

Self-forms in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*^{*1)}

Yoko IYEIRI**

Mitsumi UCHIDA***

1. Introduction

English has a set of well-established *self*-forms in the reflexive, for which some contemporary dialects are known to present variant forms such as *meself* (for *myself*), *hisself* (for *himself*) and simple personal pronouns used reflexively (rather than *self*-forms) (see Siemund et al. 2012: 414-422, among many others). This in part reveals the history of reflexive *self*-forms in a visible way: *self* was originally an intensifier used together with other words and its frequent occurrence side by side with personal pronouns led to the development of the compound reflexive forms found in Present-day English.²⁾ In Old and Middle English, when reflexive *self*-forms were not fully established, simple personal pronouns often served as reflexive pronouns, as in the following example from Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*:³⁾

- (1) & after in that contrey he enformed *hym* & lerned the waye to the mounte of caluarye and of Iherusalem (59/7-8)⁴⁾

In this example, the object pronoun *hym* refers to *he*, the subject of the sentence, and hence it is reflexive.

On the other hand, *self* is often attested side by side with simple reflexive personal pronouns from the Old English period onwards, showing a sign of the upcoming development of *self*-forms. See the following example quoted from the same text:

- (2) And after he arayed *hym self* and cladde *hym* moche nobly & wente to do the reuerence to the daulphyn and to dame Dyane And after to Vyenne theyr daughter (26/6-7)

*Key words: reflexive pronouns, translation, William Caxton

**Professor, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University

***Professor, School of Sociology, Kwansei Gakuin University

1) This study was in part supported by JSPS Kakenhi (Grant Number 15K02546).

2) An additional original meaning of *self* is 'the same'. See Poutsma (1904-1926, II, I-B: 831).

3) In the present paper, the term *self*-form is used for the combination of a personal pronoun and *self*, whether or not there exists a space between the two. Hence, *himself* in Present-day English is a *self*-form, while *hym self* as found in earlier English is also a *self*-form.

4) Unless otherwise specified, the English citations in the present paper are from Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* edited by Leach (1957). The page and line references in the quotations are to this edition, while emphasis in the citations is ours.

In this example, the first reflexive pronoun is accompanied by *self* (i.e. *arrayed hym self*), whereas the second is not (i.e. *cladde hym*). Examples (1) and (2), both from Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*, illustrate the coexistence of forms with and without *self* in earlier English. According to Mustanoja (1960: 152-153), "[t]he simple personal pronoun [without *self*] continues to predominate . . . down to the 15th century",⁵⁾ and Visser (1963-1973, I: §456) implies that this situation remains even at the beginning of the Modern English period, stating: "In the first century of the Modern Period the relative frequency of the simple and the compound pronoun [with *self*] is almost the same as it was in the second part of the preceding century".

The present paper focuses on the end of the fifteenth century, especially the language used in the Middle English translation of *Paris and Vienne*, which was published by Caxton in 1485. This text, as shown above, displays a transitional and also crucial stage in the development of *self*-forms in the history of English. König & Siemund (2000: 41) note that some European languages utilize different forms for intensifiers and reflexives pronouns, while others employ the same form for the two. Although contemporary English belongs to the latter category, *self*-forms serving for the two functions, the use of simple pronouns alone without intensifying *self* was common in earlier English. They also maintain that intensifiers can often be the source for the development of reflexive pronouns, as in the history of English (pp. 55-56). The present study amplifies this historical path. The fact that *Paris and Vienne* is a translation from French is a matter of interest. Reflexive forms in French may or may not be rendered as reflexives in English, and may or may not be accompanied by *self*. This will also be a concern in the present paper.

The section that follows will give a short survey of previous studies; this will be followed by some details about *Paris and Vienne* and a morphological discussion of *self* within the text. From Section 4 onwards, this paper will explore various uses in *Paris and Vienne* of *self*-forms as opposed to simple reflexive pronouns, including the type of reflexive environments (with verbs and prepositions), the person and the correspondence between French and English in translation. The final section will conclude the present paper.

2. Historical development of *self*-forms in English: A survey

Self was originally an intensifier occurring with other words to be intensified, although the use of *self* alone is also attested from Old English onwards. The path to the development of reflexive *self*-forms opens where it occurs together with reflexive pronouns, which were in Old and Middle English identical with simple personal pronouns (i.e. *me*, *him* etc.). Ogura's (1989a) comprehensive research into reflexive forms with and without *self* from Old to early Middle English shows that forms with *self* as well as those without were common from Old English onwards. Hence, it is difficult to trace the exact "beginning" of this competition. It had already begun by the time of the Old English period, although the common occurrence of *self* with noun phrases rather than personal pronouns in Old and early Middle English (cf. Ogura 1989a) shows that it was still pretty much an independent word modifying other elements. *Self* was usually an adjective showing adjectival endings, owing to the number, gender and case of the nouns and personal pronouns they modified, whereas it is known to have increasingly been used as a noun. Such forms as *myself* and *ourselves* (including *hissself* in dialects) derive from

5) He also notes the remnant existence of some simple pronouns in the reflexive use in Present-day English (p. 153).

this nominal interpretation of *self* (cf. Poutsma 1904-1926, II, 1-B: 831-832).⁶⁾

The path of development to be observed in Middle English is not a dramatic categorical shift, but an increasingly stronger linkage between *self* and reflexive personal pronouns it modifies, together with the steady decrease of the use of simple personal pronouns as reflexives. Simultaneously, the general loss of endings in Middle English contributed to the demise of some formerly possible forms of *self* such as *selfum* and *selfne*. Also, the general merger of dative and accusative forms of personal pronouns often obscured the distinction between the two cases in the reflexive in Middle English. This in turn contributes to the fixation of the now restricted number of the combinations between the personal pronoun and *self*, leading to the establishment of *self*-forms as reflexive pronouns. For the reduction of the whole inventory of reflexive forms with or without *self* in Middle English, see Visser (1963-1973, I: §439).

