# 埼玉学園大学・川口短期大学　機関リポジトリ

## Investigation on the Present Participial Construction in the Language of A Revelation of Love

| メタデータ | 言語: eng |
| --- | --- |
| | 出版者: |
| | 公開日: 2017-08-21 |
| | キーワード (Ja): |
| | キーワード (En): |
| | 作成者: 片見, 彰夫 |
| | メールアドレス: |
| | 所属: |
| URL | https://saigaku.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/957 |

# Investigation on the Present Participial Construction in the Language of *A Revelation of Love*

KATAMI, Akio

The aims of this paper are to investigate the present participial construction in Julian of Norwich's *A Revelation of Love* in form, meaning and position, comparing her with that of her contemporary writers including Geoffrey Chaucer and Margery Kempe and with Modern English in London-Lund Corpus. In the latter half of the fourteenth century, when this prose was written, the ending *-ing* was common in verbal nouns, while participial endings had certain dialectal variations. In the prose of Julian of Norwich, the two suffixes, *-and* and *–ing*, are found side by side in thirty-nine verbs. It is assumed that stylistic elements such as the avoidance of confusion in modified words and verbal nouns correlate with word ending preferences.

In sense Julian mainly employs temporal interpretation in the present participial construction, and most constructions are positioned in the middle or end of sentences. The paratactic structure is helpful in story progression, addition of information, summarization and enumeration. Her usage of the participial construction forms the basis of an effective means to make her preaching understood. Julian makes the most of its prototypical meanings like 'temporality' and 'simultaneity' in apposite participles emerging out of Latin influence. One may be justified in conjecturing a possibility that she aimed at making her words grave and dignified by adopting a literary style that originated from Latin rhetoric.

## 1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to show and argue how Julian of Norwich, the earliest woman whose writing in English can be identified, uses the present participle and gerund in *A Revelation of Love* (*A Revelation* for short). She was a Benedictine anchoress, living as a recluse in a cell of which traces still remain in the east part of the churchyard of St. Julian in Norwich, which belonged to Carrow Priory. Her life was one of prayer and contemplation, a life highly thought of by people of the time, as is shown that by a great influence exercised by her upon Margery Kempe. Julian's work survives in a shorter and a longer form. The shorter text - BL, MS Add. 37790 - was probably recorded soon after 1373, when she was granted 'shewings'. Of the longer versions three manuscripts are

known to exist. In the order of antiquity they rank as follows: MS fonds anglais 40 (P) in Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, in British Library MS Sloane 2499 (S1), which we are going to survey, and MS Sloane 3705 (S2). The reason why S1 was chosen as most suitable for this study is that it appears to preserve best on the whole the idiom and vocabulary of a late fourteenth-century English among the three longer versions. Windeatt supports this as follows:

> (1) Windeatt (2004:70) …in looks S1 makes no pretence to be other than of its age, it does preserve medieval English linguistic forms more faithfully and consistently than the text in P (or S2), and hence has been preferred over P as the basis of modern editions.[1]

In the 17th century when this manuscript was copied, it was important for scholarly books to be written in Latin. And not a few of her audience were considered to be educated with religious backgrounds.

The participle construction (PC henceforth) in this paper is called as follows in grammar books: appositive participle (Mustanoja 1960), free adjuncts (Visser 1963), appositional participle (Jespersen 1954), subjectless (supplementive) clause (Quirk et al. 1985)

Little descriptive research has been done on her language and style regardless of its importance of her prose in English literature. There involves some distinguished studies. Stone (1970) compares Julian's style with that of Margery Kempe taking up mainly alliteration and monotony. Riehle (1977) surveys and analyses the language of metaphor in the writings of medieval mystics including Julian of Norwich. Substantial research, however, has not been done on the present participle which occurs frequently in two suffixes, *-and* and *–ing*. The appositive participle, which is due to the influence of Latin syntax, has become quite common since OE. Her prose, significantly enough, belongs to the era that the present participle was taking root in English through Latin influences. This is supported by Manabe (1995: 27-28) who quotes corpora of Quirk and Svartvik (1970: 406-410). Manabe proves that a participle as adjunct increases slowly after the Middle English period. Quirk and Svartvik states, "we can note 'source conditioning', such as the strikingly high proportion of participial verb (in particular absolute constructions) in Boece, undoubtedly influenced by the corresponding constructions in the Latin model." By the same token, free adjuncts are abundant in *A Revelation*. Yet, curiously enough, it is originally written in English, not a Latin translation. I shall go further and give a sketch of how these historical backgrounds affect the style of Julian. After considering her prose style in the next section, I shall mention three points of view: form, meaning and position.

