaurice 2010a, 2010b). Social network theories suggest that ‘the stronger the ties that people contract among them, and the more contexts in which they encounter one another, the more likely it is that these social affinities will influence people’s linguistic practices’ (Fitzmaurice 2004: 162). It was shown earlier that the patron–literary protégé relationship between Dryden and William Walsh led the younger poet to become aware of the correct and proper use of English in his compositions and to avoid the stigmatised end position of prepositions, as advised by his patron’s precept. It is known that in the last years of Dryden’s life, Addison and Dryden spent time together in the Kit-Cat Club with other members of the social network, among them William Walsh (Macdonald 1939: 63.n3). Since Dryden was Addison’s friend, ‘mentor, model and literary patron’ (Fitzmaurice 2004: 137), one might conjecture that Addison would have followed Dryden’s opinion on linguistic matters as well. My view here is that Addison might have acted as a ‘bridge’ between the rising prescriptivism of the late seventeenth century and the definite prescriptivism of the late eighteenth century.

In the Restoration period Dryden leads the attempt to establish an Academy which would refine and fix the English language. He often complains of the ‘faults, which are daily committed by our English poets’, faults which ‘for want of publick encouragement, in this Iron Age, we are so far from making any progress in the improvement of our tongue’ (Dryden 1693: 12). A few years later Addison makes a call for the creation of ‘something like an Academy, that by the best Authorities and Rules drawn from the Analogy of Languages shall settle all Controversies between Grammar and Idiom’ (*Spectator* 1711: 4 August, no 135). Their views on the idiom of English also show similarities. Dryden refers to ‘the Idiom of the Tongue, or false Grammar, and nonsence couch’d beneath that specious Name of Anglicisme’ (1679b: A3v), and the idiomatic nature of stranded prepositions is one of the main arguments alluded to in the eighteenth century. In the *Spectator*, Addison likewise warns the poet to ‘take particular Care to guard himself against idiomatick Ways of Speaking’ because expressions ‘which are used in ordinary Conversation, become too familiar to the Ear, and contract a Kind of Meanness by passing through the Mouths of the Vulgar’ (*Spectator* 1712: 26 January, no 285). The aversion to monosyllables and contractions is also shared by the two writers. Dryden complains several times that English is ‘full of Monosyllables, and those clog’d with consonants, and our pronunciation is effeminate’, all of which are ‘enemies to a sounding language’ (Dryden 1679b: A3v). They are in fact one of the
features Dryden censures in the letter to William Walsh with the following advice: ‘Be pleased therefore, to avoid the words, don’t, can’t, shan’t, and the like abbreviations of syllables; which seem to me to savour of a little rusticity’ (1691, Letter 17). In the Spectator Addison likewise complains that the English language is ‘abounding in Monosyllables’, which, he continues, ‘has likewise very much untuned our Language, and clogged it with Consonants, as mayn’t, can’t, sha’n’t, won’t, and the like, for may not, can not, shall not, will not, &c.’ (Spectator 1711: 4 August, no 135).

Another feature which Addison may have drawn from Dryden is the preference for *wh*-relative pronouns, compared to *that*- and zero-relative marking. In a study of Addison’s correspondence, Wright ‘discovered a sea-change in Addison’s deployment of the complementiser *that*-relative to *wh*-forms’ (1997: 497), which is understood as ‘a compromise between an explicitly literary mode of writing on the one hand . . . and a more popular, colloquial mode on the other’ (1993: 33–4). Wright notices that this was a ‘conscious stylistic shift’ and that it takes place even before ‘The humble petition of Who and Which’, published in the Spectator in 1711 (Wright 1997: 496–7). What is most relevant for us here is the observation that relative *that* was giving way to *who* in Restoration and early eighteenth-century comedies, and that it is precisely Dryden’s preference for the *wh*-forms that ‘established the beginnings of the selection of *wh*-forms for standard modern English’ (1997: 487). See, for instance, Dryden’s critique of Walsh’s usage in (233). Consistent with his criticism, Dryden avoids *that*-relative in his writings, and ‘not only in his alterations of the essay Of Dramatick Poesie, but also in his usage elsewhere’ (Bately 1964: 277; also Simon 1963). It is perhaps no coincidence, then, that one of Addison’s ‘rigorous’ editing practices in the collected edition of the Spectator (1714) is the correction of relative *that* into *which* or *who* (see Wright 1994).

(233) I find likewise, that you make not a due distinction betwixt that, and who; a man that is not proper; the relative who is proper. *That*, ought always to signify a thing; *who*, a person. An acquaintance *that* wou’d have undertook the business; true English is, an acquaintance who wou’d have undertaken the business. (Dryden to Walsh, early 1691, Letter 17)

It remains to be seen in future research whether Addison also corrects the use of end-placed prepositions in the folio issues of the periodical when he ‘applied himself to the very syntactic fabric of his papers’ (Wright 1994: 267). What has already been observed is a change of attitude in his private letters, and in particular in his late letters to Charles Montagu.
(c. 1656–1722), 4th Earl of Manchester (later 1st Duke of Manchester). In comparison with earlier correspondence, Wright (1997: 497) notes that Addison is ‘assiduous in adopting, not only \(wh\)-pronouns, but pied piped constructions too’, and that he ‘is very careful to usher the appropriate preposition along with the pronoun into the marking position’, as in the following example:

\[
\text{(234) The Bill for Abolishing the Privy Council and Establishing Justices of Peace, in Scotland of which I think I have already giv’n your Lordship an account has at last made its way through the Lower House.}
\]

(Charles Montagu 1707/8: January 24; quoted in Wright 1997: 497, bold in Wright)

Instances such as this suggest that Addison is linguistically aware of the connotations implied in preposition placement, and the fact that Addison changes his usage even before the publication of the first work in my eighteenth-century precept materials that censured stranded prepositions (Greenwood 1711) implies that Addison’s awareness might have been drawn from elsewhere – a possible source being John Dryden. The fact that Addison follows Dryden’s style in other matters lends support to this hypothesis. Wright (1994: 269) emphasises that Addison is very ‘aware of a particular grammatical aesthetic’, which leads him to correct ‘his own stylistic barbarisms and viciousness’, and that Addison’s attitudes towards \(wh\)- and \(that\)-relative marking are more concerned with ‘appropriate stylistic perspicuity rather than grammatical correctness’. More precisely, in Wright’s view, Addison’s choice of fronted prepositions with \(wh\)-relative pronouns ‘underlines the formality and solemnity of the register appropriate to the situation’ (Wright 1997: 497). In Section 5.4, it is argued that the stigma attached to stranded prepositions is largely associated with the level of formality, an elegant style, and to the canons of rhetoric, which, ultimately, are a matter of style too. The chief virtue of proper style is perspicuity. This leads us to a further link between Dryden and Addison in the field of rhetoric, poetic diction and literary style.