However, the expansion of *self*-forms was, according to Mustanoja (1960: 152-153), relatively slow during the Middle English period. As mentioned above, he points to the predominance of simple personal pronouns in the reflexive till the fifteenth century. On the other hand, Ogura (2003: 536-540) explores a number of Old and early Middle English texts and shows that a reasonable number of *self*-forms were encountered at this early stage in the history of English. In addition, Ogura (1989b) investigates a number of Middle English texts, some of which are datable to the late Middle English period, though still before the age of printing, and provides some statistics concerning the relationship between simple forms and *self*-forms in the reflexive. The table below extracts some data from these publications of hers:⁷⁾

Table 1. Simple personal pronouns vs. *self*-forms in some Middle English texts (based on Ogura 1989b: 51 and Ogura 2003: 539)

	simple forms	<i>self</i> -forms	totals
<i>Ormulum</i>	111	206	317
<i>Vices and Virtues</i>	28	91	119
<i>Ancrene Riwe</i> (MS Cotton Nero A.xiv)	145	134	279
Lazamon's <i>Brut</i> (MS Cotton Caligula A.ix)	157	188	345
Lazamon's <i>Brut</i> (MS Otho C.xiii)	86	125	211
<i>Sir Gawain</i>	51	38	89
<i>Pearl</i>	12	16	28
<i>Morte Arthure</i>	38	137	175
Chaucer's <i>Boece</i>	40	151	191

Simple forms are fairly stable down to the late Middle English period, while a notable expansion of *self*-forms is also observable from early Middle English onwards. As Ogura (1989b: 50) remarks, the relationship between simple and *self*-forms tends to differ depending upon the text concerned. Apparently, a reasonable mixture of reflexive forms with and without *self* is observed throughout the Middle English period. It is therefore necessary to conduct further research on this issue by investigating the end of the Middle English period and probably the Early Modern English period. The present study focuses on the end of the fifteenth century after the introduction of printing.

6) Poutsma (1904-1926) provides some explicit details on the historical development of *self*-forms from Old English to Modern English, despite the title of his book.

7) See also Ogura (2017: 78-81) for further details.

Where there are variables, there are usually some conditioning factors affecting the choice from among possible variants, and this applies to *self*-forms as well. It has been suggested in previous studies, for example, that *self*-forms developed earlier in the third person than in the first and second persons, and earlier when they are used as objects of prepositions rather than objects of verbs. On the basis of her analysis of *Sir Gawain* and Chaucer, van Gelderen (2000: 203-208) argues that *self*-forms are much more widely attested in the third person than in the first and second persons. She also demonstrates that *self*-forms are attested only in prepositional phrases in the first and second persons, whereas they are attested much more widely in the third person.⁸⁾ These tendencies ought to be interpreted, though, as a tendency, and not in categorical terms. As Ogura (1989a) documents, *self*-forms in the first and second persons and not in prepositional phrases are known to exist from Old English onwards. Considering this non-categorical nature of the occurrence of reflexive forms, variationist methodologies will be most appropriate for the exploration of the expanding process of *self*-forms in the history of English.

3. Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* and *self*-forms

The discussion in the following sections is based on our analysis of Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* printed in 1485, which is a Middle English translation from French. For the linguistic analyses hereafter, we shall use the edition by Leach (1957).⁹⁾ We will also investigate, wherever necessary, two French versions, Le Roy in Lyon (c.1480) and Leeu in Antwerp (1487), both of which are considered to be fairly close in textual tradition to Caxton's translation. For further details on the textual relationship between different versions of *Paris and Vienne*, including French ones, see Uchida & Iyeiri (2017: 64-65).

Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* provides a total of 35 examples of *self*, all of which are separated by spaces from the personal pronouns they modify, as in:

(3) truste me I shal make *my self* redy to goo thyder for you (12/34)

(4) that he shold do *hym self* grete honour (16/19)

(5) Thenne sayd Parys make *your self* al redy for thys nyght at mydnyght I shal come (68/36-37)

The consistent presence of the space between the personal pronoun and *self* suggests that the relevant forms are not yet fully established as reflexive pronouns in this text, though they are certainly used reflexively.¹⁰⁾ On the other hand, there are a number of features indicating that the *self*-forms in Caxton

8) For a typological discussion on the clearer marking of reflexivity in the third person than in the first and second persons, see Kemmer (1993: 47-49).

9) See Note 4 above.

10) Although the space is simply a matter of convention and is not always trustworthy as a boundary between words in Middle English manuscripts, and perhaps even in printed texts, it gives some hints as to the understanding of word divisions in the past. Van Gelderen (2006: 167) notes that space is often available even in Early Modern English. She refers to the orthography of *self*-forms in Shakespeare (F1 edition) and says that “*my/thy* and *self* are always printed separately”, while “*himself* has become one unit already”. This is another case to illustrate the difference due to the person (cf. Section 2).

are getting closer to the reflexive pronouns as found in Present-day English. First of all, *self* in *Paris and Vienne* occurs always in combination with a personal pronoun. There are no examples of the item occurring with a noun phrase. In other words, it is no longer a general adjective modifying various possible items, but has been restricted in function to reflexivity.