## 2 The Style of *A Revelation*

The first point that we should discuss is the style of this prose. Does this employ mainly literary or colloquial? Julian confesses her illiterateness as in (2):

(2) These revelations were shewed to a simple creature that cowde no letter, the yeere of our lord 1373,… ( ii .2)[2]

However, judging from the fact that Julian created the Longer Version from the Shorter one, she might be, in fact, literate and learned at least during twenty years between the two versions. As A.S.G.Edwards once put it:

(3) Features that Julian's prose shares with that of the illiterate Margery Kemp – such as the frequent use of tautologically paired words and constructions relying on repetition – appear also in much other prose of the period. That Julian revised her work provides a further complication. Stylistic differences between versions perhaps reflect partly the difference between dictated and written composition; Julian may have become literate during the years separating her texts. (Edwards 1984: 103)

Görlach's idea also supports that Julian was literate enough to make variations by herself:

(4) …the longer version amounts to a second edition of the Revelations, and presumable most of these alterations are attributable to Julian herself. (Görlach 1978: 25)

We should not, however, overlook the fact that this prose also includes colloquialism as Glasscoe states:

(5) It is very probable that her account of the revelations was dictated to an amanuensis. Certainly the rhythms and inflexions of her use of language are often those of the speaking voice… (Glasscoe 1976: xviii)

There is enough room to reflect colloquialism when we consider the literary background of the era like the following:

(6) By very definition, of course, the term 'woman writer' when applied to the Middle Ages can be regarded as oxymoronic, implying as it does a contravention of space by a transgressive female voice speaking to an imagined audience outside the margins of her social or religious confinement. The very act of writing, be it performed within the confines of the private chamber, anchorhold or monastery, constituted a type of public speech-act directed at a real or imagined audience which necessarily moved the writer from the realm of the private into the public. (McAvoy 2004: 6)

An interesting feature is her frequent use of the PC in colloquialisms, in contrast to low frequency in Modern English.

## 3 The Form of the Present Participle

### 3.1 Distribution of {-and} and {-ing} suffixes

Julian uses variant forms of present participle suffixes and gerunds: -*and* and –*ing*. The following diagram shows the distribution of -*and* and -*ing* suffixes and usage in the whole. The suffix –*and* mainly appears as a participle and amounts to 95.6 . On the other hand, as for participles, the number of -*and* is one-hundred and seventy-five, whereas that of –*ing* is two-hundred and fifty two. It is interesting to note that participle suffix -*ing* outnumbers –*and* suffix in number. In this

section, we turn our attention to some causes by which one suffix is taken as more appropriate than another.

|  | participle (%) | gerund (%) | total |
|---|---|---|---|
| -and {-and} | 175 (95.6) | 8 (4.4) | 183 |
| -end {-and} | 1 (100) | 0 (0) | 1 |
| -ing {-ing} | 134 (23.8) | 428 (76.2) | 562 |
| -ung {-ing} | (0) | 1 (100) | 1 |
| -yng {-ing} | 118 (14) | 722 (86) | 840 |

In Norfolk –and and –ing coexisted in ME period.[3] The point to observe in *A Revelation* is the fact that many of the gerundial suffixes take –ing, whereas the ratio of participial –and to –ing is 41.0% (175 instances) to 59.0% (252 instances). As quoted in (7) and (8), despite the statement of Mustanoja that the two forms are "occasionally" found side by side, as for Julian this vacillation are exceptionally frequent. Contrary to participial variations caused by the characters' backgrounds in Chaucer's *Reeves Tale*, Julian arbitrarily uses these variants. How does she draw a line about the use of these two forms?

(7) The OE ending of the present participle, -ende, is found in ME in the form –inde (-ende) in the South and the Midlands and in the form –and(e) in the North and the N Midlands. At the end of the 12th century and in the course of the 13th the ending of the participle becomes –ing(e) in the southern and central parts of the country. (Mustanoja 1960: 547)

(8) The two forms are occasionally found side by side:… The appearance of –ing as the ending of the present participle is

a much-discussed subject. It is obviously not merely a morphological but also a phonological and syntactical process. (ibid.)