Like Dryden in the Restoration period, Addison complains in the Tatler about ‘the deplorable ignorance that for some years hath reigned among our English Writers, the great depravity of our taste, and the continual corruption of our stile’ and that ‘you shall not be able to find ten lines together

---

1 According to Wright (1997: 497), the correspondence between Addison and the Earl of Manchester began in 1702.
of common Grammar or common Sense’ (Tatler 1710: 28 September, no 230; quoted in Görlach 2001: 215). An educated man from Oxford, Addison was certainly aware of the importance of writing in a good, proper style, which he admired in Latin orators. When Addison entered Queen’s College in 1687 he was ‘determined to perfect his critical appreciation of the Latin poets and to improve his skill in the writing of the verse’, and by 1697 ‘his reputation as a Latin poet was considerable’ (Smithers 1954: 11, 38). According to Smithers (1954: 213), Dryden had taught the young Addison ‘to assist the reader, particularly the reader of a translation’, and this is what Addison did in his critical essays on Latin poetry, where he would ‘endeavour as much as possible to establish a taste of polite writing’. Addison had learned the rules ‘as precepts at the feet of Dryden’ (1954: 214; also pp. 34–5). By ‘modelling himself’ on Dryden and the great classic orators, Addison revised the works of his predecessors; for instance, of the ‘courtly Waller’, whom Dryden greatly admired and considered as his mentor and precursor, Addison praises his soft, smooth and harmonious verses in the lines of ‘An Account of the Greatest English Poets’. Considering that Addison had been Dryden’s pupil, one may speculate that he would have readily ‘complied with his master’s prescription for good English composition’, as he seems to have done ‘fully’ in The Freeholder essays (1715–16) (Smithers 1954: 336; also Nist 1966: 286). Smithers believes that these essays are ‘some of his best prose works’, and that that was the result of the fine writing and style he learned from Dryden: it was by the ‘application of learning, reason, and moderation to English prose [that] he succeeded in setting a standard which served for most English men and women for two centuries’ (1954: 336–7).

If Addison was aware of Dryden’s disapproving opinion of Milton and others, he was also possibly aware of Dryden’s criticism of Ben Jonson’s use of stranded prepositions. If Addison shared Dryden’s opinions as to style and poetic diction, he is likely to have modelled his style on Dryden’s, that is, by avoiding the use of prepositions. A systematic analysis of Addison’s writing must be left for future research, but a sample from his essay on Milton shows that he prefers placing the preposition before a wh-relative pronoun in five of the six instances of wh-relative clauses (Addison, Spectator 1712: 26 January, no 285). The choice of P-piping in Addison’s writings could reflect the application of the prestige variant for the sake of clarity.

2 It is also known that Addison showed a preliminary version of a tragedy to Dryden and that Dryden ‘made encouraging remarks about the script’ (Smithers 1954: 27).

3 The essay consists of eight and one-half pages. There are no instances of stranded prepositions in other types of clause.
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and precision, as he is known to have done with variation between \textit{wh}- and \textit{that}-relatives. Addison would thus be ‘anticipat[ing] the prescriptivists’ in matters of perspicuity (see Wright 1994: 268–9). As noted above, Wright suggests that Addison stood as a trend-setter, ‘a model of linguistic propriety or correctness’ who provided ‘a suitable literary style from which the [mid and late eighteenth century] grammarians could then select and codify apposite patterns of usage’ (1994: 248, 273). We might then hypothesise that Addison’s preference for pied-piped prepositions (presumably at the expense of stranded prepositions) could be one of the forms which Addison chose and helped to be considered the prestige variant in the late eighteenth century, and ‘ultimately a norm’ (cf. Wright 1997: 484).

Two parallel case studies support this view. Wright (1997: 500–1) observes that the omission of the relative pronoun is described in Addison’s contemporary grammar books in a neutral tone, ‘refrain[ing] from making any particular judgments or recommendations’ (e.g., ‘the Relative is often understood’, Saxon 1737: 86). In the \textit{Spectator} that kind of ellipsis is censured (1711: no 80, no 135). In the second half of the century, the omission of the relative pronoun becomes an object of criticism in a number of grammar books. Coincidentally, some frequent users of stranded prepositions ‘constantly omit the relative’ pronoun too, these including Swift, Gray and Walpole (Raybould 1998: 191). This link is also made by Görlach (2001: 127), who comments on the omission of the relative pronoun as an ‘attack [which] had to do with the notorious problem of the preposition at the end of the sentence’. If the pronoun is omitted, stranding the preposition is the only grammatical construction available. The second case study comes from Oldireva Gustafsson (2002: 103–4). She noticed that contractions in the preterite and past participle verbal forms are not uncommon in Addison’s letters (e.g., fore’d, comply’d, suppos’d; Letter from Addison to Charles Montague, 1699), and that in the \textit{Spectator} contractions are branded as harsh for ‘untuning’ the English language. In the second half of the century, Oldireva Gustafsson (2002: 104) observes that ‘the criticism of contractions in Addison’s essays is quoted by eighteenth-century grammarians as an argument against the use of apostrophised variants’, which in her view implies that ‘the samples from Addison’s private writing illustrate the usage of the precept of the following decades’. The case study of P-stranding bears similarities. End-placed prepositions were mildly criticised in works published during Addison’s own writing career, the attitude being mainly neutral. His own practice hints at a change of attitude in favour of fronted prepositions, presumably at the expense of stranded prepositions. It is then in the mid and late eighteenth century that stranded prepositions
are strongly proscribed and that pied-piped prepositions are prescribed. That Addison was read by normative authors has been shown elsewhere (e.g., Sundby et al. 1991: 35–7), and it has been proposed that his style is also ‘a potential model of a standard to which all English speakers could aspire’ (Wright 1994: 273). Given the similarities observed above between Addison’s and Dryden’s attitudes, one might conjecture that Addison may have played a role as the ‘bridge’ between the rising prescriptivism of the mid/late seventeenth century and the decisive prescriptivism of the late eighteenth century.

6.3 Elizabeth Montagu

More evidence of linguistic awareness in the early eighteenth century comes from the usage patterns in Elizabeth Montagu’s correspondence (Sairio 2008a; 2008b; 2009: 191–213). Montagu (née Robinson, c. 1718–1800) was an eminent figure in the Bluestocking Circle who by the 1780s had become ‘one of the most influential social hostesses and patrons in London’, and whose network ties belonged to the social élite of eighteenth-century England (Sairio 2008a: §1). The term Bluestocking, as explained by Sairio, refers to ‘the mid-century circle of learned and virtuous men and women, whose salons and assemblies were dedicated to polite conversation, and who collaborated in literary and scholarly ventures’ (2008b: 137). As an educated author and ‘successful social riser’, Elizabeth Montagu can be expected to have been aware of contemporary concerns about proper and correct English and also, Sairio argues, conscious of her own use of language (2008a: §4). As far as preposition placement is concerned, the data show that Montagu’s use of P-stranding declines significantly from 1738 to 1778, and parallel to this the use of P-piping increases (see Sairio 2009: 199–200). In contexts of syntactic variation with *wh*-relative clauses, P-stranding is ‘all

---

4 In their frequency list of citations, Sundby et al. (1991: 35–7) list Addison in fourth position (177 citations) and the Spectator in sixth position (149 citations). Wright (1994: 243) and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (1997: 451–2) also take note of Addison’s and the Spectator’s prominence in grammars. In my precept sources, half the acknowledged citations are in fact from either the author or the periodical. (See Table 3.3 in Section 3.3.1.)

5 I am indebted to Anni Sairio for drawing my attention to Elizabeth Montagu and the Bluestocking correspondence. I am grateful to her for giving me access to preliminary versions of the 2008 papers for the preparation of Yáñez-Bouza (2007), and for providing me with a copy of her 2009 monograph. In my discussion I will quote primarily from the latter work.

