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This paper aims to clarify the syntactic change of genitives by focusing on the development of -’s in the history of English, arguing that -’s is the descendant of the genitive inflection -(e)s. It is proposed that in the course of the development, the syntactic status of -(e)s/’s has changed into a D element assigning genitive Case to its specifier, which is shown to be a case of degrammaticalization. It is also demonstrated that the proposed analysis can properly explain the distributional change of genitives obtained from the investigation of historical corpora.*
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1. Introduction

This paper discusses the historical development of determinative genitives as in (1), and argues that this development instantiates degrammaticalization, in which the genitive inflection has changed into -’s as a genitive Case assigner in the head D.¹

(1) Jenny’s (new) desk

There are two opinions on the origin of -’s: the genitive inflection in OE

* This is a revised and extended version of a paper, which was originally presented at the 27th Conference of the English Linguistic Society of Japan held at Osaka University on November 14, 2009 and subsequently published as Ibaraki (2010). I am grateful to Takeshi Omuro, Tomoyuki Tanaka, and all of the members of Department of English Linguistics, Nagoya University.

¹ Here are the historical periods of English standardly assumed: Old English (OE: 450–1100), Middle English (ME: 1100–1500), Early Modern English (EModE: 1500–1700), Late Modern English (LModE: 1700–1900), and Present-day English (PE: 1900–). This paper also uses the term “early English” to refer to all the early stages of English except PE.
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and ME (Allen (1997, 2008) and Fischer (1992)) and the his-genitive as in (2) that was observed in late ME and EModE (Amano (2003) and Taylor (1996)).

(2) a. Felyce hir fayrnesse
    Felice her fairness
    (PPL. B xii 47 / Mustanoja (1960: 160))

b. Gwenayfer his love
    Gweneyfer his love
    (Lawman B 22247 / Mustanoja (1960: 160))

Based on the former opinion, it is argued that -'s has developed from the genitive inflection in early English, which is closely related to the change of genitive Case from inherent to structural Case. This paper also provides a syntactic analysis of the development of genitives in the history of English, and shows that it can properly explain the distributional change of genitives revealed by an investigation of historical corpora.

This paper is organized as follows. Examining some properties of genitives, section 2 argues that -'s has developed from the genitive inflection, genitive Case has changed from inherent to structural Case, and the syntactic position of -'s is the head D in PE. It is also claimed that the development of -'s is an instance of degrammaticalization. Section 3 discusses the distribution of genitives in the history of English based on the data obtained from an investigation of historical corpora, and attempts to account for the distributional change of genitives by relating it to the development of -'s. Section 4 is the conclusion of this paper.

2. Some Properties of Genitives

2.1. The Origin of -'S

As mentioned above, there has been some debate on the origin of -'s: the genitive inflection or the his-genitive. However, the latter view faces a serious problem concerning the frequency of the his-genitive. Consider the following table showing the frequency of three kinds of genitives from late ME to EModE.3

---

2 The former has been the standard opinion in philological studies. See Curme (1931), Altenberg (1982), Rissanen (1999) and Rosenbach (2002) among others.

3 Rosenbach and Vezzosi (2000) deal with not only s-genitives comprising both -(e)s and -'s but also of-genitives. Therefore, Table 1 represents the parts of their original data that are relevant for the present discussion.
Table 1 The Frequency of the Genitive Inflection, ’s and the His-genitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>1400–1449 (I)</th>
<th>1450–1499 (II)</th>
<th>1500–1549 (III)</th>
<th>1560–1630 (IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(e)s</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of instances (cf. Rosenbach and Vezzosi (2000: 290))

Notice that in Table 1 the frequency of the his-genitive is much lower than the other two types of genitives throughout late ME and EModE, so it is implausible to consider the his-genitive as the origin of ’s. Rather, the data in Table 1 suggest that there is a close connection between the genitive inflection -(e)s and ’s: the number of -(e)s is dominant over that of ’s in the periods (I) and (II), but with the radical increase of ’s, the proportion of -(e)s to ’s in the period (III) is approximately 55 to 40, and finally in the period (IV), the situation of -(e)s and ’s is reversed. This series of changes in late ME and EModE will indicate that the genitive inflection -(e)s was replaced by ’s.