Secondly, the inventory of the *self*-forms attested in *Paris and Vienne* is already fixed. The forms attested are: *my self*, *thy self*, *your self*, *hym self*, *hyr self* and *them self*. Table 2 shows their frequencies in the text:

Table 2. The frequencies of *self*-forms in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*

<i>my self</i>	<i>thy self</i>	<i>your self</i>	<i>hym self</i>	<i>hyr self</i>	<i>them self</i>
6	1	3	18	3	4

There are no morphological variants for each person and number. In other words, *Paris and Vienne* does not yield “irregular forms”—in the modern sense—such as *me self* or *his self*.¹¹⁾ The only deviation of this text, except for the space before *self*, from Present-day English is that the plural form *-selves* is unavailable.¹²⁾ It is likely that the language of *Paris and Vienne* has not quite reached the stage where plural forms with *-selves* are employed. On this issue, the description of the *Oxford English Dictionary* under the entry of *themselves* is detailed: *themselves (themselfs)* is attested from around 1500 and becomes standard around 1540.¹³⁾

The discussion in the following sections will concentrate on the reflexive use of *self*-forms. Hence, the following example, where *my self* is used as a pure intensifier, is excluded from analysis:

(6) For I *my self* onely haue doon it (49/25)

The following example, where *hym self* is most likely a pure intensifier, is also excluded from the investigation below:

(7) but the more that he sawe hyr the more grewe þ^e fyre of loue within *hym self* (3/15-16)

In this example, *hym self* may have some reflexive implication referring to *he* in the preceding clause, but the subject of its own clause is *þ^e fyre*, which is not co-referential with *hym self*.¹⁴⁾ Hence, *hym self* in (7) is not reflexive in grammatical terms.

11) This is clearly illustrative of an advanced stage, when compared with Old and early Middle English, where there were numerous variant forms (see Ogura 1989a: 32-33).

12) *Oursel* and *themsel* are available in some contemporary varieties of English. See Siemund et al. (2012: 414-415).

13) Caxton prints *Paris and Vienne* in 1492 again, but this text also provides *them self* only, and not forms with *-selves*. Visser (1963-1973, I: §§447, 455) mentions the existence of *-selfs* and *-selves* in later Middle English, but clearly they were rare before 1500.

14) Even in later English, it is not always easy to make a clear distinction between the intensifying and reflexive uses of *self*-forms (cf. Poutsma 1904-1926, II-I-B: 870). The investigation of the present paper is limited to those examples in which the reflexive interpretation is possible from syntactic perspectives, whether or not they still retain the original function as intensifiers.

4. Simple and *self*-forms in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*: An overview

The account in the previous section may give the impression that the development of the reflexive in *Paris and Vienne* has made a great advance towards the state of Present-day English, at least morphologically, except that *self* is always a separate word from the personal pronoun to which it is attached and that the plural form *selves* is not yet used. This is certainly the case when *self*-forms alone are examined.

A different picture emerges, however, when we investigate the whole system of the reflexive, including simple pronominal forms without *self*. *Paris and Vienne* provides numerous examples of simple forms, which feature the real gap between the language of this text and Present-day English. Although we have already observed an illustrative simple form in the Introduction, it is worth citing some additional examples as they are related to the discussion here:

(8) wherof I fere *me* that he shal become a man of relygyon (21/25-26)

(9) and for the grete Ioye that she had she sette *hyr* down on the grounde (23/14-15)

(10) And whan the doulphyn was loos he cladde *hym* lyke a moure (69/20-21)

When all relevant instances are inclusively counted, whether they are dative, accusative, or prepositional objects, they are more than twice as frequent as *self*-forms in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*. Simple forms account for 76 examples (69.7%), whereas *self*-forms in the reflexive account for 33 examples (30.3%). The rate of the occurrence of simple forms is large enough perhaps to support the above-quoted comment by Mustanoja (1960: 153)—“the simple personal pronoun continues to predominate . . . down to the 15th century”—, although it is not wholly clear what he exactly means by “predominate”.

On the other hand, when compared with the Middle English data provided in Table 1, the language of Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* seems to be rather conservative in terms of the development of *self*-forms. Table 1 includes various Middle English texts, all going back to periods before the age of printing, but they show some further expansion of *self*-forms with varying degrees. It is probable that the real expansion and establishment of reflexive *self*-forms takes place only in the Modern English period. It is possible that throughout the Middle English period, reflexive forms of both types were available to authors as fairly stable variants. Hence, the rate of simple personal pronouns differs depending on the author, though the general trend is certainly in the direction of the expansion of *self*-forms. To clarify the real situation of the language of *Paris and Vienne*, detailed linguistic analysis of the relevant examples is required.

5. Simple and *self*-forms as objects of verbs

While the statistics in the preceding section include all examples of reflexive pronouns, either with or without *self*, the present section focuses on those occurring as objects of verbs, excluding those occurring in prepositional phrases, which will be examined in the next section.

Mustanoja (1960: 430-431) remarks that there are originally two types of verbs taking reflexive objects. The first are verbs taking accusative co-referential objects, and the second are intransitive verbs taking dative reflexive pronouns, which often indicate “motion or fear”. In the analysis of Middle English texts, however, it is not necessarily easy to define the whole inventory of the verbs of these two types, or even to try to make a distinction between them. Even during the Old English period some verbs are known to have taken both dative and accusative objects (cf. Mitchell 1985: §1055). Middle English lost the formal distinction between the dative and accusative cases, making the fundamental difference between the two types further obscure. Moreover, with some verbs which are often used reflexively, the occurrence of the co-referential pronoun was optional from the earliest time. The same verb displays different behaviours in different contexts (Visser 1963-1973, I: §328; Mitchell 1985: §§1056-1058).¹⁵⁾

The historical trend is to drop reflexive pronouns as time passes, verbs with reflexive pronouns occurring increasingly without reflexive pronouns (cf. Mustanoja 1960: 431). It was also common for the reflexive to be replaced by other constructions without co-referential objects. In some cases, for example, impersonal constructions occurred with verbs that were formerly reflexive. Fischer (1992: 237), referring to van der Gaaf (1904), gives *repenten* and *remembren* as illustrative verbs of this development.¹⁶⁾ It is perhaps partly due to this unstable status of reflexive constructions that the reflexive in other languages was often rendered into other constructions when translated into Middle English (cf. Fischer 1992: 238).¹⁷⁾

In view of the altering nature of, and the difficulty in defining “reflexive verbs”, in Middle English, it would not be wise—at least at this stage of our research—to start with “reflexive verbs” and see what kind of constructions they take (i.e. top-down methodology).¹⁸⁾ Instead, Table 3 categorizes relevant examples into those with simple personal pronouns only, those with reflexive pronouns of both types and those with *self*-forms only (i.e. bottom-up methodology). Since most verbs provide only one or two relevant examples in *Paris and Vienne*, this categorization itself is no more than a working one—an examination of additional texts can easily move some verbs into different categories—but it helps for the purpose of furthering the discussion here.