6 Sairio’s Bluestocking corpus consists of c. 155,000 words and is divided into four subperiods: 1738–43, 1757–62, 1766–71, 1775–8. The data on P-stranding are based on automatic searches for eleven high-frequency prepositions (*at*, *by*, *for*, *from*, *in*, *into*, *of*, *on*, *to*, *upon*, *with*) with additional instances from *wh*-relative clauses. (See Sairio 2009: 62, 198.)
along very infrequent’, whereas P-piping is already ‘much more frequent’ in the first subperiod of the corpus. The constructions with obligatory P-stranding also seem to have become less frequent over time (2009: 206–9). There is also evidence of self-correction in favour of P-piping (2009: 191); for instance, in an early letter from c. 1740 Montagu inserts a missing relative pronoun headed by a preposition in stranded position: ‘it will not admit of that tranquility which a weariness of action must make us wish for’. Here Montagu chooses a wh-relative pronoun (rather than that-relative) but does not correct the position of the preposition. However, in 1778 she inserts a missing preposition in front position, where she could have placed it in final position: ‘My health for which you so kindly interest yourself, has not been affected’. Sairio concludes that Montagu’s usage is not significantly determined by sociolinguistic factors such as the gender or rank of the addressee, nor by the formal/informal relationship between her and her correspondents; she does not accommodate to her husband’s frequent use of P-stranding or to that of other members of the nobility, such as Lord Lyttleton (2009: 205–6). This seems, then, to be an idiolectal preference influenced by proscriptions on stranded prepositions.

Since the Bluestocking corpus ranges from 1738 to 1778, at first sight the findings seem to indicate potential influence from late eighteenth-century normative works. While this could explain the decline in use in the later subperiods of Sairio’s corpus, especially the categorical use of P-stranding in the last subperiod (1775–8), when stranded prepositions are only found in clauses that make P-stranding obligatory, it cannot fully account for the decrease observed in the earlier periods. The timing is crucial: the use of P-stranding has already decreased from the period 1738–43 to the period 1757–62, and this is also the time span when P-piping starts to increase, from forty-seven to sixty-four per cent. This suggests that Montagu must already have been aware of the stigma against P-stranding in the 1740s and early 1750s, before the boom of works proscribing this feature, which lends support to my view that the early eighteenth century is a period of latent awareness. Also, there is evidence that Montagu avoided stranded prepositions even more in the letters addressed to aristocrats, the social class above her own, and this can be appreciated as early as the second period, 1757–62. The rise of P-piping at this time, then, might be interpreted as a case of hypercorrection, of conscious language use (Sairio 2008b: 152).

Elizabeth Montagu had been educated in the 1720s, and it is unlikely that she would have read the grammars published in or after the 1760s because of her age and the high status that she already enjoyed by then; besides,
it is not known that she was acquainted with influential grammarians, as far as Sairio could tell (2009: 198). However, Montagu was familiar with Dryden’s literary work, and she was friends with rhetoricians such as Hugh Blair and Lord Kames. It may not be a coincidence that these three men all criticised implicitly and explicitly the placing of prepositions in end position – Dryden in the late seventeenth century, Kames and Blair in the mid and late eighteenth century. In a letter dated 1768, Montagu wrote to her sister-in-law Mary Robinson telling her about her evenings in Edinburgh, which she ‘passd very agreably’ with ‘diverse ingen[ious?] & agreeable persons’, among whom were ‘Dr Blair’ and ‘L Kames’. A year later Blair wrote to Montagu to congratulate her on her essay on Shakespeare, which he thought had ‘enriched our language with a very candid, elegant & masterly piece of criticism’. Sairio (2009: 198) believes that, unlike the study of grammar books, there would be no reason for Montagu ‘to dismiss rhetorical studies’ given her personal acquaintance with eminent rhetoricians and given Blair’s praise of her style; thus Montagu might be expected to have been aware of Blair’s stylistic and rhetoric preferences, including the proscription against P-stranding. Yet again, rhetoric may have acted as a reinforcing factor in the decline of the construction during and after the 1760s, but this decade postdates the early decline of stranded prepositions in Montagu’s letters, which is observed in the period 1757–62. Dryden stands then as a potential source for Montagu’s initial awareness. It is known that she had read some of Dryden’s works and that she held the seventeenth-century writer in high esteem: in one of her letters she described him as ‘an exemplary poet’, saying that ‘no poet can write in the true spirit of Dryden, Cowley, or Shakespeare’ (1760, quoted in Sairio 2009: 209). If not directly, her awareness was perhaps indirectly acquired from other members of the coffeehouses and salons that she frequented, places which were dedicated to polite and literary conversation. In this respect, Joseph Addison and/or the Spectator, which she did read, could have been an intermediate source.

6.4 Periodical reviews

The view that the early eighteenth century acted as a period of hibernation of prescriptive norms is further supported by the analysis of periodical reviews. For Fitzmaurice, early eighteenth-century periodical essay writers constitute a discourse community ‘reflecting contemporary preoccupations

---

and inclinations as regards the politics, culture and life of the time’, sharing certain patterns of language choice and providing ‘a more compelling model and set of practices than social ties’ (Fitzmaurice 2010a: 34, 2007: §2.1). The Spectator in particular enjoyed ‘considerable cultural authority in matters of manners and politeness for many middle-class English men and women’, and thus later codifiers took the periodical ‘as an index of social prestige’ (Fitzmaurice 2000a: 195; also Watts 2002). Attention to usage is documented in periodicals and newspapers during the early eighteenth century, especially in critical reviews of books and essays; crucially, these predate the boom of grammar writing of the mid/late century. McIntosh (1998: 184) argues that periodicals in the 1750s ‘greatly intensified many readers’ awareness of standards for formal, precise written English’ with their critical reviews on grammar and style, so that they ‘seconded and applied many of the rules of prescriptive grammars’. In Percy’s view, opinions and attitudes to language had been ‘disseminated and consolidated’ in these publications and hence the role of the reviews in establishing standard English should be acknowledged (Percy 2008: 142). In particular, Percy examined the Monthly Review (1749–1844) and the Critical Review (1756–1817) and observed that interest in language increased, including lists of grammatical and stylistic errors (2010b: 69). She argues that it is possibly through this criticism of language that readers’ anxiety about their own language use intensified, and the grammars of the 1760s were then ‘ostensibly designed to dispel’ such fear and anxiety (Percy 2008: 142). Periodical reviews stated rules ‘explicitly’ and ‘vividly’, some during the early eighteenth century, even before they were cited in grammar books; hence prescriptive attitudes in periodicals also predate prescriptive grammars (Percy 2009b: 132; 2008: 137–8). One can assume that at least some of the codifiers of the late eighteenth century would have read these periodicals and would have been in a position to pick up some of the examples of bad grammar that reviewers criticised; it is known, for instance, that Robert Lowth read the Monthly Review (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011: 118).

The case study of Elizabeth Montagu’s attitudes to P-stranding provides further evidence here. We have seen above that the frequency of stranded prepositions in Montagu’s correspondence starts to decline from the 1740s to the late 1750s, well before the publication of grammars such as Lowth’s in the 1760s. In addition to Dryden and/or rhetoricians like Blair, another potential source of awareness might have been periodical reviews, as it is known that Montagu read both the Monthly Review and the Critical Review, and the decrease is timely, from the period 1738–43 to the period
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1757–62. For instance, Montagu’s essay on Shakespeare was announced in the Critical Review (1769). In a letter to George Lyttelton she admits that she had been ‘afraid’ that ‘these Reviewers would have been severe’, but she was delighted to read the positive reviews. She was aware of their importance because ‘[t]hese Reviews are read by people in the Country’, so she now hoped that ‘their favourable sentence will be of use’ (4 June 1769, in Eger 1999: 184). Another review came out soon after in the Monthly Review (1769), about which Elizabeth expresses her concern in a personal letter to her husband (235) and asks him for advice: ‘I beg of you to read ye doughty Monthly Reviewers, & where you find ye criticism just when you have referd it to my text I will correct my fault’ (in Eger 1999: 189); presumably she took his advice into account (see Sairio 2009: 170). Further investigation into periodical reviews is needed to examine whether P-stranding was explicitly criticised in these writings, too.

