CHAPTER 9

Betwixt, amongst, and *amidst*

The diachronic development of function words with final /st/

Ryuichi Hotta
Keio University

The purpose of the paper is to examine, using historical corpora, the diachronic development of variants of the function words BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID with emphasis on the variants with final /st/, i.e. *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*. In Present-day English, the variants with final /st/ have a more formal, literary, or archaic ring to them than their counterparts without it. In older English, however, the former variants were more widely used than they are today. This paper addresses how individual variants – especially ones with final /st/ – came into being, how they competed with one another in terms of frequency in each period, and how this resulted in the Present-day English distribution.

Keywords: Middle English, Modern English, preposition, paragoge, corpus

1. Introduction

This paper examines the diachronic development of variants of the function words BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID with special emphasis on the variants with final /st/, i.e. *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*. In Present-day English (PDE), variants with final /st/ have a more formal, literary, or archaic ring than their counterparts without it. In older English, however, the variants with final /st/ were more widely used than they are today. To my knowledge, no diachronic studies have been conducted about the ebb and flow of the variants, and questions remain unanswered as to how individual variants – especially the ones with final /st/ – emerged, how they competed in each period, and how this resulted in the current PDE distribution.

I cover all the historical periods of English from Old English (OE) to PDE, but I focus on the Middle English (ME) and Modern English (ModE) periods, as these are the periods when the several variants occurred most frequently and competition between them was the greatest. To collect as many examples as possible from historical sources, the study draws on historical corpora and text databases as well

DOI 10.1075/cilt.343.09hot

as commonly cited dictionaries. In the first place, I consulted the *Oxford English dictionary* (*OED*) and *Middle English dictionary* (*MED*) to appreciate the range of variants historically attested. Then, I searched *The Helsinki corpus of English texts* (*HC*) for variants to get an overview of their distribution in each period and their changing distribution across periods. The overview thus obtained served as a useful starting point, but since *HC* is a small-sized corpus by today's standards, the data obtained from *HC* had to be supplemented with data from historical corpora focusing on particular periods of the language. I used *A linguistic atlas of Early Middle English* (*LAEME*) for Early Middle English (EME), *The Middle English grammar corpus* (*MEGC*) for Late Middle English (LME), *Early English books online* (*EEBO*) for Early Modern English (EModE), *The corpus of Late Modern English texts* (*CLMET3.0*) for Late Modern English (LModE), and *BNCweb CQP-edition* (*BNCweb*) for PDE.

After providing a historical description of the variants of the three lexical items in the following three sections, I examine several views that have been proposed about the emergence, growth, and decline of the variants with final /st/, and then I attempt to integrate the different views into a likely scenario accounting for the historical changes. Before I go on to the study, some preliminary notes are in order. To be able to refer to the wide range of variants accurately, I have adopted a notational system to facilitate reference at distinct levels. To refer to the lexical items at their most abstract level, I use BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID, in upper case.[1] These abstract lexical items subsume the variant spellings (written in italics), such as *betux*, *bituhen*, *betweonan* for BETWEEN; *amange*, *emonges*, *on gemang* for AMONG; and *amidde*, *amyddes*, *amid'st* for AMID. The variant spellings can then be classified into a number of types according to their morphological configuration, particularly of their final segments. Within the item BETWEEN, for example, several types can be distinguished by their ending, such as 'betwix', 'betuh', 'betweenen' (these types are indicated by single quotation marks); types are often abbreviated to 'x', 'h', 'nn', and the like. The classification into types is only sensitive to consonantal variation and the final vowel at the end of the spelling variant. In other words, *atwix*, *betweox*, and *be twyx*, for example, all belong to the 'x'-type; *among*, *bimong*, and *on gemang* are members of the 'g'-type; *amidde*, *in mydde*, and *on midde* are assigned to the 'de'-type. Admittedly, the difference in prefixes and vowels is also important enough to deserve independent examination, but here, I am particularly interested in the development of paragogic consonants, and I therefore concentrate on word-final segments.[2]

1. In the present study, I use 'lexical item' in a specific sense. In everyday usage, *between* and *betwix* are referred to as different words or lexical items, but in this study I treat them as alternative realizations of the more abstract entry BETWEEN, which I refer to as a 'lexical item'.