In the instance below {-ing} and {-and} seem to appear without distinction. Examples abound like (9):

(9) …in which werkyng he will we ben his helpers, *gevyng* to him al our entendyng, *lerand* his loris, *kep[yng]* his lowes, *desirand* that we al be done that he doith, truely *trosting* in hym;…(lvii. 93)

Indeed we may admit that one cause for these vacillations is that the 14th century preceded the standardization of grammar. Yet, as a matter of fact, it is reasonable to suppose that Julian was careful in her choice of the two suffixes based on context and usage. She may have been conscious of the viewpoint of her readers and listeners. The same verb has both variants, so whether active or static has no connection. Thus, there are thirty-nine verbs which take both {-and} and {-ing} as the present participial suffix. They are showon as in (10):

(10) abiden / ben / biholden / bledan / enjoien / everlasten / fallen / flouen / folwen / fulfillen / gifan / gon / haven / joien / kepen / knouen / leren / lasten / liven / longen / louen / menen / merveillen / mornen / overpassen / passen / preien / quaken / reulen / seien / sen / sheuen / stonden / sufferen / thanken / thinken / turnen / willen / wonen

We shall now look more carefully into the condition of occurrence of these words.

## 3.2 Semantic Basis to Avoid Confusion among Subjects and Modified Parts

Julian chooses either of the suffixes to clarify the modified statements. The reason of *fulfilling* in (11a), and *fulfilland* in (11b) might be inferred from the distinction of modification. In the former, *-and* participle lovand modifies a noun *soule*. Likewise in (12a) the subject of *sekyng* is *I*, while *menand* is a particple as an attendant circumstance to supply the content of *helpe* just before. This is applicable to instances with the same endings, which on the surface seems to contradict the above explanation. Take (13) for example. The subject of both *lovand* and *dredand* is *he* in the matrix clause, and that of *kepand* is *God*. Although their subjects are different, their suffixes are integrated. The reason for this is the conjunction *and* preceding *nevertheless* plays a role of a marker to show addition of a new sentence. As a result, there is little concern over confusion. That is also valid for (14) of the same subjects *we:*

(11)　　Thus is that blisfull syte end of all manner of peyne to *lovand* soule, *and fulfilling* all manner of ioy and bliss. (lxxii. 116)

　　for ryte the same that mankynde shal ben in endles bliss *fulfilland* the ioye of God as anempts…(liii. 85)

(12)　　I cryed inwardly with al my myte, *sekyng* into God for helpe, *menand* thus: "A! lord Iesus, (l. 71)

And al this shewid he ful blisfully, *meneing* thus: "Se I am God…(xi. 18)

(13)…he was a derworthy servant to God, mekyl God *lovand* and *dredand*, and nevertheless God suffrid him to fall, hym mercyfully *kepand* that he perished not ne lost no tyme;(xxxviii.52)

(14) He loveith us endlesly, and we synne customably, and he shewith us full myldely; and than we sorow and mornen discretly, *turnand* us into the beholding of his mercy, *clevand* to his love and goodness, *seand* that he is our medecine, *wittand* that we doe nowte but synne.(lxxxii.131)

## 3.3 Cause for Distinctness of Participle near Gerund

Since gerund *vnderstonding* is adjacent to participle *seyand* in (15a), differentiation of suffix is effective for avoiding grammatical confusion here. This is also relevant to (16ab):

(15)　　And xv yer after and more I was answerid in gostly *vnderstonding, seyand* thus: "Woldst thou wetten… (lxxxvi: 135)

　　I beheld with avisement, *seing* and *knowing* in sight with a soft drede, …(xi. 17)

(16)　　This iid sheweing was so low and so litil and so simple that my sprets were in grete travel in the *beholding, mornand*, dredfull and longand; (x: 15)

for God gave me *vnderstondyng* and knowing that it was hymself that I saw; *morning*, (xlvii. 66)

## 3.4 Juxtaposition, conjunction *and*

Juxtaposition is another cause for the unification of the suffixes:

(17)    , seing verily the cause of allthyng that God hath don dredfully *tremeland* and *thankand* for ioye, mervelyng the gretnes of God (and) lulshed of all that is made…(lxxv. 120)

   , him reverently *thankyng* and *praiseyng* of our makyng, mytily *prayeng* to our moder of mercy and pite,..(lix: 96)