(235) The Monthly Review is ye only periodical paper which has not treated my essay with indulgence, but I think they will not do the work much harm, for much of their cavilling is unintelligible. They say the language of ye Essay is affected, & in many places corrupt, & triumph over a sentence falsely printed. They write with peevishness & ill manners even to great Shakespear himself, so how can his poor little Critick hope to escape. My work had undoubtedly many defects & deficiencies, but if it keeps its ground till these carping Pedants write a better Criticism it may flourish long.... Wherever I think their criticism just I shall profit by it, by correcting ye fault they blame in ye next edition, if my work live to another edition, as there is hope it may.

(Elizabeth Montagu to Edward Montagu, 10–11 September 1769; quoted in Eger 1999: 188)

6.5 Further evidence

Another example of early awareness before the boom of proscriptive comments on end-placed prepositions comes from Sir Horace Walpole

---

8 On 2 June 1769 Elizabeth Montagu writes to Benjamin Stillingfleet: ‘I have seen the Essay advertised in a morning & an evening [issue/periodical] . . . The Monthly Review & ye Magazines have not yet taken the Essay into consideration’ (in Eger 1999: 182). Two days later she writes to George Lyttelton about ‘the wonderful indulgence of the Critical Reviewers’, yet ‘the other monthly papers have not yet taken notice of me, but I suppose they will do it’ (in Eger 1999: 184).

9 I am grateful to Anni Sairio for giving me access to the relevant letters (personal communication, June 2013).
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(1717–97). It has been observed that he reprimanded Robert Dodsley for the use of P-stranding in a private letter: ‘Line 449, and line 452 [of a poem by Dodsley], should I think be corrected, as ending with prepositions, disjoined from the cases they govern’ (Tierney 1988: 161, quoted in Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011: 136). This letter dates from November 1753. Walpole could have picked up on this feature from periodical reviews or from treatises on rhetoric, where the separation of prepositions from their nouns was often referred to as an instance of ‘disjoined’ elements.

It is also worth noting that there is evidence of criticism of the splitting of the preposition and the governed word in the early eighteenth-century work of John Clarke (1733). Clarke (1687–1734), like Dryden before him and Kames, Blair and others after, is concerned primarily with the match between word order and perspicuity; for him, ‘Construction [syntax] is nothing but the putting of Words duly chosen together, in such a Manner as is proper to convey a compleat Sense’ (1733: 165). Although he provides an example in which the preposition to and the governed word God are separated in an unnatural way, the point he makes is of relevance: the rule ‘prescribed’ by ‘common Sense’ is that ‘the Preposition should stand immediately before the Substantive’ and this is ‘absolutely necessary to Clearness and Perspicuity’ (236). Logic in thought and word order is again recalled here:

(236) Then again a different position of the Words would have likewise been improper in point of Construction for the same Purpose: For instance, To utmost Reverence due God is; in this order the Words convey no Sense at all, because the Construction is wrong with Respect to the Position thereof; common Sense having prescribed this Rule as absolutely necessary to Clearness and Perspicuity, and the easy Conveyance of our Thoughts to one another, that the Preposition should stand immediately before the Substantive, whose Relation in the Sentence it is design’d to signify; whereas the Preposition to stands before utmost Reverence, and not the Substantive God, whose Relation in the Sentence it should be here used to signify, to make out a just and compleat Sense. (Clarke 1733: 167)

Finally, that there is an awareness of what constituted bad grammar in the early eighteenth century can be inferred from more anecdotal evidence. Tieken-Boon van Ostade (2010: 66–7) discusses the correspondence between Bishop Edward Synge (1691–1762) and his daughter Alicia, in which he aims to teach her to spell and compose letters properly and with
correct grammar, following contemporary norms of politeness. In addition to giving advice on proper English, the Bishop also corrected Alicia’s poor English with explicit labels such as *bad expression, fault, false English*, etc. According to Tieken-Boon van Ostade, his approach is ‘normative’ and the tone is ‘more strongly prescriptive than that of Lowth’ (2010: 69). The timing is crucial: the extant letters belong to the period from 1746 to 1752.
(237) Q. What is a Preposition?
A. A Preposition is a word that expresses the relation which one word hath to another, and performs in English what in Latin is effected by cases, or different terminations of nouns . . .

Q: Why are these words called Prepositions?
A: Because they are commonly placed before the words, to which they refer: as He wrote it with a pencil; He gave it to his sister.

Q: Are they always so placed?
A: No: they are sometimes placed after the word, to which they refer; as How much did you buy it for? Instead of, For how much did you buy it?

(Fenning 1771: 79–80)

This passage from Daniel Fenning’s *A New Grammar* (1771) perfectly captures the topic of this monograph: preposition placement, the peculiarity being the place of the preposition ‘after the word’ to which it refers. More precisely, what has been investigated here is the history of P-stranding during the early and late Modern English periods (1500–1900) in close relation to the eighteenth-century normative tradition during the process of standardisation of the English language. Chapter 1 set out the research context as a case study in which precept and usage are compared in order to assess whether and to what extent the criticism of end-placed prepositions has had an effect on actual language usage. Chapter 2 explained the methodology and described the data examined: a self-compiled database of eighteenth-century precepts and rules on preposition placement, and a usage corpus from a collection of letters, plays, diaries, science texts, sermons, etc. Chapter 3 focused on the detailed analysis of the precept data: the type of attitudes towards P-stranding (critic, neutral, advocate; Section 3.1), the semantic nuances conveyed in the epithets used to refer to
stranded prepositions (e.g., *harsh, inelegant, improper*), and the dimensions of usage in which these epithets are framed (Section 3.2). This chapter also touched upon the subject of plagiarism or unacknowledged borrowing, characteristic of the eighteenth-century (Section 3.3), and it provided an overview of attitudes to preposition placement in the nineteenth century (Section 3.4). Chapter 4 examined the patterns in usage regarding the overall distribution of P-stranding and the contexts of syntactic variation with P-piping (Sections 4.1 and 4.2). The trends were further analysed in relation to the distributional patterns in a variety of registers in relation to the historical stylistic drift towards more oral or more written prose (Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.5), as well as with regard to medium (Section 4.3.3) and to the level of formality of the text (Section 4.3.4). Chapter 5, the central part of the book, traced the origins and development of the stigmatisation of P-stranding from EModE grammars to John Dryden and to eighteenth-century precept works. After discussion of a variety of English and Latin grammars published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Section 5.2), the evaluation of precept and usage data touched on three main topics: the ideal of grammatical correctness and the influence of Latin (Section 5.3), differences in style and medium (Section 5.4), and the role of rhetoric in the prescriptive tradition (Section 5.5). Chapter 6 then offered some reflections on the role of John Dryden (Section 6.1) and on the early eighteenth century as a period of latent awareness before the prescription against P-stranding materialised more strongly and explicitly in mid/late eighteenth-century works (Sections 6.2–5). Given that substantial summaries and conclusions of the main issues have been provided at the end of Chapters 3, 4 and 5, what remains for this concluding chapter is to summarise the answers to the research questions established as the basis for this study.

The main research questions that this study set out to examine are the following (see Section 1.2.2):

- To what extent did the eighteenth-century normative tradition have an influence on the actual use of stranded prepositions?
- Did the late eighteenth-century normative tradition trigger change in usage (that is, bring about a shift in usage trends) or did it reinforce an existing trend (that is, reflect language use)?
- How was preposition stranding conceptualised in eighteenth-century precept works, and what kind of attitudes are expressed in these works?
- What are the arguments behind the stigma against preposition stranding?
Conclusion

To what extent did the eighteenth-century normative tradition have an influence on the actual usage of stranded prepositions?