2. To give an idea of the importance attached to parts of the word that I must leave unexamined, consider that *eLALME* distinguishes sixteen types according to several criteria, giving

Note, finally, that in this study, the different syntactic functions of BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID (e.g. their part-of-speech function) are not distinguished because the primary focus of this study is morphonological rather than syntactic – though I acknowledge that some items have different meanings depending on their syntactic function.[3]

2. BETWEEN

2.1 Etymological notes and historical overview based on the *HC*

Historical variants of BETWEEN abound. A search of the *HC* yielded 101 distinct variants, and searches of other historical corpora yielded dozens more. The variants can be classified, however, into a manageable number of types according to their endings, which largely reflect their etymological makeup and later morphonological processes. According to Kitson (1993: 12), underlying all known variants of BETWEEN are the component prototypes corresponding to the preposition BY and the numeral TWO. In early OE, at least in poetry, the two elements occurred separately, as in *be sǣm tweonum* "between two seas" (*Beowulf* 858). Later, the transposition of the noun and the numeral (i.e. *be twēonum sǣm*) triggered a syntactic reanalysis that allowed *be twēonum* to be reinterpreted as a composite preposition.

The numeral TWO inflected in various ways in and before OE; accordingly, a range of forms with different inflections can be attested in the corpora. Three main types can be recognized. Firstly, the 'betwēonum'-type, or 'nm' in abbreviation, is characterized by the dative ending *-um*, as required by the preposition. In late OE, the *um*-ending was phonetically leveled to *en*, thus resulting in the 'betwēonen'-type ('nn'). The second nasal as well as the schwa preceding it, however, were subject to further phonetic attrition, producing the 'betweene'-type ('ne') and eventually the 'between'-type ('n').[4]

---

corresponding dot maps under the item number 89. See also the dot maps 703–706 and 1118–1119 in *LALME*, and Ciszek-Kiliszewska's (2013) separate treatment of *twix* as distinct from *bitwix*.

3. In her study on the preposition-cum-adverb *twix*, Ciszek-Kiliszewska (2013: 88) discusses the semantic differences between the prepositional and adverbial uses, with the former meaning "among, in among; between" and the latter meaning "in the meantime, from this moment".

4. It is likely that, in many cases, the final <e> was a silent <e>, i.e. an orthographical variant without a phonetic equivalent. Thus I could have merged the 'n'- and 'ne'-types, for example, into an 'n(e)'-type. I did not do this, however, for consistency with leveling and loss of inflection: I assumed that the distinction between the 'n'- and 'ne'-types was as important as that between the 'nm'- and 'nn'-types or between the 'nn'- and 'n'-types.

Secondly, the 'betwēox'-type ('x') is characterized by its final *x*. The second component of OE *betwēox* has its origin in Germanic *twa (two) + *-iskaz (-ish); clearly, by the OE period, the consonants in the suffix had been metathesized to *ks*. The 'x'-type invited paragogic *t*, providing a prototype for *betwixt*. Derivations from the 'x'-type include the 'xe'-type (e.g. *bitwexe*), 'xn'-type (e.g. *bitwixen*), 'xte'-type (e.g. *betwyxte*), 'xst'-type (e.g. *bitwixst*), and 'xts'-type (e.g. *betwixts*).

Thirdly, the 'betwēoh'-type ('h') is characterized by final *h*, which represents an old accusative ending of the numeral in a prehistoric period when the preposition governed the accusative. The *h*, however, was subject to loss in later times, and *-en* or *-es* tended to be appended on the analogy of variants that had such endings (e.g. *bitweien* and *bitweies*, an instance of the 's'-type). Other types derived from the 'h'-type include 'hn' (e.g. *bitwihan*) and 'he' (e.g. *bituhhe*).

Table 1 shows a diachronic distribution of the types of BETWEEN, as they can be distinguished in the *HC* data. It serves a starting point for the more detailed period-by-period description that follows.