(18)    …., him *loveand*, him *thankand*, him *praysand.* (liii. 86)

   …. feythfully knowing his everlasting love, him *thanking* and *prayseing*, (lxxxii. 131)

## 4  Features – Meaning　Position

## 4.1  Meanings of the PC and Comparative Observation

Kortmann's statement in the case of PC in Modern English suggests that construction leaves room for the subjectivity of recipients:

(19) …,it has been suggested that one may postulate a gradient of "informativeness" on which interclausal relations can be arranged according to, primarily, the degree of world knowledge or (co-/ contextually substantiated) evidence that is required in order for a free ad-

junct or absolute to be given the relevant interpretation. (Kortmann 1995: 223)

The participle in ME needs to be examined here. Mustanoja (1960: 555-556) categorizes:

"Appositive Participle" which correspond with the PC as temporal / modal / causal / final / conditional / concessive / consecutive, and adds it is often used instead of a co-ordinate clause.

Visser (1972: 1132-1140) tentatively divides the notional relationships between the –*ing* adjunct and the main syntactical unit as follows, and years in the parenthesis are his oldest quotations, showing us they are almost coincident with *A Revelation*: attendant circumstances (c1250) / cause, reason (c1225) / time (c1300) / condition (c1382) / concession (c1340) / means, manner (c1200) / purpose (c1340)

We need to draw attention to the problem that the frequency of each signification still remains unsettled yet. The following are some of the claims made concerning the interclausal relationships found in Jespersen and Quirk et al.:

(20) Cause or reason, generally corresponding to a clause with *as*. This is particularly frequent with *being*, but may also be found with other first participles. (Jespersen 1954　62)

*Having seen*, placed in the beginning of the sentence generally denotes time, but it indicates a cause or reason when placed at the end… (Ibid. : 407)

(21) In –*ing* clauses, verbs used dynamically tend to suggest a temporal link, and

stative verbs a causal link. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1124)

According to context, we may wish to imply temporal, conditional, causal, concessive, or circumstantial relationship. In short, the supplementive clause implies an accompanying circumstance to the situation described in the matrix clause. For the reader or hearer, the actual nature of the accompanying circumstance has to be inferred from the context. (ibid.)

There are regularities to some extent as above; however we need to keep in mind that interpretation of the PC is likely to become multifarious caused by the overlapping of some meanings. Below are diagrams illustrating distribution of semantic relations of free adjuncts in *A Revelation*. By reference to data of Chaucer and those of Modern English, we will note some distinctive features employed by Julian. It is necessary to note that figures of Kortmann's data based on London-Lund Corpus and those of Chaucer's works are not limited to religious prose; therefore, we will just consult them  to grasp the general inclination.

n=288      %   round off to one decimal places

| meaning | frequency (n) | category |
|---|---|---|
| Simultaneity | 49.6% (143) | Temporal |
| Addition / Accompanying circumstance | 36.8% (106) | Temporal |
| Time | 0.7% (2) | Temporal |
| Cause | 2.8% (8) | Conceptual |
| Exemplification / Specification | 6.9% (20) | Conceptual |
| Condition | 0.3% (1) | Conceptual |
| Concession | 2.8% (8) | Conceptual |
| Progressive form   12 | Restrictive Adjunct / Modifier 127 | Complement 4 |

Kortmann (1995  216) London-Lund Corpus (The number of words in each register: Fiction 150,000  News 100,000 Science 50,000 Conversation 150,000)    n=1412

| meaning | frequency (n) | category |
|---|---|---|
| Simultaneity | 19.5% | Temporal |
| Addition / Accompanying circumstance | 12.2% | Temporal |
| Cause | 11.8% | Conceptual |
| Exemplification / Specification | 11.5% | Conceptual |
| Condition | 4.0% | Conceptual |
| Concession | 3.4% | Conceptual |

Cf. Higuchi (1996: 355) Related adjuncts in Chaucer's works[4]  n=242

| meaning | frequency (n) | category |
|---|---|---|
| Attendant circumstance | 58.7% (142) | Temporal |
| Time | 4.5% (11) | Temporal |
| Means | 5.0% (12) | Temporal |
| Coordinate | 21.0% (50) | Temporal |
| Purpose | 0.8% (2) | Conceptual |
| Cause | 7.0% (17) | Conceptual |
| Concession | 3.3% (8) | Conceptual |

In *A Revelation*, a temporal usage amounts to approximately 87% and in Chaucer's works 89%. It must be noted that these figures are contrastive to 31% of Modern English observed by Kortmann.