To a great extent. The use of P-stranding declines drastically during the second half of the eighteenth century, after a gradual increase in previous centuries. The decrease is evident in terms of the overall frequency of the construction and also in contexts of syntactic variation. Furthermore, in some registers the effect lasts into the early decades of the nineteenth century, and to some extent also into the second half of that century, since the frequency ratio is lower than in the late seventeenth century. The effect of the proscriptions laid down in eighteenth-century works is thus immediate, but only temporary, as the frequency of P-stranding starts to increase slowly in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and in present-day English the construction is still alive and well. The change in usage in the nineteenth century seems to be a response to the change in attitudes within the normative tradition towards less proscription and more description, with a positive knock-on effect on attitudes towards P-stranding.

Did the late eighteenth-century normative tradition trigger change in usage or did it reinforce an existing trend?

It reinforced an existing trend. In assessing the influence of precept on usage, a time gap is necessary between the establishment of rules and their effect on usage becoming noticeable. For it to be claimed that late eighteenth-century normative works triggered change, as is generally reported in the literature, the change should have affected the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. However, the data first show a change in usage patterns in the early half of the eighteenth century, when the gradual increase from 1500 to 1700 comes to a halt in the overall frequencies; this early period already shows a decrease of P-stranding in registers such as science, diaries and private letters. Thus late eighteenth-century works reinforced a declining trend that had began at the start of the century. In my view, the period 1700–49 stands as a period of latent awareness that turns into a more definite awareness and aggressive attitude in the mid and late decades, strengthening the ongoing stigmatisation of the construction. The early eighteenth century can be seen as a period of transition in terms of both usage of and attitudes to P-stranding.

This raises the question: What triggered the change? To judge from the evidence gathered hitherto, the change in the early eighteenth century derives from the stigmatisation of P-stranding that developed over the course of the seventeenth century. Grammarians such as John Hewes (1624) and
Joshua Poole (1646) raised awareness of the differences between Latin and English syntax and advised the turning of end-placed prepositions to the front. This is followed by John Dryden’s implicit and, more importantly, explicit criticism of P-stranding in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Contemporaneous to this, the prescriptive approach to grammar writing was emerging with Christopher Cooper (1685) and Guy Miège (1688). As Claridge (2000: 198) argues, ‘only if there is awareness can one pose the next question, that of positive or negative attitudes’. In my view, the fact that EModE authors take notice of the place of prepositions in ‘post-position’ implies that there was linguistic awareness of variants in preposition placement. That Poole also provides a ‘necessary’ rule to correct the end position paves the way for the evidently negative attitudes in Dryden a few decades later. A crucial observation at this point is the tentative connection between Poole and Dryden: various evidence, such as their common views on Latin and on rhetoric and Poole’s preface signed by an anonymous ‘J.D.’ (1657), suggest that Dryden may have been familiar with Poole’s rhetorical treatises and Poole’s grammar. (To say the least, Dryden was aware of the tradition of rhetoric in which Poole’s works had been produced.) That Dryden is explicitly prescriptive may in turn have paved the way for awareness and critical attitudes in the early eighteenth century, to be followed by explicit and abundant proscriptions in the latter half of the century. In other words, contrary to the traditional account in the literature, late eighteenth-century precepts on P-stranding were louder but not original, the roots being traceable to grammarians, rhetoricians and literary writers of the seventeenth century. I thus would like to emphasise the importance of the seventeenth century in the rise and development of the eighteenth-century prescriptive norms. Attention in the field of normative linguistics has focused primarily on the eighteenth century, and rightly so; but now that this century is no longer a ‘Cinderella’, to use Charles Jones’ expression, we should widen the scope and look at both the nineteenth and the seventeenth centuries. The latter is often overlooked as a century of descriptivism, one influenced largely by Latin grammars. While this may well be true, we should not underestimate the potential of EModE grammar books and treatises on rhetoric for the development of the stigmatisation of certain linguistic features.

The third and fourth research questions can be discussed together: How was preposition stranding conceptualised in eighteenth-century precept works? What kind of attitudes are expressed in these works? And, What are the arguments behind the stigma against preposition stranding?
The stigma against P-stranding can be related to three main themes. First, grammatical correctness and the influence of the Latin model. P-stranding is generally understood as the marked position of prepositions, mainly because of to the etymology of the term *preposition*, which many grammar writers quote in their passages. Prepositions placed after the word they govern are out of order etymologically and logically; they do not have a parallel construction in Latin syntax and therefore they are the least preferred option. Second, P-stranding is usually associated with informal and spoken language. Given that the focus of the standard norms is formal, written prose, features such as P-stranding are doomed to be stigmatised. And third, end-placed prepositions are often the subject of discussion in terms of rhetoric because of the importance that is given in this field to the last element of the clause/sentence. Little words, rhetoricians argue, should not end sentences because the construction breaks a variety of principles of rhetoric, including harmony, precision, unity and vivacity.

P-stranding is indeed fiercely criticised in the eighteenth century, but there is more than criticism. The construction is occasionally advocated for the same three reasons. First, the idiom is preferred to Latin by those who realise that Latin and English have different morphosyntax and that we should not try to impose the former on the latter. Second, P-stranding is suitable in certain styles. And third, P-stranding can be elegant and harmonious, and can smooth the flow of the sentence, provided it does not obscure the meaning. In addition, grammar writers often discuss this feature in a neutral way, simply pointing to the fact that in certain contexts there is syntactic variation. One of the main conclusions to draw from the above is that normative linguistics should widen its scope of study and look beyond stand-alone grammar books. The investigation of P-stranding has shed new light on the importance of rhetoric as a facet of prescriptivism that endorsed the norms established in grammar books – in some cases, such as P-stranding, it may well have initiated them. More research is necessary in this field with regard to other features, since, as John Hornsey (1793: 93) said, it is not merely grammatical knowledge that is needed; the canons of rhetoric are ‘absolutely necessary’ too.

From a broader perspective, the investigation of P-stranding presented in this book was envisaged as contributing a new case study to linguistic historiography and normative linguistics. In the introductory chapter, I summarised the findings in previous studies as to whether eighteenth-century works had triggered or reinforced change, and whether the change was permanent or temporary. P-stranding falls into the group of temporary reinforcement in that precept retarded linguistic change but did not succeed
in stopping the natural trend – the increase of P-stranding from the Middle English period to the present day. Precept can thus account for change in the frequency of a particular construction as a change from above, in that not all linguistic changes result from internal forces, that is from changes from below, in Labovian terms (1994: 78). The historical development of P-stranding illustrates both types of force. On the one hand, the genuine increase of P-stranding in the EModE period represents a change from below, that is, below the level of social awareness, and also at the lower end of the sociostylistic range, most notably in informal texts. On the other hand, the decline in usage during the eighteenth century and part of the nineteenth century represents a change from above, both in terms of being imposed from above in the social scale (from the ‘polite’ society) and being above the level of conscious awareness, as writers actively avoided the construction in order to comply with the new norms in grammar books and treatises of rhetoric. In other words: ‘language change need not be “natural” and take place [from] below... but can indeed originate “from above” in the concrete prescriptive sense of the term’ (Nevalainen 1996: 4). All in all, historical grammars from the early and late ModE periods have gradually received more attention, and their use as evidence for the study of historical linguistics has slowly but solidly come to be recognised in the disciplines of normative linguistics and historical sociolinguistics. With due caution, their study can help explain language use in the past and in the present day, it can shed light on early and modern conceptualisations of linguistic features, and it can help us trace language change and (the loss of) variation. The study of the relationship between norms and practice, as Sundby et al. (1991: 3) remark, ‘lends itself as an aid to studying syntactic variation as a sociolinguistic phenomenon on a diachronic–synchronic basis’.