Table 3. Verbs occurring with reflexive pronouns with or without *self* in Caxton’s *Paris and Vienne*

simple pronouns only (frequencies)	both simple pronouns and <i>self</i> -forms (frequencies, frequencies)	<i>self</i> -forms only (frequencies)
abasshen (1), absenten (1), aduysen (6), awaken (1), beren (1), bethinken (1), clothen (6), commaunden (1), confessen (2), coueren (1), deceyuen (1), dysporten (2), estraungen (1), feren (1), grieuken (1), hyren (2), enformen (1), leyen (1), lodgen (1), meruayllen (1), pourueyken (1), quyten (1), recommaunden (2), refresshen (1), remembren (1), resten (1), setten (1), suffren (1), taken (1), vnarm (1), wythdrawen (4)	armen (1, 1), dysposen (1, 1), holden (1, 1), maken (8, 2)	appeasen (1), arayen (1), bewayllen (1), demenen (1), dyscomforten (1), don (1), enforcen (1), fynden (1), gyuen (1), hyden (1), kepen (1), seyen (1), sleen (4)

15) Visser (1963-1973, I: §328) argues that even the boundary between the transitive and intransitive is not easy to draw, as this can be defined only by the existence of objects.

16) This shift was possible as Old and Middle English had a number of verbs showing both reflexive and impersonal constructions. For a list of such verbs, see Ogura (1991).

17) Fischer refers particularly to the translation from Old French to Middle English.

18) See Visser (1963-1973: §159), who remarks that “[n]o verb is naturally ‘reflexive’”.

Despite the scarcity of relevant examples for each verb, this table as a whole demonstrates that the use of simple reflexive pronouns is still stable, reconfirming the frequency analysis in the previous section.

Among the verbs occurring with simple pronouns only, those that are attested more frequently than a few times and merit some attention are: *aduysen* (6 exx), *clothen* (6 exx) and *wythdrawen* (4 exx). Of the six reflexive examples of *aduysen*, four are found in the second person, all occurring in the imperative or similar suasive expressions:

(11) *aduysen you* wel fayr suster what honour is comen to me by his prowess & by his bounte (19/12-13)

(12) *Aduysen you* what wysedom it were (33/10-11)

(13) but atte leste of one thyng I praye you that this nyght ye *aduysen you* (73/5-7)

(14) . . . and hath sayd that ye shold remembre and *aduysen you* (73/23-24)

This usage seems to be typical of *aduysen* in the reflexive, although examples like the following are also attested:

(15) & the bysshop whyche *aduysed hym* noo thyng of thentencyon and thought of vyenne said that he shold brynge hym wythoute faute (27/13-15)

In this example, the reflexive takes place in the third person.

Also, non-reflexive uses of *aduysen* are encountered in *Paris and Vienne*. Of the twelve examples of the same verb attested in this text, six are reflexive (as Table 3 reveals), and the remaining six are non-reflexive, as in:

(16) therefore fayr brother *aduysen* we what is beste for to do (4/35-36)

Thus, *aduysen* may or may not be reflexive, but when it occurs reflexively, it occurs with simple reflexive pronouns, often in the imperative or expressions of similar meaning in *Paris and Vienne*.

Clothen is another verb often attested in the reflexive and with simple personal pronouns. Five of the six reflexive uses are in the past tense and show the form *cladde*, as cited below:

(17) And anone vyenne and ysabeau *cladde them* in mannes araye (35/34-36/1)

Examples of this type appear repeatedly in *Paris and Vienne*, which is for the most part due to its content matter. Apart from the five past tense examples, there remains one example of reflexive *clothen*, which is infinitival:

(18) Thenne he sente to his doughter clothyng and vestymentes for to *clothe hyr* and also mete for to ete (54/14-15)

The semantic subject of *for to clothe* in this example is the *doughter*, with whom *hyr* is co-referential. Thus *clothen* commonly occurs as a reflexive verb accompanied by simple reflexive pronouns in *Paris and Vienne*. When it is not used reflexively, it takes place in the past participle construction in the same text, as the following example illustrates:

(19) To that feste came many noble knyghtes & squyers *clothed* and arayed rychely after the guyse of theyr contree (7/7-9)

(20) and by cause that Parys was rychely *clad* euery man made to hym grete honour and sayd that he semed wel to be the sone of somme grete moure (65/33-35)

As (19) and (20) exemplify, two types of the past participle, namely *clothed* and *clad*, are encountered in *Paris and Vienne*.

Finally, *wythdrawen* is found solely in the reflexive, and with simple reflexive pronouns. The four examples listed in Table 3 are the full count of the examples of this verb, one of which runs as follows:

(21) And thenne Vyenne *wythdrewe hyr* fro the bysshop and the other (27/19-20)

As for the remaining categories, *maken* and *sleen* are attested more than a few times and worthy of particular attention. All of the ten relevant examples of *maken* in *Paris and Vienne* are encountered in the same collocation, i.e. *maken* + reflexive pronoun with or without *self* + *redy* ‘ready’. Some illustrative examples are:

(22) for thys that many a fayre and hardy knyght *made them redy* to mayntene the quarelle of hyr beaulte (12/12-14)

(23) truste me I shal *make my self redy* to goo thyder for you (12/34)

(24) Thenne sayd Parys *make your self al redy* for thys nyght at mydnyght I shal come (68/36-37)

Despite the more frequent attestation of causative *make* in *Paris and Vienne* in general, reflexive usages are restricted to this particular collocation. As the above examples demonstrate, the form of *make* can be imperative, preterite or infinitive (with a modal auxiliary), and the reflexive pronoun can be with or without *self*. In other words, the collocation is fixed when this verb is used reflexively, but its constructions are changeable. Hence the ongoing process of the development of *self*-forms is visible with this verb.