I have originally investigated the frequency of the his-genitive in ME and EModE by using The Second Edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2) and The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME). However, as shown in Table 2, there are only 4 and 14 examples of the his-genitive in PPCME2 and PPCEME, respectively, which shows that its frequency is extremely low, compared with that of s-genitives comprising both -(e)s and ’s.

Table 2 The Frequency of the His-genitive and S-genitives in PPCME2 and PPCEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>PPCME2</th>
<th>PPCEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>6409</td>
<td>99.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are examples of the \textit{his}-genitive attested in each corpus.\footnote{Although the example in (3b) has \textit{s} as the contracted form of \textit{his}, this does not constitute evidence that \textit{-s} has developed from the \textit{his}-genitive because of the extreme rarity of the latter. It would be that the genitive inflection \textit{-es} developed into \textit{-s} first and then the \textit{his}-genitive started to be expressed as \textit{-s} by analogy. Both processes did exist, but it is pretty clear that the direct origin of \textit{-s} is the genitive inflection.}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. and in especiall for my lorde sir Gawayne \textit{his} sake and in especial for my lorde sir Gawayne his sake \hfill (CMMALORY, 192.2858: m4)
\item b. as Beda 's Epitome records as Beda his epitome records \hfill (MILTON-E3-P2, X, 176.38: e3)
\end{enumerate}

From these empirical arguments, it can be concluded that \textit{-s} has not developed from the \textit{his}-genitive, but from the genitive inflection \textit{-es}.

\section{The Change of Genitive Case Assignment in the History of English}

Ohmura (1995) proposes that genitive Case has changed from inherent to structural Case in the history of English (though he argues that the origin of \textit{-s} is the \textit{his}-genitive, contrary to the conclusion in the previous section). Following his proposal, this section discusses the change of genitive Case assignment in the history of English.

In order to argue for the change of genitive Case from inherent to structural Case, Ohmura (1995) notices the expansion of the functions of genitives and the development of verbal gerunds. In illustration of the former property, consider the following examples.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. your house's guest \hfill (\textit{Love's Labor's Lost}, 5.02.354 / Ohmura (1995: 57))
\item b. this fair land's peace \hfill (\textit{King Richard The Third}, 5.05.39 / Ohmura (1995: 57))
\item a. the decade's event \hfill (Ohmura (1995: 57))
\item b. a moment's thought
\end{enumerate}

According to Ohmura, genitive Case was assigned only to arguments of nouns until ME, but the genitive forms of locative and temporal noun phrases as in (4) and (5) began to increase their number in EModE. Given the uniformity condition in (6), this is accounted for by assuming that genitive Case was inherent Case assigned by the head N under \(\theta\)-role assignment until ME.
(6) If $\alpha$ is an inherent Case-marker, then $\alpha$ Case-marks NP if and only if $\theta$-marks the chain headed by NP (Chomsky (1986: 194)).

Then, genitive Case changed from inherent to structural Case in EModE, which made possible genitive Case assignment to noun phrases that are not $\theta$-marked like locative and temporal noun phrases.\footnote{\textsuperscript{5} It is pointed out by several scholars (e.g. Mitchell (1985)) that examples of locative and temporal genitives as in (4) and (5) already existed in OE. However, they seem to have been rare in OE and ME, as Ohmura (1995) and Rosenbach (2002) observe that their frequency increased during the ModE period. According to Ono and Nakao (1980: 288), locative and temporal genitives in OE belong to the class of so-called “adverbial genitives,” which also occur outside noun phrases and hence are licensed by some other mode(s) than inherent Case assignment by N. Therefore, as far as genitive Case assigned by N is concerned, the analysis in the text can be maintained that it was only assigned to arguments of nouns in OE, and sporadic cases of locative and temporal genitives observed in OE noun phrases would instantiate adverbial genitives that happen to appear within noun phrases. See Rosenbach (2002) for other factors in the spread of locative and temporal genitives in EModE than the change of genitive Case assignment argued for in the text.}

This is also supported by the development of verbal gerunds in EModE, as shown in (7).