Although P-stranding is ‘a time-honoured usage, which even the most eminent stylists’ of Elizabethan drama such as Shakespeare, Jonson and Fletcher ‘did not fight shy of’, as Visser notes (1963–73: I.§412.n), the fact is that the proscription of ending a sentence with a preposition lingers to today, and the practice is still sometimes resisted in literary writing.¹ The negative approach in usage guides also persists, a good example being The Grouchy Grammarian, who suggests writing ‘a how-not-to guide’ on that grounds that ‘You’ll be producing a manual of practical correctness, and you’ll have to do it negatively, of course, by showing mistakes – usages writers should avoid’ (Parrish 2002: 5; my emphasis). The stylistic stigma is still felt, echoed here in Robert W. Burchfield’s advice in 1996:

¹ On the legacy of eighteenth-century prescriptivism, see, for instance, Beal (2009).
In most circumstances, esp. in formal writing, it is desirable to avoid placing a preposition at the end of a clause or sentence, where it has the appearance of being stranded. But there are many circumstances in which a preposition may or even must be placed late... and others where the degree of formality required governs the placing. (Fowler 1996: 619)

And stranded prepositions are still one of the pet hates in letters to the editor and of language conservatives, here expressed only partly in jest by the BBC’s commentator John Humphrys:

A preposition should never, ever end a sentence. Ever. On pain of death. OK, maybe not on pain of death, but at least on pain of angry stares and a good deal of sulking... To me it’s the verbal equivalent of two bits of polystyrene rubbing together: unbearable. (Humphrys 2004: 41, quoting from Sunday Times)

Thus, as Vallins (1960: 14) noted, ‘grammatical dogmatism left us a legacy of superstitions’, of which P-stranding is one, but ‘the rule and custom are not separate or separable conceptions’. English, in not being controlled by an official academy of the language, has in some cases let usage prevail: ‘throw out a net, and pull in a sample of English usage, and you’ll readily find sentences where the end is the only natural or idiomatic place for a preposition to go’ (Crystal 1986: 60). I will end this book with a note from John Humphrys’ Lost for Words (2004), with which I think many of us identify:

As you will have noticed, I habitually start sentences with conjunctions and end them with prepositions. I can’t see anything wrong with that. Both “and” and “but” are useful words with which to begin a sentence – or even to end one with. (Humphrys 2004: 89, my emphasis)
1. Precept effect on usage: Case studies and main findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Precept data</th>
<th>Usage data</th>
<th>Findings (study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past participle strong verb&lt;br&gt;<code>wrote/written</code></td>
<td>C17–C19 +</td>
<td>C17–C19</td>
<td>Tr-Perm (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past strong verb <code>a/u (sang/sung)</code></td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Tr-Perm, StE (Anderwald 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive: perfect, counterfactual&lt;br&gt;<code>Shall/will</code> with first person</td>
<td>C18–C20</td>
<td>C12–C20</td>
<td>Tr-Perm (Molencki 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive inflected</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C16–C19</td>
<td>Tr-Temp (Auer 2006, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractions past and participle <code>-ed</code> weak verb, contractions in auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>C16–C18 +</td>
<td>C16–C18</td>
<td>Re-Perm² (Oldireva Gustafsson 2002, Osselton 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative: double periphrastic</td>
<td>C16–C19 +</td>
<td>C16–C19</td>
<td>Re-Perm, StE (González-Díaz 2007, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative: double suppletive <code>worse</code></td>
<td>C16–C18</td>
<td>C16–C19</td>
<td>Re-Perm, StE (González-Díaz 2007, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>You was/were</code></td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C15–C18</td>
<td>Re-Perm, StE (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2002, Laitinen 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple negation</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Re-Perm, StE (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2008c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal verbs</td>
<td>C18–C20 +</td>
<td>C17–C20</td>
<td>Re-Perm² (Wild 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect <code>believe</code></td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Re-Perm (Anderwald 2012a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case: <code>who/whom</code>, gerund subject with <code>his/him</code></td>
<td>C19 +</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Re-Perm³ (Dekeyser 1975)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Feature | Precept data | Usage data | Findings (study)
--- | --- | --- | ---
Comparative: double suppletive lesser | C16–C18 | C16–C19 | NI (González-Díaz 2007, 2008)
Subjective lest-clauses | C17–C19 | C17–C20 | NI (Auer 2008)
Phrasal verbs | C18–C20 + C17–C20 | C17–C20 | NI4 (Wild 2010)
Progressive passive vs. passival | C19 | C19 | NI5 (Anderwald 2012)

(B) Precept Effect on Usage: Individual Authors (sorted diachronically by author)

Contractions past and participle -ed weak verb, contractions in auxiliary verbs | Ct8 | Elizabeth Montagu (1738–78) | NI6 (Sairio 2009)
Subject–verb concord, be–plural levelling, past participle strong verb wrote/written, past strong verb known/knew, syntax adverb/adjective, 3p sg present tense do/have | Ct8 | Captain Cook (1768–79) | Tr-Perm (Percy 1996)
Be–plural levelling, dialect where/whether, dialect expression of time, multiple negation, relative which/that, 3p sg present tense do/does | Ct8 | William Clift (1792–1801) | Tr-Perm (Austin 1984, 1985)
Relative dialect forms, you was/were, contractions past and participle -ed weak verb, apostrophe plural nouns, noun capitalisation | Ct8 | William Clift (1792–1801) | Tr-Perm7 (Austin 1994)

Legend:
- Tr-Perm = triggered, permanently; Tr-Temp = triggered, temporarily; Re-Perm = reinforced, permanently; Re-Temp = reinforced temporarily; NI = no influence
- StE = in Standard English, but not in nonstandard/dialect
- + indicates that in addition to grammar books the precept data also include rhetorical treatises and/or dictionaries and/or usage manuals

Notes:
1. Osselton (1998) remarks that printers’ practices also had an influence, and that there is a dual standard: private and published spelling.
2. As far as repetitive phrasal verbs are concerned.
3. Dekeyser (1975) argues that influence is only moderate: prescriptivism maintains variation which otherwise would have been levelled to just who.
4. Overall there is no strong influence, except in formal texts and repetitive particles.
5. Criticism in the nineteenth century retards language change, but in the end it runs its way.
6. Montagu follows private spelling norms, but there are indications that she is aware of the standard norm as well.
7. Moderate only; he is still careless in spelling, and still keeps some dialect forms.
## 2. Design of the usage corpora

### Usage corpora: number of words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Let-P</th>
<th>J/D</th>
<th>Sermon</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Let-O</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>12,880</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>11,790</td>
<td>74,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>11,590</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>13,040</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>41,889</td>
<td>25,821</td>
<td>32,584</td>
<td>23,622</td>
<td>31,639</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>13,180</td>
<td>182,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EModE</strong></td>
<td>64,269</td>
<td>48,051</td>
<td>58,164</td>
<td>43,392</td>
<td>57,559</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td>17,830</td>
<td>36,750</td>
<td>333,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>22,395</td>
<td>16,417</td>
<td>21,443</td>
<td>10,669</td>
<td>20,785</td>
<td>16,754</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>108,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>23,915</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>11,078</td>
<td>20,577</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>29,270</td>
<td>14,056</td>
<td>21,765</td>
<td>11,097</td>
<td>20,992</td>
<td>26,101</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>123,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>33,054</td>
<td>10,732</td>
<td>22,681</td>
<td>10,959</td>
<td>21,748</td>
<td>31,931</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>131,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LModE</strong></td>
<td>108,634</td>
<td>53,701</td>
<td>87,739</td>
<td>43,803</td>
<td>84,102</td>
<td>81,389</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>459,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>172,903</td>
<td>101,752</td>
<td>145,903</td>
<td>87,195</td>
<td>141,661</td>
<td>88,915</td>
<td>17,830</td>
<td>36,750</td>
<td>792,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Let-P: private letters; J/D: journals/diaries; Let-O: official letters.