By contrast, the reflexive of *sleen* is always found with *self*-forms, as in:

(25) and yf ye do not so I shal *slee my self* wyth your swerde (39/14-15)

As there are only four relevant examples, it is difficult to reach any generalization as to the fixation of *sleen* and *self*-forms in *Paris and Vienne*. Still, the constant attestation of *self*-forms with this verb is

in accordance with the contention by Visser (1963-1973, I: §454) that the use of the *self*-form will help avoid a possible misinterpretation in such sentences as “she killed her” and “he forgot him”. He argues that *her* and *him* in these sentences can be someone else if they are not accompanied by *self*. Another possible explanation will be that the markedness of this usage is relevant. Reflexive uses are rather exceptional with the verb *sleen*, whose direct objects are usually someone else than the subject of the sentence. This markedness may have incited the use of *self*-forms in *Paris and Vienne*, as they are emphatic in origin. This explanation does not necessarily deny the argument by Visser, though. The use of the more emphatic form will help clarify the referent of the object of *sleen* and thus obviate possible misinterpretations in the end.

As hitherto discussed, there are some possible tendencies for some verbs to select simple personal pronouns and others *self*-forms. In other words, some verbs are more prepared than others to employ the newly developing *self*-forms. This, however, requires additional research into other contemporary Middle English texts for additional pieces of evidence. It is also important to consider that *Paris and Vienne* is a translated text, which may reveal some influence of the base text of translation. For the influence of French, see Section 8 below.

6. Simple and *self*-forms in prepositional phrases

In addition to their use as verb objects, reflexive pronouns either with or without *self* are also found in prepositional phrases, as illustrated by:

(26) Redoubted fader I see wel and knowe in *my self* that I haue mesprysed and faylled toward you (41/16-18)

It is generally assumed that *self*-forms are more frequent when reflexive pronouns are dominated by a preposition rather than a verb. The present section examines this.

In *Paris and Vienne*, there does indeed seem to be a fairly clear tendency for *self*-forms (rather than simple reflexive pronouns) to be comparatively frequent in prepositional phrases. See Table 4, which exhibits the frequencies of reflexive pronouns with or without *self* used as objects of verbs and prepositions in *Paris and Vienne*:

Table 4. Reflexive pronouns with or without *self* as objects of verbs and prepositions in Caxton’s *Paris and Vienne*

	simple forms	<i>self</i> -forms
with verbs ¹⁹⁾	59 (73.8%)	21 (26.3%)
with prepositions	17 (58.6%)	12 (41.4%)

As discussed in the previous section, different verbs show different tendencies, but on the whole, *self*-forms (as opposed to simple forms) appear less extensively when reflexive pronouns occur as objects of verbs rather than of prepositions. In other words, prepositional phrases tend to present more extended use of *self*-forms.

19) The category “with verbs” gives a total of 101%, which has been caused by the rounding of the ratios of the simple and *self*-forms.

As a matter of fact, Table 4 includes examples such as (27), where even today simple forms will be employed:

(27) and that eyther of them shold brynge *wyth hym* a present of rychesse (11/26-27)

The seventeen examples of simple forms in prepositional phrases (see Table 4) include about ten examples of this kind.²⁰ If all these are excluded from analysis, *Paris and Vienne* will show the predominance of *self*-forms in this particular syntactic context, a step closer to Present-day English. Because of this great gap between verbal and prepositional reflexive objects, the discussion in the following two sections will rely mostly on the examples of reflexive forms as verbal objects, although those in prepositional phrases are also mentioned wherever they are relevant.

7. Simple vs. *self*-forms and the person

One linguistic factor discussed in relation to the expansion of *self*-forms is the person involved in the sentence. As mentioned above, van Gelderen (2000: 203-208), on the basis of her research into *Sir Gawain* and Chaucer, argues that the establishment of *self*-forms occurs earlier in the third person than in the first and second persons. She points to the fact that in the first and second persons *self*-forms are often restricted to prepositional phrases, where they tend to expand earlier than in verb complements, while they are more widely attested in the third person.

If the third person is indeed progressive in terms of the expansion of *self*-forms, this will accord well with the contention by Newmeyer (2003: 694), who draws hints from Faltz (1985) and Comrie (1999), that distinctive reflexive forms are always available in the third person if they are available in the first and second persons. Newmeyer (2003) refers to the explanation by Faltz and Comrie that the third person is less easily identifiable than the first and second persons, who are speakers and listeners, and therefore has greater need, at least in comparison to the first and second persons, for an item to mark the reflexive relationship. He then moves on to his own explanation based on frequencies and maintains that the much more frequent occurrence of the third person singular than the first and second persons in language use is the key. His reasoning relies on the assumption that lexicalization occurs where particular items occur frequently. *Himself* occurs much more frequently than other relevant forms in English, and therefore its establishment as a compound takes place earlier, according to him.