Table 1. Distribution of historical variants of BETWEEN in the *HC*

Period/type	nm	nn	n	ne	x	xe	xn	xt	xte	xst	xts	h	hn	he	s
O2 (850–950)	14	1	–	–	13	–	–	–	–	–	–	31	–	–	–
O3 (950–1050)	5	22	15	–	56	–	–	–	–	–	–	49	–	–	–
O4 (1050–1150)	1	15	3	–	22	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	–	–
M1 (1150–1250)	–	28	3	8	14	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	5	8	–
M2 (1250–1350)	–	1	5	33	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
M3 (1350–1420)	–	–	5	44	29	42	2	1	–	4	–	–	–	–	–
M4 (1420–1500)	–	–	6	33	28	8	2	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
E1 (1500–1570)	–	–	12	76	2	–	–	28	4	–	–	–	–	–	–
E2 (1570–1640)	–	–	23	43	–	–	–	32	6	–	–	–	–	–	–
E3 (1640–1710)	–	–	54	8	–	–	–	14	–	–	1	–	–	–	–

Table 2 presents illustrative examples of each variant in contexts.

Table 2. Illustrative examples of each variant of BETWEEN

Type	Period	Text (line in *HC* file)	Context (keyword in italics)
'nm'	O2	COOROSIU(26301)	ðæt hie friþ him *betweonum* hæfden
'nn'	O3	COAELET3(34692)	And eac eow *betwynan* eowre fet aðweaþ mid eadmodnysse
'n'	O3	CODURHAM(23628)	ðætte god is fylgeþ gie *bituen* & in allum
'ne'	M1	CMANCRE(8435)	hit ne weoxe forþre *bitweone* mon & ancre
'x'	O4	COWULF4(15831)	Þes gedwolgod wæs arwurþe eac *betwux* eallum hæþenum on ðam dagum

Table 2. (*continued*)

Type	Period	Text (line in *HC* file)	Context (keyword in italics)
'xe'	M3	CMBOETH(55785)	For so as ther nis noon alliaunce *bytwixe* good folk and schrewes
'xn'	M3	CMWYCSER(16133)	to make diuision *bytwixen* hem and oðtre men
'xt'	M4	CMTOWNEL(7151)	I am agast that we get som fray *Betwixt* vs both
'xte'	M4	CMMALORY(17074)	for there was muche trw love *betwyxte* hem
'xst'	M3	CMHORSES(19203)	ðat it be fast sittynge *bi-twexst* ðe fyke & ðe hol skyn
'xts'	E3	CEPRIV3(61120)	there will come severall things *betwixts* that and the Abby
'h'	O2	COBOETH(67363)	ða yflan bioþ ungerade *betwuh* him selfum
'hn'	M1	CMHALI(31624)	hwuch schal beo ðe sompnunge *bituhen* ow ibedde?
'he'	M1	CMHALI(24596)	Hwet makeþ hit iluuet *bituhhe* beasteliche men
's'	M2	CMTHRUSH(702)	Hic herde a strif *bitweies* two

2.2 Period-by-period description[5]

I have not conducted a detailed investigation of OE in this study, but I refer to the diachronic distribution of the BETWEEN-types in the OE segment of Table 1. Kitson (1993: 11) collected from OE texts "a total of 1901 instances" representing "1010 spelling-variants" and localized these variants on an OE dialect map. One of his revealing findings was that *betweox* was "the exclusive form in north and west Wessex, and the most common in south and east England generally" (1993: 13–14). Kitson made no note of the 'xt'-type, nor did I find any instance of it when searching *The dictionary of Old English corpus* (*DOEC*); however, there are other references that testify to its presence.[6]

Moving on to the EME period, we can draw on *LAEME* to obtain the distribution of BETWEEN-types (see Table 3).[7]

5. Appendix 1 provides illustrative examples of BETWEEN (with source reference), as they occur in the corpora of different periods. Likewise, Appendixes 2 and 3 provide examples of AMONG and AMID, respectively.

6. Bosworth & Toller (1898) mention *betwyh*, *betwuht*, and *betwuxt* under the entry *betweoh*. Barnhart et al. (1973) also point out with regard to *betwixt* that "[t]he final t in *betwixt* developed in Old English." *DOEC* gives no instance of the 'xt'-type but dates *betuxt* as C13 and C14 under the dictionary entry "*be-twux* prep. and adv."