### Usage Corpora: Number of Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Let-P</th>
<th>J/D</th>
<th>Sermon</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Let-O</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EModE</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LModE</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Let-P: private letters; J/D: journals/diaries; Let-O: official letters.

---

1 It should be noted that the compilation of the usage data for this study took place in 2005, while the official version of ARCHER 3.1 was finalised in July 2006. There may be some minor differences from the contents and word counts of the official version. A new version, ARCHER 3.2, became available in December 2013.
Usage corpora: Split between Science and Medicine (number of words and number of texts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500–70</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>12,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>13,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>31,639</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td>39,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EModE</strong></td>
<td>44,759</td>
<td>20,326</td>
<td>65,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–49</td>
<td>20,785</td>
<td>16,754</td>
<td>37,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>20,577</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>27,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>20,992</td>
<td>26,101</td>
<td>47,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>21,748</td>
<td>31,931</td>
<td>53,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LModE</strong></td>
<td>84,102</td>
<td>81,389</td>
<td>165,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>128,861</td>
<td>101,715</td>
<td>230,576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Usage corpora: Split between diaries and journals (number of words and number of texts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Diaries</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500–70</td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570–1640</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1700</td>
<td>13,402</td>
<td>19,182</td>
<td>32,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EModE</strong></td>
<td>38,982</td>
<td>19,182</td>
<td>58,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700–49</td>
<td>12,475</td>
<td>8,968</td>
<td>21,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–99</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>13,162</td>
<td>21,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800–49</td>
<td>10,667</td>
<td>11,098</td>
<td>21,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850–99</td>
<td>15,713</td>
<td>6,968</td>
<td>22,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LModE</strong></td>
<td>47,543</td>
<td>40,196</td>
<td>87,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1900</td>
<td>86,525</td>
<td>59,378</td>
<td>145,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3. An overview of preposition stranding and pied piping in the history of English

It is commonplace that historical studies can only rely on the data that have come to us, and hence there is always the possibility that the absence of stranded prepositions in a particular type of clause is merely an accidental gap, ‘a matter of chance’ (Fischer et al. 2000: 265; see also Allen’s remark on ‘the problem of the lack of negative evidence’ in the early stages of English, 1980: 263). In this Appendix, I use the label ‘systematic gap’ in contexts in which previous scholars have claimed that P-stranding did not exist in a particular period because they have not found any evidence of it, and I use the label ‘literature gap’ in contexts in which, to date, I have not come across references to that particular period in my literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old English (c. 500–c. 1100)</th>
<th>Middle English (c. 1100–c. 1500)</th>
<th>ModE (1500–1900) to PDE (1900–)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-position nouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal pronouns</td>
<td>P-stranding (extremely rare)</td>
<td>P-stranding (died out c. 1200)</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative <em>ærr</em></td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparative clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... as</td>
<td>P-stranding swa</td>
<td>P-stranding as</td>
<td>P-stranding as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... than</td>
<td>P-stranding þonne (rare)</td>
<td>P-stranding than</td>
<td>P-stranding than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-finite -ing clause</strong></td>
<td>[literature gap]</td>
<td>[literature gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositional</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding (13C): rare in EME, common in LME</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb-nominal</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding (mid/late 14C)</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrasal-prepositional</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding (late 15C) [literature gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb-adjective</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infinitives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective-infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pleasant</em></td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding (c.1400)</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>easy-to-please</em></td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding late C16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb-infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rare in EModE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>easily-to-please</em></td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old English (c. 500–c. 1100)</th>
<th>Middle English (c. 1100–c. 1500)</th>
<th>ModE (1500–1900) to PDE (1900–)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt relative</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-piping &amp; P-stranding if embedded (late 14C, rare)</td>
<td>P-piping &amp; P-stranding if embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrogative:</strong></td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-piping &amp; P-stranding</td>
<td>P-piping &amp; P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(late 12C, uncommon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-stranding (LME, 14C)</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding (LME c1400, rare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective-infinitive</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative clause:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>P-piping (se, se ðe)</td>
<td>P-piping (died out by end of 12C)</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>se ðe</td>
<td>se ðe</td>
<td>(what, -ever)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding (died out 12C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wh</em> pronoun (-ever)</td>
<td>swa hwa swa, -ever</td>
<td>swa hwa, -ever</td>
<td>P-stranding &amp; P-piping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(rare)</td>
<td>P-stranding &amp; P-piping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-relative</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding (that)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ðe (extremely common)</td>
<td>ðe (dies out 13C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ðæt (rare)</td>
<td>ðæt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero-relative</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(rare, late 11C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-relative</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(swa)</td>
<td>(swa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(late 10C/early 11C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Bergh and Seppälän (2002: 299) quote some (debatable) instances of P-piping with *that* in Middle English. I follow here traditional standard reference grammars. I am grateful to Ayumi Miura for her advice on this matter (personal communication, July 2013).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Middle English</th>
<th>ModE (1500–1900) to PDE (1900–)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c. 500–c. 1100)</td>
<td>(c. 1100–c. 1500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>but-relative adverb-relative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(locative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there, thither</td>
<td>[systematic gap]</td>
<td>[literature gap]</td>
<td>P-stranding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ðær, ðyder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-stranding &amp; P-piping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(systematic gap)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hwer+p (early C13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh-relativiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-stranding &amp; P-piping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(systematic gap)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wh-interrogative clause**

|                          |              |                |                                 |
| main                    | P-piping     | P-piping & P-stranding (early 13C, rare in EME) | P-stranding & P-piping |
| subordinate             | P-piping     | P-piping & P-stranding (13C, sporadic in EME)   | P-stranding & P-piping |

**Exclamative clause**

|                          |              |                | P-piping & P-stranding          |
|                        | [literature gap] | [literature gap] |                                 |