In *Paris and Vienne*, *hym self* is indeed the most frequent combination by a large margin, when compared with other possible combinations of personal pronouns and *self*. Although this is visible in Table 2 above, it is perhaps practical to show it again, this time combined with the frequencies of simple forms and the reflexive uses as verb objects extracted. See Table 5:

20) The figure is approximate here, since in some occasional cases, reflexive forms with and without *self* are both attested even in Present-day English. This category is called “optional reflexive”, for which Quirk et al. (1985: 359) give the following example: “They left the apartment, pulling the spring lock shut behind *them/themselves*”. See also the following example quoted in Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1489): “Rhiana saw a spider near *her/herself*”. Thus the boundary between simple and *self*-forms is not yet 100% clear in contemporary English. This is ascribed to the fact that today’s English is simply a continuation of the history of English, in which simple reflexive forms and *self*-forms have long co-existed as variants. See also Poutsma (1904-1926, II, I-B: 861-862), who mentions the fact that the simple form served as a poetic device in late Modern English, when it was already archaic, to meet the exigency of metre, etc.

Table 5. Reflexive pronouns with or without *self* used as verb objects in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*

<i>me</i>	<i>us</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>hym</i>	<i>hyr</i>	<i>them</i>
7	1	13	19	6	13
<i>my self</i>	<i>our self</i>	<i>your self</i>	<i>hym self</i>	<i>hyr self</i>	<i>them self</i>
4	0	2	10	2	3

Although the number of *self*-forms is by far the largest in the third person, this in fact seems to derive from the numerous examples of *hym self*. Even though they are third person, *them self* and *hyr self* are not frequent at all. If indeed the development of *self*-forms is earlier in the third person than in the first and second persons, this will to a large extent be due to the earlier development of *himself*, which in turn may be due to its frequent attestation as proposed by Newmeyer (2003).²¹⁾

Simultaneously, however, Table 5 also shows the possible tendency for plural reflexive pronouns to stay behind in the adoption of *self*: both *your self* and *them self* are relatively scarce, not only in absolute frequencies but also in relative frequencies to their simple counterparts. All in all, it is probably safe to state that *Paris and Vienne* displays the beginning stage of the establishment of *self*-forms. Its sign is clearly visible with the frequent occurrence of *hym self*, but other forms have not really joined this trend. While *hym self* is clearly the harbinger, it is difficult to tell at this stage which other items join the development of *self*-forms earlier than the others. The contrast may be the singular to the plural, or the third person to the first and second persons. *My self* gives the impression that it is the next to join the trend, but to confirm this, we need additional data from other contemporary texts.

8. French pronominal verbs

In this section, Caxton's reflexive use of simple and *self*-forms in *Paris and Vienne* will be examined in comparison with two French versions of the same text—Le Roy (c.1480) and Leeu (1487)—which are most likely to have been available for reference to the printer in the process of translation. As in Section 7, examples of reflexive forms as verb objects will mainly be discussed.

Among the 80 English examples of simple and *self*-forms used as reflexive objects of verbs, three are located in passages where both of the two French versions fail to show enough textual parallelism with Caxton's version. Table 6 shows the breakdown of the 77 corresponding French expressions:

21) For the sake of reference, see also the following table, which gives the frequencies of reflexive pronouns used as objects of prepositions:

Reflexive pronouns with or without *self* used as objects of prepositions in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne*

<i>me</i>	<i>thee</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>hym</i>	<i>hyr</i>	<i>them</i>
1	0	3	8	0	5
<i>my self</i>	<i>thy self</i>	<i>your self</i>	<i>hym self</i>	<i>hyr self</i>	<i>them self</i>
1	1	1	7	1	1

Here again, the form *hym self* is by far the most frequent.

Table 6. French expressions corresponding to Caxton's use of reflexive forms

Caxton	French versions			
	directly related verbs		non-related verbs	
	pronominal	non-pronominal	pronominal	non-pronominal
simple forms (58)	11	5	25	17
<i>self</i> -forms (19)	3	0	15	1

If we consider simple and *self*-forms combined together, among the total 77 cases, 54 French passages (70%) are expressed with pronominal verbs. This means Caxton's use of reflexive forms does not always reflect the existence of French pronominal structures in the original text. When we turn attention to nineteen examples of *self*-forms, however, all but one (95%) have their corresponding French sentences with pronominal verbs, which indicates that the translator opted for the *self*-forms almost only when he saw the original text expressed with pronominal verbs. The following three example pairs represent such typical correspondence:

(28) e. and wente to vname them to þ^e place where they fyrst *armed them self* (9/1-2)
 f. et sen allerent desarmer ou premierement *cestoient armes* (R a7r-b)²²⁾

(29) e. & after he cursed the day that he was borne & moche *dyscomforted hym self* (49/19-21)
 f. et puis mauldisoit le iour quil naquit et *ce desconfortoit* moult (R e8r-a)

(30) e. that she must retorne to the mercy of hyr fader the doulphyn she *appeased hyr self* (40/23-24)
 f. et quil lui estoit force de retourner a la mercy de son pere le dauphin si *sappaisa* (R d3v-b)

Even in the fourteen cases where the original French text has directly (lexically) related pronominal verbs, Caxton more often (11/14) chooses to use simple pronominal forms, rather than *self*-forms. The following are three of eleven such cases:

(31) e. And vyenne *confessyd hyr* to hym moche deuoutely (27/2)
 f. Et vienne *se va confesser* a lui moult deuotement (R c6r-a)

(32) e. and knewe that he wold *estraunge hym* fro that contree (58/21)
 f. et sceut quil sen vouloit *estrangir* de la contree (R f7r-a)

(33) e. Parys & Edward yede to a secrete place where they *armed them* secretly (7/18-20)
 f. Et paris et edouard sercherent vng lieu secret ou ilz *se armassent* moult secretement (R a6r-b)

The last example is worth special attention. The same French pronominal verb *s'armer* is translated using a *self*-form in (28e). As discussed in Section 4, the development of *self*-forms here appears to be still at an early stage. In some other cases, Caxton uses simple pronominal forms where the lexi-