7. The 'hs'- and 'e'-types, unattested in the *HC* evidence, represent variants such as *twihs*, *be-tue*, and *bi-twe*.

Table 3. Distribution of historical variants of BETWEEN in the *LAEME*

Period/Type	nn	n	ne	x	xe	xn	xte	hn	he	s	hs	e
C12b[8]	18	1	2	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
C13a	23	4	19	7	5	4	–	9	14	–	–	–
C13b	20	5	23	2	1	4	4	1	–	1	2	1
C14a	5	16	28	10	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	1
Total	66	26	72	26	8	10	4	10	14	1	2	2

The distribution of BETWEEN-types in EME based on the *LAEME* squares well with the survey of the types in the *HC* (Table 1), but *LAEME* shows in greater detail the diachronic and diatopic distribution of the types in EME. Diachronically, the 'nm'-type had fallen out of use by the beginning of the EME period, as it was leveled to the 'nn'-type. The old 'n'-type remained present, but the 'ne'-type, with final schwa added, increased so much that it became the most common type throughout most of the period. In the meantime, the 'x'-type not only maintained itself, but it also developed the 'xe'-, 'xn'-, and 'xte'-types. Although the 'h'-type had fallen out of use by EME, the period saw a moderate development of the 'hn'- and 'he'-types, though not for a long time.

The diatopic distribution of variants also yields a number of insightful observations. In earlier work (Hotta 2014), I have provided a diatopic analysis of the *LAEME* evidence. Table 4 reproduces the distribution of variants of BETWEEN across the seven distinguished dialects, as presented in Hotta (2014: 27): N[orthern], N[orth]E[ast]M[idland], N[orth]E[ast]M[idland], N[orth]W[est]M[idland], S[outh]E[ast]M[idland], S[outh]W[est]M[idland], S[outh]W[estern], and S[outh]E[astern].

Table 4. Distribution of variants of BETWEEN across seven dialects of EME

Dialect	nn	n	ne	x	xe	xn	xte	hn	he	tn	tx	txn	txe	ths	s	e	Yn	zn	Total
N	–	–	1	9	2	2	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	15
NEM	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	14
NWM	7	–	6	–	–	–	–	8	14	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	37
SEM	14	20	9	5	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	52
SWM	31	1	26	7	5	7	–	2	–	–	1	–	1	–	1	–	1	1	84
SW	–	–	16	3	–	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	24
SE	–	–	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	15
Total	66	21	72	24	7	9	4	10	14	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	241

As Mustanoja (1960: 369) notes, the 'nn'-type occurred "mainly in the more southern parts of the country," but *LAEME* shows that it does appear to be common in

8. In these tables and below, century specifications are abbreviated as 'C12', 'C13', etc.; 'a' and 'b' stand for the first and second half of the century, respectively.

the North Midland dialects as well. Kitson's observation about the geographically restricted distribution of *betweox* in OE, as noted above, seems to square with the EME evidence in the *LAEME*, which shows that types including *x* occur as unique forms in the Northern dialects and as common forms in the South-West Midland dialects. The 'xte'-type, which will be seen to grow towards ModE, remained marginal at this stage, with variants like *bi-twixte* only occurring four times in the Southwestern dialects in the period C13b. As for the *h*-type, the *HC* evidence seems to indicate that it went out of fashion quickly after OE, but the *LAEME* evidence suggests that it survived well into EME despite its attestation being almost restricted to C13a North-West Midland.

In the LME period, the *MEGC* revealed the following distribution: 1 instance of the 'nne'-type, 62 instances of 'n', 216 of 'ne', 126 of 'x', 14 of 'xe', 2 of 'xn', 4 of 'xt', and 6 of 's'. The most common type remains the 'ne'-type. What characterizes this period most, however, is a remarkable growth in the relative share of the 'x'-type. As a result, other derivative types with *x* such as 'xe', 'xn', and 'xt' saw a slight growth as well. The 's'-type remained as marginal, as it was in EME.

To get an overview of the situation in EModE, I used *EEBO*. Since *EEBO* is not a compiled corpus but a collection of books published from 1473 to 1640, I compiled a text database of about 150 million words which I then used as a corpus. This custom-made database that I drew from *EEBO* was not as balanced and representative as more established corpora. It should also be noted that the size of the subcorpora for each half century varies greatly: 244,602 words for C15b; 3,277,691 for C16a; 13,166,673 for C16b; 48,784,537 for C17a; 83,777,910 for C17b; and 90,945 for C18a. In this and the following tables based on the *EEBO* evidence, figures are given in words per million (wpm) rather than in raw frequency. Most of the older distinct types had either fallen out of use or had been leveled by the EModE period, such that no more than three types were recognized: 'between', 'betwix', and 'betwixt'.