## 4.2 The Basic Meaning of the PC and the Usage of Julian

The following statements show that the PC has a temporal relationship where the event in the subordinate clause is located simultaneous with that in the main clause:

(22) In all cases like *He came, carrying a heavy burden on his back, He comes, carrying a heavy burden on his back*, and *He will come, carrying a heavy burden on his back* we have a vague simultaneity with something else, rather than any definite reference to one particular time. (Jespersen 1909-1942: vol. 4, 91)

(23) When this participle (=the present participle) appears in a non-finite construction,...it is said to have 'relative present time meaning', i.e. express simultaneity as its basic meaning. (Dahl 1985: 25)

(24) ...Temporal coincidence is also the hallmark of *–ing*, which occurs with many more types of main-clause predicates than does zero. In the case of *–ing*, though, a distinction has to be made between the overall subordinate event and the profiled segment of that event. ...The most one might hope to say for the entire class of such constructions is

that there is always some kind of overlap between the main-and subordinate-clause profiles. (Langacker 1991: 444-445)

The significations in the PC involve both temporal and conceptual ones. The core concept common to them, however, is 'simultaneity', which amounts to approximate 87% in *A Revelation*. Here are some instances:

(25) he is the first receyvor of our prayors, as to my syte, and takyth it ful thankfully and heyly *enioyand*; (xli. 57)

(26) God will we onderstond, *desirand* of al our hert and al our strength to have knoing of hem more and...(lvi. 91)

(27) we se nedys wherfore we prayen, than our good lord folowyth us, *helpand* our desire. (xliii. 61)

(28) he hastily reysith us, not *brekyng* his love for our trespass, for he may not suffre his child...(lxi. 99)

(29) , willand that we have ever sekir trost in his blisfull behests, *knowyng* his goodness; (lxx. 113)

In some instances, the PC have developed the polysemy such as 'cause', 'condition' and 'concessive' by a domains shift as follows:

(30) Cause: He is our clotheine that for love wrappith us, (halseth) us and all beclosyth us for tender love, that hee may never leave us, *being* to us althing that is gode, (Trans. when I saw it he is everything that is good,) as to myne understondyng. (v. 7)

(31) Condition: and how in the day of dome the ioy of the blissid shal ben incresid,

*seing* verily the cause (Trans. since they see the true reason) of allthyng that God hath don… (lxxv.120)

(32) Concessive: , *seying* she had ravid, (Trans. though she says (she) was so ill,) which, being hir gret sekeness, I suppose was but venial synne; (lxvi.107)

Julian does not use augmented PC[5] to imply cause and temporality. The augmented participle is effective to clarify an interclausal connotation by the use of a preposition. Therefore it seems reasonable to propose that she chiefly applies prototypical connotation like 'simultaneity', 'attendant circumstance' and 'succession' in order to avoid ambiguity. Accompanying the stabilities of those prototypical implications, informative as well as subjective labels such as 'causal' 'conditional' and 'concessive' are to be increased.[6]

I would like to add the evidence of prototypical feature of Julian's usage. In *A Revelation*, background aspects with a wider range of time appear in the main clause. Meanwhile, instantaneous aspects emerge as a free adjunct in a participial clause. Namely abstract event is ordinarily expressed in a main clause and specific event is in a subordinate clause as the following example indicates:

(33) And ryth thus will our lord that we ac-cusen ourselfe (main clause), wilfully and sothly seand and knowand our fal-lyng and all the harmes that cum thereof, seand and witand that we may neve(r) restoren it, subordinate clause and therwith that we wilfully and truly sen

and knowen his everlasting love that he hath us, (lii. 83)

On the other hand, markers like *thereby, therefore* are accompanied with participle in present-day English, thus to increase acceptability exemplified by the following:

(34) The uses of passive devices reduce the number of active components through-out the network, *thereby* decreasing the number of potential faults.  Hayase 2002: 166

No reversal example like (34) is found in Julian, hence no conjunct marker is required. Therefore the evidence leads us to believe that her use of the present PC occurs in a limited domain of meaning. Julian's awareness of her audience and readers deserves a mention as a crucial element to make up her style. Based on her temporal use and simplified style of the present PC, we may be justified in mentioning her intent to let her readers and audience understand her aurally. Her style is suitable in colloquialism for its locality of the signification.