(7) a. the doctors marrying my daughter

b. Jacob Hall’s dancing on the ropes

According to Ohmura (1995), the appearance of verbal gerunds means the loss of the semantic dependence of genitive Case upon a head noun, which will in turn indicate that genitive Case ceased to be inherent Case assigned by N. Assuming with Abney (1987) that verbal gerunds do not have a head noun, but have the DP structure above VP, it will follow that the genitive noun phrases in (7) are assigned structural Case by the functional head D with no ability of $\theta$-role assignment.

2.3. '-s as a D Element

This section presents some pieces of evidence that -’s, which has developed from the genitive inflection, is a D element in PE. Let us first consider the path of its change from the genitive inflection to a D element in the history of English by looking at the development of the group geni-
tive. In OE, when noun phrases consist of more than one noun, each noun has the genitive inflection, as shown in (8) (Ono and Nakao (1980), Nakao (1972), Allen (2008)).

(8) Ælfredes cyninges godsunu
    ‘king Alfred’s godson’
    (ChronA 82, 10 (890) / Ono and Nakao (1980: 292))
In late OE, inflections including the genitive inflection started to decline gradually, and as a consequence, only the second noun came to have the genitive inflection, as illustrated in (9).

(9) Davið kinges kinn
    ‘king David’s kin’
    (Orm / Nakao (1972: 221))
Then, group genitives like (10) first appeared in Chaucer’s works (Allen (2008)), and it was established in the late 16th century (Araki and Ukaji (1984)).

(10) a. my lorde of Bedfores mynde therin
    ‘my lord of Bedford’s mind therein’
    (1553 Q. Elizabeth I / Araki and Ukaji (1984: 284))
b. the King of Perseas crown
    ‘the king of Persia’s crown’
    (Marlowe, Tamb. 651 / Araki and Ukaji (1984: 284))
The development of the group genitive suggests that the genitive inflection -(e)s came to occupy the head D. That is, in the OE example of (8), genitive Case is assigned to the relevant noun phrase by the head N as discussed in section 2.2, with the realization of the genitive inflection on each noun. On the other hand, the genitive inflection is attached to the whole noun phrase in (10), and -’s can now form various kinds of group genitive, as shown in (11).

(11) a. Fred’s taste in wallpaper is appalling.
b. The man in the hall’s taste in wallpaper is appalling.
c. Every man I know’s taste in wallpaper is appalling.
d. That brother-in-law of mine that I was telling you about’s taste in wallpaper is appalling.
e. Even that attractive young man who is trying to flirt with you’s taste in wallpaper is appalling. (Anderson (2008: 2))
The possibility of the group genitive as in (10) and (11) can be accounted for by assuming that -(e)s/-’s is located in the head D and it is attached to the noun phrase in Spec-DP, as illustrated in the structure of (12).

(12) [DP DP [D’ -(e)s/-’s [NP [N’ N]]]]
Second, the distributional relation between pronouns and -’s also suggests
that -’s is located in the head D in PE. Consider the following examples.

(13) a. *I/me’s, you’s, *she/her’s, *we/us’s lunch
   b. The woman who loves me’s bad habit
   c. A friend of mine’s bad habit (Anderson (2008: 11, 12))

Assuming that pronouns are located in the same head D as -’s (Abney (1987)), it immediately follows that the two elements cannot cooccur within the same noun phrase, as illustrated in (13a). In (13b, c) (and (11e)), on the other hand, -’s can be attached to the pronouns, because the latter are included in the noun phrase in the specifier of the head D that -’s occupies.