Table 5 clearly shows that in EModE the 'xt'-type far outnumbered the 'x'-type, although it hardly approached the ever predominant 'n'-type in frequency. The 'xt'-type seems to have reached its peak towards the end of EModE, perhaps in C17, and served as a respectable rival of the 'n'-type.

Table 5. Distribution of historical variants of BETWEEN in *EEBO* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'between'	'betwix'	'betwixt'
C15b	196.24	36.79	69.50
C16a	239.68	1.825	36.20
C16b	175.59	4.025	57.87
C17a	245.51	0.57	123.13
C17b	256.12	0.084	85.17
C18a	197.92	0.00	164.93

The LModE distribution was obtained on the basis of the *CLMET3.0*, which contains about 34 million words, divided into three subcorpora of a roughly equal size at 70-year intervals (10,480,431 words for 1710–1780; 11,285,587 for 1780–1850; and 12,620,207 for 1850–1920). Figures are given in wpm. Only two types were attested in the corpus: 'between' and 'betwixt'.

Table 6. Distribution of historical variants of BETWEEN in the *CLMET3.0* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'between'	'betwixt'
1710–1780	465.06	62.78
1780–1850	483.89	9.66
1850–1920	480.97	4.04

What Table 6 shows is that during the LModE period, the share of the 'xt'-type decreased dramatically, such that the 'n'-type was established as effectively the only form available. This distribution has continued to this day: a *BNCweb* search resulted in 920.52 wpm for *between* while it only yielded 0.31 wpm for 'betwixt'. In PDE, *betwixt* is nearly out of use.

2.3 Historical summary of BETWEEN

Throughout the history of English, variants of BETWEEN with *n* have remained the most common. The 'nm'-, 'ne'-, and 'n'-types were favored in OE, EME, and LME, respectively, and the last one of these, typically realized as *between*, has been a dominant type since EModE. The variants that contain *x*, including the 'xt(e)'-type, have been attested since OE, but among them the 'x'-type grew particularly in LME. In EModE, it was largely replaced by the 'xt'-type (realized as *betwixt*), which then reached its peak in C17, serving as the second most common variant. Nevertheless, *betwixt* became increasingly rare from LModE to PDE. All other types were either limited to particular periods (e.g. the 'h'-type largely to OE) or were used only sporadically (e.g. the 's'-type in ME).

3. AMONG

3.1 Etymological notes and historical overview based on the *HC*

PDE *among* has its origin in OE in the composite expression (where the meaning of each of the composite parts is clearly identifiable) *on gemang* "in the crowd", followed by the genitive of a noun. Towards LOE and EME, the reanalysis of the

second word as part of a lexicalized preposition along with phonetic reduction of the first component gave rise to variants such as *amang* and *imong*. In addition, forms with other prefixes like *bimong* emerged, as a result of analogy with *amang*. Variants with final *s* and final *st* first appeared in C13b and in C15b, respectively.

Variants of AMONG collected from the *HC* are classified into seven types: 'g', 'ge', 'ges' (the vowel varies between *e*, *i*, *y*, and *u*), 'gs', 'gest', 'geste', and 'gst'. Table 7 summarizes the results.

Table 7. Distribution of historical variants of AMONG in the *HC*

Period/Type	g	ge	ges	gs	gest	geste	gst
O2 (850–950)	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
O3 (950–1050)	14	–	–	–	–	–	–
O4 (1050–1150)	3	–	–	–	–	–	–
M1 (1150–1250)	37	2	–	–	–	–	–
M2 (1250–1350)	29	6	6	–	–	–	–
M3 (1350–1420)	80	5	23	1	–	–	–
M4 (1420–1500)	27	38	11	2	–	–	–
E1 (1500–1570)	19	43	3	2	8	2	15
E2 (1570–1640)	44	5	–	–	1	–	49
E3 (1640–1710)	57	–	–	–	–	–	37

The 'g'-type has been widely available throughout its history. The 'ge'-type with final *e*, first attested in EME, increased greatly in frequency towards C16 but afterwards went out of fashion. The 'ges'-type and, to a lesser extent, the 'gs'-type grew along with the 'ge'-type during ME, but in EModE they were displaced by the 'gest'-, 'geste'-, and 'gst'-types. The 'gst'-type, in its established form *amongst*, became so common during EModE that it even outnumbered *among* in C17. Table 8 presents illustrative examples of each variant in contexts.