## 4.3 Position

There are three positions of participle which may: (35) precede the main clause (front-position), (36) intervene between the subject and the predicate (mid-position) or (37) follow the main clause (end-position).

(35) And stondyng al this, methowte it was impossibil that al manner thyng should be wele as our lord shewid in this tyme; and as to this I had no other answere in shewyng of our lord God… (xxxii. 45)

(36) And I, <u>beholdyng</u> al this be his grace, saw that the love of hym was so strong whych he hath to our soule that wilfully he ches it with gret desyr and myldly he suffrid it with wel payeyng; …(xx. 30)

(37) Ther arn v hey ioyes, as I vnderstond, in which he wil that we enioyen, hym <u>praysyng</u>, him <u>thankyng</u>, him <u>loveing</u>, him endlesly <u>blissand</u>. (lii. 81)

According to Kortmann's date (1995: 205), free adjuncts in front-position amount to 32.2%, 6.9% is placed in the middle, and 60.9% occur in end position. And according to Higuchi (1996: 355-357) in the case of Chaucer's works, 30 instances occur at front-position, 36 at mid- position and end-position is by far the most frequent, 176 instances. Excluding *Boece*, which is translated from the French text in Latin original, front-position is 27 (13.5%), medial is 14 (7%) and 159 instances (79.5%) occur at the end. And in three prose *Melibee, Parson's Tale* and *Astrolabe*, free adjuncts occur exclusively in end-position.

In the Book of Margery Kempe, who frequently visited Julian and was greatly affected by her, I collected data in the first thirty chapters of Book with number of words 28,000, which amounts to half of those of *A Revelation*. In Kempe a ratio of mid-position is raised because of its noun modifying function.

In the diagram below I shall look into the position of Julian: front-position (1.4%), id-position 67 (23.3%), end-position 217 (75.3%).

|  | front | mid | end |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| London-Lund (Kortmann1995) | 32.2%, | 6.9% | 60.9% |
| Chaucer (except Boece) | 30 27 (13.5%) | 36 14 (7%) | 176 159 (79.5%) |
| Margery Kempe | 0 (0%) | 59 (43.4%) | 77 (56.6%) |
| Julian | 4 (1.4%) | 67 (23.3%) | 217 (75.3%) |

After the main clause, chiefly at the end position, the PC verb indicates a situation located simultaneous with the time of the main verb. This connotation leads to the PC verb successive to time of the main clause, yielding the function of putting events chronologically and time progression. The following is one of the instances which exemplifies this type of PC:

(38) But in this I stode beholdyng generally, swemly and mournyng, *seyng* thus to our lord in my meaning menyng with ful grete drede: (xxix. 40)

(But while I understood beholding all this, troubled and grieving, *and said* thus to our lord in my meaning with great dread.)

In the case of Modern English Kortmann argues:

(39) Postposed adverbial clauses, on the other hand, serve a much more "local" function by exhibiting a high degree of referential continuity with the main clause and by providing more specific or additional information to the matrix proposition. (Kortmann 1995: 228-229)

These 'information adding' and 'time progressing' function exit in ME and Julian frequently makes good use of them in her rhetoric. We will now consider accounts by Chafe:

(40)　It would seem that often, though perhaps not always, the adverbial clause modifies only part of what was stated in the main clause—not everything in that clause. In such cases, what is modified is likely to be located toward the end of the main clause. (Chafe 1984: 447)

　　　To explain the distribution of free adverbial clauses I invoked, first, the notion of guideposts to information flow. Preposed adverbial clauses appear to serve this function, orienting the listener or reader temporally, conditionally, causally, or otherwise, to the information in the main clause which is to follow. (ibid: 448)

From these assertions some general points become clear; i.e. postposed adverbial clauses serve a "local" function by exhibiting a high degree of referential continuity with the main clause and by providing more specific or additional information to the matrix proposition. Simultaneously they take a unitary function which supports the interpretation that the producers of such sequences are focusing separately, first on the main assertion and then on the adverbial one as "afterthought." The observation holds in *A Revelation*. Consider the following extract:

(41) The iid came to my mynde with contrition, frely *desireing* that sekenesse so herde as to deth that I might, in that sekeness, vnderfongyn all my rites of holy church, myselfe *weneing* that I should dye, and that all creatures might suppose the same that seyen me; (iii. 3)

　　　(Trans: The second came to my mind with great urgency, (I) sincerely *desiring* that sickness so hard to the point of dying that I might, in that sickness, receive all my rites of Holy Church, *believing* myself that I should die, and all creatures might suppose the same that said to me.)