The third evidence comes from the comparison between -’s and the contracted forms of auxiliaries in PE.

(14) I’d like to take …, When you’ve come to …

As shown in (14), when auxiliaries in T are contracted and attached to their preceding subjects in Spec-TP, they appear in the form of the apostrophe. Under the present analysis, -’s is located in the head D and attached to the noun phrase in Spec-DP, which will account for its formal similarity to the contracted forms of auxiliaries.6

In this section, we have presented some pieces of evidence that -’s is placed in the head D in PE. It is reasonable to suppose that -’s has a clitic-like status, since it needs a host to attach to and phonologically depends on its host without its own stress (Anderson (2008)). Therefore, the development of -’s represents a case of an inflectional affix changing into a clitic, for which some comments are provided in the next section.

2.4. Summary: The Development of Genitives as Degrammaticalization

Thus far, we have argued that -’s has developed from the genitive inflection, genitive Case has changed from inherent to structural Case, and -(e)s/-’s has come to occupy the head D. Given that the latter two changes happened roughly during the same period (see the discussion of (4), (5), (7), and (10)), it is a natural move to pursue the correlation between them. Therefore, I propose the structural development of genitives as in (15) (see section 3.2 for the discussion of the base position and movement of genitives).

---

6 One might wonder why -’s does not have a non-contracted form unlike auxiliaries. This can be attributed to their developmental processes in the history of English: auxiliaries have developed from verbs that are independent lexical items, whereas -’s has developed from the genitive inflection and still remains a dependent element (as a clitic; see below).
Until ME, the head N assigns inherent genitive Case under θ-role assignment as illustrated in (15a), where the genitive inflection is realized on each element of the noun phrase base-generated in Spec-NP. Then, genitive Case changed from inherent to structural Case with the change of the syntactic status of -(e)s/-’s as in (15b): -(e)s/-’s is a structural genitive Case assigner placed in the head D and it is attached to the whole noun phrase in Spec-DP.

One might wonder why only -’s has survived into PE even though the other case inflections on nouns were leveled and disappeared during the ME period. The present analysis provides a straightforward answer to this question: -’s has become a Case assigner (Anderson (1983–4)), taking over the task of the head N, so that it needs to have survived. In other words, when various forms of genitive inflection were collapsed into -(e)s by the inflectional leveling in ME, nouns lost their capacity to assign inherent genitive Case, causing -(e)s/-’s to become a D element assigning structural genitive Case to its specifier, as shown in (15b).

The development of -(e)s/-’s illustrated in (15), from an inflectional affix to a clitic, is regarded as an instance of degrammaticalization, in the light of the unidirectionality of grammaticalization as envisaged by Hopper and Traugott (2003) that language change proceeds along the cline in (16).

(16) content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

(Hopper and Traugott (2003: 7))

Indeed, Hopper and Traugott themselves recognize sporadic counterexamples to the unidirectionality of grammaticalization; there are also a number of cases of degrammaticalization reported in other works. Thus, the cline in (16) only represents a general tendency, and the development of -’s in English counts as one of the sporadic cases of degrammaticalization.

According to Newmeyer (1998), the Mainland Scandinavian genitive -s is a clitic marker on noun phrases and it has developed from the Old Norse genitive inflection -s, which shows roughly the same process as that of -’s discussed in the text. See also Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994) and Norde (1997, 2009) for other cases of degrammaticalization in a number of languages.
3. The Distribution of Genitives in the History of English

This section investigates the distribution of genitives within noun phrases in the history of English by using historical corpora. Then, I propose a syntactic analysis of the result of this investigation, based on the analysis of the development of genitives proposed in (15), together with the licensing of definiteness.

3.1. Historical Data

According to Quirk et al. (1985) and Taylor (1996), there are two kinds of genitive in PE: the genitive as a determinative and the genitive as a modifier, as shown in (17a, b), respectively.