22) In French examples from Le Roy's (marked as "R") and Leeu's ("L") editions, abbreviations are expanded, with folio numbers, 'r' (recto) or 'v' (verso) and 'a' or 'b' (columns) following in parentheses.

cally related French verbs are not accompanied by object pronouns:

(34) e. *adyse you* wel fayr suster what honour is comen to me by his prowesse & by his bounte (19/12-13)

f. *Aduisez* belle seur quel honneur il me vient par sa prouesse et par sa bonte (R b8r-ab)

(35) e. and wente & *lodged them* in a lytel chyrche (36/10-11)

f. et allerent *logier* en vne petite esglise (R b5r-b-v-a)

Furthmore, Caxton uses simple reflexive forms as grammatical objects where the relevant French portions are expressed in non-pronominal predicates as in (36)-(39):

(36) e. Edward the kynges sone of englond *bare hym* (8/15-16)

f. Et alors *vint* edouard le filz au roy dangleterre (L 6r-b)

(37) e. wherof I *ferre me* that he shal become a man of relygyon (21/25-26)

f. dont iay grant *paour* quil ne le face homme de religion (R c1v-b-c2r-a)

(38) e. many of them were wery of the Iouste & *rested them* (8/21-22)

f. beaucoup deulx estoient ennuyez et *prenoyent espace de reposer* (R a7r-b)

(39) e. sayd that ye shold remembre and *adyse you* (73/24)

f. et a dit que vous y *penses* (R h2r-a)

They reflect the fact that transitive-intransitive distinction, or argument structures of verbs were not fully established in either language.

A closer look at the verbs used in the French versions reveals another noteworthy tendency. Out of the nineteen examples of *self*-forms, Caxton uses English verbs that are lexically related to the corresponding French pronominal verbs only in three cases. Among the remaining sixteen, excluding one case where the verb *être* ‘be’ is used in the French versions, as many as fifteen (80%) examples of *self*-forms appear as the object of English verbs that are lexically unrelated to the French verbs found in the relevant original passages.²³⁾ This fact implies that Caxton’s use of those *self*-forms is not necessarily the result of simple transplant of similar French structures. Rather, in these cases, he chooses a suitable English verb and then places a *self*-form following it. A similar tendency, though to a lesser extent, is observable in the 58 cases of simple reflexive forms: the majority of relevant French passages are expressed with lexically unrelated verbs.

This brings us to the next question: when the translator decides to use an English verb that is lexically unrelated to the French original, what prompted him to choose either the simple or the *self*-form, especially when the French verb is accompanied by a reflexive pronoun? Table 7 shows Cax-

23) The one example of a non-pronominal French verb *être* ‘be’ translated by Caxton using a *self*-form is an imperative sentence:

(i) e. *make your self* al redy (68/36)

f. soyez appareilliez (R g6v-a)

ton's translation patterns of French pronominal structures where he chooses lexically unrelated English verbs:

Table 7. French pronominal verbs and lexically non-related English verbs in their translation

	with simple forms	with <i>self</i> -forms
French > English	s'en aller > absent se réveiller > awake se penser > bethought se vêtir > clothe (5) se muer > deceive s'ébattre > disport s'ennuyer > grieve se mettre à (dormir) > lay s'apprêter > make (3) s'armer > make s'appareiller > make (2) se dépêcher > make s'asseoir > set se donner > take s'éloigner > withdraw (4)	s'habiller > array se complaindre > bewail s'accorder > dispose se faire > do se parforcer > enforce se trouver > find se donner > give s'escondre > hide se tenir > hold se garder > keep se voir > see se tuer > slee (4)

N = 40

One notices that quite a few verbs found in the left-hand column represent situations that are not typically transitive, that is, the represented situations do not necessarily involve semantic agents or patients (cf. Kemmer 1992, 1993). It should also be noted here that some other examples of Caxton's use of simple reflexive forms, in cases where French counterparts are not in the pronominal structure, as in (36)-(39) above, seem to accord with this semantic tendency. Verbs attested in those examples include *advise* (for *penser* 'think'), *bare* (for *venir* 'come'), *fear*, *make ready*, *remember* and *rest*, which cluster more or less around the semantic category of "middle".

In contrast, several examples with the *self*-forms in Table 7 represent the situations that are comparatively higher in transitivity (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1980; also cf. Kemmer 1994), that is, the verbs in the right-hand column include those which represent actions that typically affect people or things other than the actor themselves. The *self*-forms in those examples explicitly mark that the actor and the patient are co-referential in the represented situations.

The present study has so far been based on a broad sense of reflexivity and explored all examples with co-referential objects, whether they are simple in form or with *self*, and whether they are in verbal or prepositional phrases. As a working method, this has been practical, since reflexivity can be acknowledged only when the sentence includes "reflexive pronouns", which can manifest as either simple pronouns or *self*-forms. As discussed above, a single verb can take both types of "reflexive pronouns", showing the transitional stage of the development of "reflexive pronouns" in *Paris and Vienne*. The above discussion, however, alludes to a possible line of research into reflexivity, perhaps around the semantic area of relevant verbs, which will be a separate work of ours in the future.

9. Conclusion

As hitherto discussed, *Paris and Vienne* published towards the end of the Middle English period yields a number of *self*-forms, which are morphologically stable in the sense that they lack variant

forms. The forms attested in this text are limited to: *my self*, *thy self*, *your self*, *hym self*, *hyr self* and *them self*. They are essentially the same in form as in Present-day English except that *self* is always separated by a space from the personal pronoun with which it occurs and that the plural form is *self* instead of *selves*.

Although this gives the impression that *self*-forms are fairly well-established in *Paris and Vienne*, this is not exactly the case, since there are much more frequent attestations of simple pronominal forms without *self*. Hence the above discussion has dealt with some linguistic conditions possibly related to the choice of reflexive forms. First of all, the analysis of the relationship between the forms of reflexivity and different verbs involved in the construction has shown that there are some verbs which occur always with *self*-forms, such as *sleen*, whereas more commonly encountered are verbs which tend to show simple forms only, e.g. *aduysen*, *clothen* and *wythdrawen*.