(41) shows that the subordinate clause adds information and puts together plural sentences into one.

A small number of preposed participles against a large one of the postposed denotes that Julian does not employ participial clauses as "guidepost" to serve a frame setting function for the material that follows, but as "afterthought" to provide more specific or additional information. The paratactic structure is also helpful in the effect we have seen in the previous section, 'story progression,' 'addition of information,' 'summarization' and 'enumeration'. If we postulate a readership and oral delivery, the position is suitable to the local meanings. These observations are connected with Smith's statement below:

(42) The paratactic style pushes interpretative responsibility onto the audience/reader of the text, leaving the latter to draw conclusions; thus parataxis is the dominant mode in orally-delivered texts, where authorial utterance is part of a collective act of creation. (Smith 2005: 66)

(43) demonstrates her use of enumeration.

(43) The heyest bliss that is, is to have him in cleerty of endless life, him verily se-and, him swetely feland, all perfectly haveand in fulhede of ioy. (lxxii.115)

(Translation: The highest blessdness there is, is to have God in the clear light of eternity, seeing him in truth, experiencing his sweetness, and possessing him in utter perfection and fullest joy.)

## Conclusion

In the present paper we have explored the present PC in *A Revelation* in 'form' 'meaning' and 'position' comparing her with her contemporary writers, Geoffrey Chaucer, Margery Kempe and Modern English in London-Lund Corpus. In the latter half of the fourteenth century when this prose was written, the ending *-ing* makes its appearance in verbal noun, while participial endings have some kinds of dialectal variation. In the prose of Julian of Norwich, the two suffixes, *-and* and *–ing*, are found side by side in thirty-nine verbs. In determining word endings, stylistic factors to avoid some confusion contribute: firstly between subjects, secondly modified elements and thirdly participle and verbal noun.

Julian mainly employs temporal interpretation in the notational relationships between the *–ing* and adjunct and the main syntactical unit, and the positions of most of them are middle or end in the whole sentence.

Wilson (1958: 97) maintains that Julian uses "the most obvious devices of the Latin rhetorical, but sparingly and amateurishly."

He continues that "her use gives one the impression that Julian knows nothing of the style at first hand, but is simply using devices which she found in vernacular religious literature." In my judgement a counterargument may be proposed. She is strikingly intellectual, and rhetorical devices we have observed shows her to be an analytical mystic. The paratactic structure is helpful in story progression, addition of information, summarization and enumeration. Her usage of the PC forms the basis of effective means of making her preaching understood. Julian makes the most of their prototypical meanings like 'temporality' and 'simultaneity' in the appositive participle emerging out of Latin influence with aiming at making her words grave and dignified by adopting literary style originated from Latin rhetoric. It must also be noted that the abundant subordinating and restricting clauses have the effect of demonstrating Julian's spiritual development as it happens.

## Notes

1 S1 is the base text of Glasscoe 1976. Other evidence of validity of this text is mentioned in Katami (2004: 160).

2 The figures indicate the chapter and the page numbers in the text.

3 See McIntosh, A, ML. Samuels and M.Benskin (1986). Since the fourteenth century is the period before a concept of English prescriptivism emerging in the mid-eighteenth century, the spelling arbitrariness is not exceptional. One of the factors in these suffixes is due to phonological mixture. *A*

*Revelation* is in a transitional period from *–and* (-ende) to *–ing*.

4  The works are *The Canterbury Tales, Boece, Troilus and Criseyde, The Legend of Good Women* and others.

5  Mustanoja (1960: 116-117) states, "…an absolute construction is not infrequently introduced by the preposition *mid* (*with*), and ME this is fairly common," like *fayne she wold be redde of it with hyr onowr savyd* (Paston    295).

6  Three "semantic - pragmatic tendencies" are claimed in Traugott and König (1991: 208-209).

The point boils down to this: Propositional > Textual > Expressive

## Text

Julian of Norwich, Glasscoe, Marion. ed. (1976) *A Revelation of Love*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Electronic text: Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse, http://www.hti.umich.edu/c/cme/

Margery Kempe, Meech, Sanford Brown. ed. (1940) *The Book of Margery Kempe*, Early English Text Society, O.S. 212, Oxford University Press.