(17) a. the/her/Jenny’s/my daughter’s (new) desk (genitive as determinative)
    b. several/new women’s universities (genitive as modifier)
(cf. Quirk et al. (1985: 326–328))

The syntactic position of the genitives in (17a), which precede the adjective new, corresponds to that of determiners and possessive pronouns, whereas the genitives in (17b) show the distribution similar to adjectives, following other modifiers like several and new. Our focus here is on the genitive as a determinative, excluding the genitive as a modifier.

The word order patterns to be examined in historical corpora are given in (18).

(18) a. *Det - Gen - Adj - Noun
    b. Det - Adj - Gen - Noun
    c. *Gen - Det - Adj - Noun
    d. Gen - Adj - Noun
    e. Adj - Gen - Noun

According to the investigation by Ibaraki (2009), adjectives do not precede determiners in all the historical periods of English, so such word order is excluded from (18). In addition to PPCME2 and PPCEME, The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English (YCOE) has been used to investigate the distribution of genitives from OE to EModE. As a result of the investigation, the word order pattern in (18a) is not attested in all the three corpora, and only two examples of the word order pattern in (18c)
are found in PPCEME. Therefore, it was almost impossible that both determiners and genitives precede adjectives within the same noun phrase in early English. The distribution of the other word order patterns in (18) is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 The Distribution of Determiners, Adjectives and Genitives as a Determinative and Modifier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Det-Adj-Gen-N</th>
<th>Adj-Gen-N</th>
<th>Gen-Adj-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YCOE</td>
<td>42 (76.3%)</td>
<td>3 (5.5%)</td>
<td>10 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCME2</td>
<td>73 (33%)</td>
<td>69 (31.2%)</td>
<td>79 (35.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCEME</td>
<td>182 (66.2%)</td>
<td>37 (13.4%)</td>
<td>56 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excluding examples of genitives as a modifier, the distribution in Table 4 is obtained.9

Table 4 The Distribution of Determiners, Adjectives and Genitives as a Determinative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Det-Adj-Gen-N</th>
<th>Adj-Gen-N</th>
<th>Gen-Adj-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YCOE</td>
<td>42 (74.5%)</td>
<td>3 (5.9%)</td>
<td>10 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCME2</td>
<td>13 (13.5%)</td>
<td>4 (4.2%)</td>
<td>79 (82.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCEME</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (4.2%)</td>
<td>56 (77.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that adjectives rarely precede genitives in the same noun phrase without determiners. Here are examples of the word order patterns Det-Adj-Gen-N and Gen-Adj-N, respectively.

9 Taylor (1996) argues that genitives as a modifier have the compound structure in PE, as shown in (i).

(i) the torn [N woman’s magazine] (cf. Taylor (1996: 290))

If this is true of all the historical periods of English (which seems to be supported by their distributional properties), they should be syntactically distinguished from genitives as a determinative, which were argued to have undergone the change in (15) in section 2.4. Therefore, I will not discuss genitives as a modifier further here, just noting the possibility that their compound structure has been constant throughout the history of English and they are assigned genitive Case in a different way from genitives as a determinative.
(19) a. ðe wrecche Adames soule  
    the wretch Adam’s soul (CMVICES1, 115.1401: m1)
  
b. Moises longe trauaile
    Moise’s long travel (CMCLOUD, 127.739: m3)

There are three interesting properties revealed from the results in Table 4. First, the word order which is not allowed in PE, namely Det-Adj-Gen-N, was possible in OE. However, this word order pattern declined in ME and EModE, and was finally lost by PE. Second, when determiners and genitives cooccur within the same noun phrase, the only possible word order pattern is Det-Adj-Gen-N, where genitives follow both determiners and adjectives. Third, when genitives and adjectives cooccur in the same noun phrase without determiners, genitives show a strong tendency to precede adjectives. The next section provides a syntactic account of the distribution of genitives in the history of English including these facts, in terms of the development of genitives discussed in section 2 and the licensing of definiteness.