Secondly, the above discussion has shown that *self*-forms are more extensively found when the reflexive occurs as objects of prepositions rather than of verbs. *Paris and Vienne* does not yield numerous relevant examples in prepositional phrases, but the tendency for this environment to present *self*-forms more extensively than in other environments is clear enough.

The third factor considered above was the relationship between the reflexive and the person. It has been examined whether *self*-forms are better established in the third person than in the first and second persons, as previous studies suggest. The data in *Paris and Vienne* indeed show that *hym self* (third person singular) is distinctively frequent when compared with other *self*-forms, but this may be due to the frequent occurrence of this combination in language in general. Even in the third person, *hyr self* and *them self* are not necessarily frequent. The data obtained even suggest that the distinction between the singular and plural may in fact be more relevant than distinctions of person.

Finally, comparing Caxton's use of reflexive forms with usage in French versions of *Paris and Vienne* has shown that Caxton uses *self*-forms mostly when the relevant French expressions are in the pronominal structure. The verbs used to translate the French pronominal verbs are, however, often not lexically or etymologically close items. The translator's choice of English expressions seems fairly independent of the French original. In addition, it emerged that in Caxton's text of *Paris and Vienne*, the *self*-forms are mainly used to mark explicitly the co-reference of the semantic actor/agent and the undergoer/patient, while simple reflexive forms tend to be used to represent situations that are lower in transitivity. Further semantic analyses from typological viewpoints remain to be undertaken.

References

- Comrie, Bernard. 1999. "Reference-tracking: Description and Explanation". *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 52: 335-346.
- Faltz, Leonard M. 1985. *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. New York: Garland.
- Fischer, Olga. 1992. "Syntax", in *The Cambridge History of the English Language, II: 1066-1476*, ed. Norman Francis Blake, pp. 207-408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". *Language* 56: 251-299.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1992. "Grammatical Prototypes and Competing Motivations in a Theory of Linguistic Change", in *Explanation in Historical Linguistics*, ed. Garry Davis & Gregory Iverson, pp. 145-166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1994. "Middle Voice, Transitivity, and the Elaboration of Events", in *Voice: Form and Function*, ed. Bar-

- bara A. Fox & Paul J. Hopper, pp. 179-229. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2000. "Intensifiers and Reflexives: A Typological Perspective", in *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, ed. Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci S. Curl, pp. 41-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leach, MacEdward (ed.). 1957. *Paris and Vienne: Translated from the French and Printed by William Caxton*. EETS O.S. 234. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax, Part I: Parts of Speech*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2003. "Grammar is Grammar and Usage is Usage". *Language* 79: 682-707.
- Ogura, Michiko. 1989a. *Verbs with the Reflexive Pronoun and Constructions with self in Old and Early Middle English*. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Ogura, Michiko. 1989b. "Simple Reflexives, Compound Reflexives, and Compound Forms of 'Refl/non-Refl Pron + Self' in Old and Middle English". *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 4: 49-72.
- Ogura, Michiko. 1991. "Displese yow and Displesees yow: OE and ME Verbs Used Both 'Impersonally' and Reflexively". *Poetica* 34: 75-87.
- Ogura, Michiko. 2001. "Verbs Used Reflexively in Old and Middle English: A Case of the Syntactic Continuity and Lexical Change". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 102: 23-36.
- Ogura, Michiko. 2003. "'Reflexive' and 'Impersonal' Constructions in Medieval English". *Anglia* 121: 535-556.
- Ogura, Michiko. 2017. "Compound Reflexive as a Metrical Filler, or *Self* in *Himself* Used as an Alliterating Element?". *Studies in English Literature* 58: 77-95.
- Poutsma, Hendrik. 1904-1926. *A Grammar of Late Modern English: For the Use of Continental, Especially Dutch, Students*. 2 parts in 4 vols. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Siemund, Peter, Georg Maier & Martin Schweinberger. 2012. "Reflexive and Intensive *Self*-forms", in *Areal Features of the Anglophone World*, ed. Raymond Hickey, pp. 409-437. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Uchida, Mitsumi & Yoko Iyeiri. 2017. "For and Because: A Comparative Study of Causal Conjunctions in Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* and Three French Versions of the Same Text", in *Language Contact and Variation in the History of English*, ed. Mitsumi Uchida, Yoko Iyeiri & Lawrence Schourup, pp. 61-79. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- van der Gaaf, Willem. 1904. *The Transition from the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2000. "Bound Pronouns and Non-local Anaphors: The Case of Earlier English", in *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, ed. Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci S. Curl, pp. 187-225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Visser, Frederik Th. 1963-1973. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Self-forms in Caxton's Paris and Vienne

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the development of reflexive *self*-forms in the history of English, exploring William Caxton's *Paris and Vienne* and two related French versions of the same text. It is known that *self* was in origin a simple intensifier, which occurred only optionally in earlier English. In *Paris and Vienne*, both simple personal pronouns and *self*-forms were used in the reflexive. The inventory of *self*-forms in this text, namely *my self*, *thy self*, *your self*, *hym self*, *hyr self* and *them self*, was already stable, with *hym self* being the most frequent. Also, *self*-forms were more commonly employed in prepositional phrases than as verbal complements. A comparative analysis of the English and French versions indicate that Caxton's reflexive forms often correspond to French pronominal verbs, although the English and French verbs involved are not necessarily etymologically linked. Overall, simple reflexive pronouns rather than *self*-forms tended to occur with verbs of lower transitivity. For this final point, more extensive research into various verbs is needed from semantic and typological perspectives.

Key Words: reflexive pronouns, translation, William Caxton