## References

Beer, Frances. ed. (1978) *Julian of Norwich's Revelations of Divine Love, The Shorter Version, ed. from B.L.Add. MS 37790*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter   Universitätsverlag.

Chafe, Wallace L. (1984) "How people use adverbial clauses," in *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 17-20 February 1984, ed. Brugman, Clausia-Monica Macaulay, 437-449, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Dahl, Östen (1985) *Tense and Aspect Systems*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Edwards, Anthony S.G. (1984) *Middle English Prose*, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König, eds. (1995) *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms: Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hayase, Naoko (2002) *Eigokoubun-no-Kategorii-Keisei*, Tokyo: Keisoo Syoboo.

Higuchi, Masayuki (1996) *Studies in Chaucer's English*, Tokyo: Eichosha.

Homier, Donald F. (1981) "The Function of Rhetoric in Julian of Norwich's Revelations of Divine Love," *Fourteenth Century Mystics Newsletter*, 7, 162-178.

Jespersen,Otto (1909-1949) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, 7 vols, London: George Allen & Unwin.

Katami, Akio (2004) "Studies in the Language of *A Revelation of Love*: with special reference to vacillation in nouns, pronouns and verbs," *Bulletin of Saitama Gakuen University, Faculty of Management*, No.4, 159-172, Saitama: Japan.

Kortmann, Bernd (1991) *Free Adjuncts and Absolutes in English: Problems of Control and Interpretaion*, London and New York: Routledge.

Kortmann, Bernd (1995) "Adverbial participial clauses in English," in M. Haspelmath and E.König (ed.)189-237.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar II*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Manabe, Kazumi (1995) *Syoki Eigo no Togo   Buntairon Kenkyu*, Tokyo: Kaibunsya.

McAvoy, Liz H. (2004) *Authority and the Female Body in the Writings of Julian of Norwich and Magery Kempe*, (Studies in Medieval Mysticism) Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer.

McIntosh, Angus, M.L.Samuels and Michael Benskin with the assistance of Margaret Laing and Keith

Williamson (1986) *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, 4vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Mossé, Fernand (1949) *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue Anglaise*, trans. James A. Walker. 1952. A *Handbook of Middle English*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mustanoja, Tauno F. (1960) *A Middle English Syntax: I Parts of Speech*, Helsinki: Société Néophiolologique.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.

Quirk, Randolph and Jan Svartvik (1970) "Types and Uses of Non-finite Clause in Chaucer," *English Studies: Journal of English Letters and Philology,* LI, 393-411, Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Reynolds, Anna M. (1952) "Some Literary Influences in the Revelations of Julian of Norwich," *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages* 7 and 8, 18-28.

Riehle, Wolfgang (1977) trans. Standring, B.1981. *The Middle English Mystics*, London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rose, Linda (1993) "The Voice of a Saintly Woman: The Feminine Style of Julian of Norwich's Showings," *Women and Language*. XVI, 14-17.

Stone, Robert K. (1970) *Middle English Prose Style*, The Hague Paris: Mouton de Gruyter.

Smith, Jeremy J. (2005) "Language, Class and Region in Late Medieval England," *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature*. No.20, 59-73, Tokyo: The Japan Society for Medieval English Studies.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Ekkehard König (1991) "The Semantics-pragmatics of Grammaticalization Revisited." In Traugott, E.C. and Bernd Heine, *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1, 189-218, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Visser, Frederikus Th. (1963-1973) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 4vols, Leiden: E.J.Brill.

Wilson, Richard M. (1956) "Three Medieval Mystics," *Essays and Studies*, n.s.9, 87-112, London: J.Murray.

Windeatt, Barry (1977) "Julian of Norwich and her Audience," *Review of English Studies*, n.s.,28, 1-17.

Windeatt, Barry (2004) "Julian of Norwich." in *A Companion to Middle English Prose*, (ed.) Edwards A.S.G, 67-81, Cambridge: D.S.Brewer.

Wright, Robert E. (1987) "The 'boke performyd': affective technique and reader response in the Showings of Julian of Norwich," *Christianity and Literature*, 36.4, 13-32.