**Topicalisation**

|                          |              |                |                                 |
| NPs                     | P-piping & P-stranding (extremely rare) | P-piping & P-stranding (rare in EME, common in LME) | P-piping & P-stranding |
| personal pronouns       | P-piping & P-stranding (fairly common) | P-piping & P-stranding (common) | P-piping & P-stranding |
| locative pronoun ðær    | P-stranding  | P-stranding    | [systematic gap]               |
### 4. Chronology for John Dryden (1631–1700)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Literature and grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Born (19 August), Aldwinckle All Saints, Northamptonshire.</td>
<td>1635 L’Académie Française founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1640 Ben Jonson, <em>English Grammar</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1645 Edmund Waller, <em>Poems</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Entered Westminster School as a King’s Scholar.</td>
<td>1646 Joshua Poole, <em>The English Accidence</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Recalled in 1693 that he translated <em>Persius, Satire III</em>, as a school exercise about this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>First published work: ‘Upon the death of the Lord Hastings’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Admitted as pensioner to Trinity College, Cambridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>John Wallis, <em>Grammatica Linguae Anglicana</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Received BA, Cambridge University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Possibly in the service of the Protectorate about this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td><em>Heroique Stanza</em>, on Cromwell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td><em>Astræ Redux</em> on the Restoration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td><em>To His Sacred Majesty</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Elected Original Fellow of Royal Society.</td>
<td>1662 Royal Society given charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Married Elizabeth Howard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>First play acted: <em>Wild Gallant</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td><em>The Rival Ladies</em>, first piece in which Dryden explicitly stated his concern with the English language, though not specifically with stranded prepositions.</td>
<td>1664 Royal Society committee for the improvement of English language. Call for an Academy. Dryden and Tillotson meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665–7</td>
<td><em>The Indian Emperour</em>, first composed in the mid 1660s; first printed in 1667.</td>
<td>1664 Edmund Waller, <em>Collection of Poems</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden and end-placed prepositions</td>
<td>Literature and grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1665–8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1665</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Great Fire in London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Tillotson, Rule of Faith.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1667</strong></td>
<td><strong>1667</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Milton, Paradise Lost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1667</strong></td>
<td><strong>1667</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Sprat, History of the Royal Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1668</strong></td>
<td><strong>1668</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Indian Emperour, 2nd edition [1667], ‘reviewed by the author’; silently corrected end-placed prepositions.</td>
<td>Contract as a playwright with the King’s Company (1668–82).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1668</strong></td>
<td><strong>1668</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed Poet Laureate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succeeded James Howell as Historiographer Royal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1670</strong></td>
<td><strong>1670</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of Shakespeare’s The Tempest; silent corrections of end-placed prepositions.</td>
<td>Appointed Historiographer Royal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1670</strong></td>
<td><strong>1670</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to an unidentified person; critique on language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1672</strong></td>
<td><strong>1672</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A Defence of the Epilogue to The Conquest of Granada’; First explicit critique of end-placed prepositions, when he cast his eyes on Ben Jonson’s Catiline.</td>
<td>Tyrannic Love, second edition ‘review’d’ by the author.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1678</strong></td>
<td><strong>1678</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of Shakespeare’s All for Love; silent corrections of end-placed prepositions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1679</strong></td>
<td><strong>1679</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida; Latin thoughts, call for Academy, grammar, dictionary, prosodia; silent corrections of end-placed prepositions.</td>
<td>Robert South, Sermons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1682</strong></td>
<td><strong>1682</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absalom and Achitophel, second edition [1681] with ‘verbal alterations’.</td>
<td>(cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td><em>Religio Laici.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Dryden’s <em>Mac-Flecknoe,</em> second edition [1682], ‘with a few slight alterations’ and ‘slight improvements’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td><em>Miscellany Poems.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td><em>Examen Poeticum,</em> dedication to Congreve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Christopher Cooper, <em>Grammatica Linguæ Anglicana,</em> first prescriptive grammar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>R.C., <em>The Royal Grammar.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689/90 early</td>
<td>First contact with William Walsh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Letter to William Walsh, his friend and protégé. Second explicit criticism for ‘concluding’ sentences with prepositions, ‘which is not elegant’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Dryden and Congreve meet. Dryden thought to have seen Congreve’s <em>The Old Bachelor</em> (1691/2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td><em>Discourse concerning Satire,</em> on prosodia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>‘To my dear friend Mr Congreve’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Joseph Addison’s ‘Dedication To Mr. Dryden’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>William Congreve revises <em>The Old Batchelor,</em> presumably following Dryden’s suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>John Tillotson, <em>Works.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>William Congreve wrote a prologue for <em>The Husband, His own Cuckold.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Prologue for Congreve’s <em>The Mourning Bride.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Translation of Virgil’s <em>Æneid.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Dedication/Postscript <em>Æneis,</em> praise to Addison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Letter to Elizabeth Thomas, criticism on style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td><em>The Fables</em>, Preface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>(1 May) died of degenerative disease. (9 May) buried in Westminster Abbey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-12</td>
<td>Joseph Addison, <em>Spectator</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Jonathan Swift, proposal for an Academy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td><em>The Dramatick Works</em>, carefully edited by William Congreve; Dedication to Mr. Dryden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Robert Lowth’s quotations of John Dryden’s good and bad usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dryden’s work</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Grammatical feature</th>
<th>Lowth’s stricture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatick Poesie</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>adjectives as adverbs (extreme elaborate)</td>
<td>improperly, not agreeable to the genius of the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fables</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>use of prepositions (accuse for [off])</td>
<td>impropriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>past tense for past participle (was wove)</td>
<td>corruption, colloquial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>object case for nominative case (Scotland and Thee did)</td>
<td>it ought to be thou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal’s Satires</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>nominative for object case (Tell who loves who)</td>
<td>it ought to be whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>pre-verbal negation (not offend)</td>
<td>impropriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>management of the modes and tenses (have found . . . were drowned)</td>
<td>faulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamorphoses Poems</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>pre-verbal negation (not deludes)</td>
<td>impropriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>participle for past tense (have began)</td>
<td>corruption, colloquial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>past tense for past participle (have arose)</td>
<td>corruption, colloquial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(On Cromwell)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>agreement second person (thou shall)</td>
<td>mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>whose possessive of things (the question, whose solution)</td>
<td>improperly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>irregular comparative forms (worse than)</td>
<td>more barbarous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>were for was in second person (thou wert)</td>
<td>(improper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>agreement these/those/they (this forty years)</td>
<td>must agree with noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>omission of neither in correlation with nor (Simois, nor Xanthus shall be wanting there)</td>
<td>improper, mistake, (imprecise, inelegant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown<strong>good</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>article (a thousand years; the thousand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>reciprocal (pro)noun (thy self)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>agreement noun of multitude with plural verb (the mob are)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Robert Lowth’s passage on preposition stranding in the late eighteenth century

Use of P-stranding or P-piping in the precept passage

Lowth 1762 an Idiom which our language is strongly inclined to
Ussher 1785, Seally 1788, Story 1793, Wright 1794, Murray 1795 an idiom to which our language is strongly inclined
Bullen 1797 the most inelegant construction, to which the idiom of our language seems strongly addicted
Fell 1784 an idiom that our language is strongly inclined to
Priestley 1761b a situation they [prepositions] naturally incline to

Illustrative quotations (I): bad usage

Lowth 1762 Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with
The world . . . which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of
Buchanan 1767 George is a Monarch whom his Subjects delight in
Is that the Book which I spoke of?
Whom did you dine with?
Raine 1771 He is a Person whom I am much pleased with
This is the Truth, which you do not like to be informed of
Whom do you speak to?
Devis 1777 Shenstone is an author whom I am much delighted with
That is the book which I am pleased with
Devis 1782a Johnson is an author whom I am much delighted with
That is the book which I am pleased with
Marriott 1780 Churchill is an author whom I am much delighted with
The world . . . which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of
Anonymous 1781 Horace is an Author whom I am much delighted with
The World . . . which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of
Seally 1788 Horace is an author whom I am much delighted with
Hornsey 1793 Blair is an author whom I am much delighted with
Avarice is a crime which wise men are often guilty of
Jesus is a king whom Christian soldiers fight for
Story 1793 Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with
Wright 1794 Horace is an author, whom I am much delighted with
Alderson 1795 Riding is an exercise which I am delighted with
Murray 1795 He is an author whom I am much delighted with
The world . . . which generally their booksellers are the first that inform them of
Postlethwaite 1795 Whom shall I speak to?
### Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>The man whom I <em>spake to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coar</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Whom dost thou <em>speak to</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bullen | 1797 | Gay is an Author whom I am much *delighted with*  
Gay’s Fables is the Book which I *speak of* |

### Illustrative quotations (II): good usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayly</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>a book, an author, which, whom I am much <em>delighted with</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fell   | 1784 | he brought the nation into those distresses, which it has, at this time, to *contend with*  
but what will not ambition and revenge *descend to*  
it will be the same, whomsoever I happen to *deal with* |
| Priestley | 1761 | This is the thing which I am *pleased with* |
| Campbell | 1776 | *The man whom you were so anxious to discover, I have at length got information of.* |
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