3.2. A Syntactic Analysis of the Distribution of Genitives in the History of English

It is observed in Table 4 that genitives may cooccur with determiners in OE, and they follow adjectives within the same noun phrase in such cases. On the other hand, in cases where genitives do not cooccur with determiners, they show a strong tendency to precede adjectives throughout the history of English. On the basis of these facts, I propose the following two structures with genitives in OE.

(20) a. \[ \text{DP} \text{[D′ [D Det] [NP Adj [NP Gen [N′ N]]]]} \] \(= (18b)\)

b. \[ \text{DP Geni [D′ [D] [NP Adj [NP ti [N′ N]]]]} \] \(= (18d)\)

Following Ibaraki (2009), I assume that determiners occupy the head D since OE, genitives are base-generated in Spec-NP, and adjectives are adjoined to NP. In (20a), genitives remain in their base positions, where they receive inherent genitive Case from the head N. As a result, the word order pattern in (18b) is derived in which genitives follow both determiners and adjectives. On the other hand, in (20b), which does not contain determiners, genitives are base-generated in Spec-NP and receive inherent genitive Case from the head N. Then, they move to Spec-DP, yielding the word order pattern Gen-Adj-N in (18d).

An immediate question here is what the motivation for the movement of genitives in (20b) is. This can be attributed to the licensing condition on definite noun phrases in (21) proposed by Ibaraki (2009).
Definite noun phrases are licensed iff the [+definite] feature of D enters into a checking relation with its matching element(s) in a Spec-head and/or a head-head configuration. (Ibaraki (2009: 84))

Given this condition, definite noun phrases have the [+definite] feature on the head D which needs to be checked by definite elements such as determiners and determinative genitives. The derivations of the structures in (20) are naturally explained in terms of the condition in (21): in (20a), the head D is occupied by determiners, which in turn serve to check the [+definite] feature of D under a head-head configuration. On the other hand, since there are no definite elements in D or Spec-DP in the base structure of (20b), genitives need to move up to Spec-DP in order to check the [+definite] feature of D under a Spec-head configuration.

If the arguments above are on the right track, it immediately follows that the word order patterns in (18a, c) are extremely rare. In the light of the structure in (20a), there is no landing site for genitives between determiners and adjectives in (18a). As for (18c), it might be possible to assume that genitives move to Spec-DP, but such movement will be redundant in terms of the licensing of definiteness, because determiners occupy the head D, checking the [+definite] feature of D. Thus, the movement of genitives is prohibited in (18a, c), thereby accounting for the extreme rarity of these word order patterns.

As we can see from Table 4, the frequency of the word order pattern where determiners and genitives cooccur within the same noun phrase declined after ME, and it seems to have been lost during the ModE period. The loss of the word order pattern Det-Adj-Gen-N can be attributed to the development of -(e)s/-’s from the genitive inflection to a D element. In section 2, it was argued that the origin of -’s is the genitive inflection -(e)s in OE and ME, and it changed into a structural Case assigner in the head D in EModE, taking over the task of the head N as an inherent Case assigner. Therefore, determiners can no longer appear in the head D in noun phrases with genitives, because the position is already occupied by -(e)s/-’s, as shown in (22).

\[
\text{(22)} \quad [\text{DP Gen}_i [D' [D -(e)s/-’s] [\text{NP Adj} [\text{NP } t_i [N' N]]]])
\]

Note that -(e)s/-’s, which is a D element and Case assigner, serves to check the [+definite] feature of D under a head-head configuration in (22). Here, the motivation of the movement of genitives is to provide a host for the
clitic -(e)s/-'s to attach to.\textsuperscript{10} The development of -'s was completed during EModE, with the result that only the word order pattern in (18d) has survived into PE.\textsuperscript{11}

4. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the development of genitives in the history of English, arguing that -'s has developed from the genitive inflection -(e)s, and it is now a genitive Case assigner occupying the head D. As a consequence of this analysis, it has been demonstrated that the distribution of genitives in the history of English can be naturally accounted for in terms of the development of -'s and the licensing of definiteness.
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