Table 8. Illustrative examples of each variant of AMONG

Type	Period	Text (line in *HC* file)	Context (keyword in italics)
'g'	O3	COWSGOSP(58093)	ða ne for se H+alend na openlice *gemang* þam Iudeon
'ge'	M2	CMALISAU(19600)	*Amonge* hem of Perce was a kniȝth
'ges'	M3	CMBOETH(3422)	so that there ne be *amonges* hem no difference
'gs'	M4	CMROLLPS(4483)	i. eldyd *ymangs* all myn enmys
'gest'	E1	CEBIO1(28855)	It is therefore in lawe *amongest* Christen men insufficient
'geste'	E1	CEBOETH1(19604)	they shoulde be accountyd *emongeste* thynges that are to be desyred
'gst'	E1	CETRI1(88321)	the Holy Ghost be *amongst* you

3.2 Period-by-period description

Let us begin by looking at what the *LAEME* data tells us about the distribution of variants of AMONG in EME. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Distribution of historical variants of AMONG in the *LAEME*

Period/Type	g	ge	n	ges
C12b	22	–	–	–
C13a	68	1	2	–
C13b	95	3	3	4
C14a	49	5	–	3

The distribution based on the *LAEME* results is compatible with that based on the *HC*. Alongside the predominant 'g'-type (available throughout EME), the 'ge'-type (e.g. *imange*) as well as the 'ges'-type (e.g. *amanges*, *amangis*, and *amongus*, with different vowels before *s*) became available in C13b.

With regard to LME, the *MEGC* survey shows that this period continued the trend observable in EME. Four distinct types occur with the following frequencies: 195 for 'g', 95 for 'ge', 38 for 'ges' (with different vowels), and 1 for 'gs'.

By EModE, variants were reduced to three types: 'g', 'gs', and 'gst'. The distribution of the AMONG types in *EEBO* is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Distribution of historical variants of AMONG in *EEBO* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'among'	'amongs'	'amongst'
C15b	89.94	12.26	4.09
C16a	97.03	35.28	65.70
C16b	245.16	7.52	170.43
C17a	241.67	0.27	267.17
C17b	329.04	0.095	250.04
C18a	241.90	0.00	208.92

Most striking about the distribution of AMONG-types in EModE is that the 'gst'-type not only appeared for the first time in this period, but that it also saw such a dramatic growth during the period that by 1600, it had displaced the 'gs'-type from which it derived and even temporarily surpassed the ever steady 'g'-type in C17a. The 'gst'-type, however, declined, after it had reached its peak somewhere around 1650.

Table 11, based on the *CLMET3.0* search, shows the following distribution in the subsequent LModE period.

Table 11. Distribution of historical variants of AMONG in the *CLMET3.0* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'among'	'amongst'
1710–1780	387.39	65.46
1780–1850	396.52	136.28
1850–1920	438.19	78.68

The LModE period saw a continued decline of *amongst*, but less remarkable than that of *betwixt* (see above). Despite its steady fall in frequency over time, *amongst* has remained a viable alternative to *among*, whereas *betwixt* can hardly be regarded as a competitor to *between* today. The *BNCweb* search returns 227.64 wpm for *among* and 46.18 wpm for *amongst*.

3.3 Historical summary of AMONG

Among the historical variants of AMONG, the 'g'-type has been dominant throughout, except in C17 when the 'gst'-type outnumbered the 'g'-type, if only temporarily. The 'ge'- and 'ges'-types were first attested in EME texts and then increased in frequency towards C16; afterwards, however, they declined under the pressure of the innovative 'gst'-type. The EModE period was characterized by the striking growth of *amongst*, which competed with *among* in frequency and even surpassed it for some time around 1650. This peak, however, did not last long, and *amongst* soon took up second place again. Today *amongst* remains a viable, though more formal, alternative to *among*.

4. AMID

4.1 Etymological notes and historical overview based on the *HC*

AMID can be traced back to OE *on middan* "in the middle". Like *among*, *amid* is in origin a composite expression made up of the preposition *on* and the dative noun *middan*, possibly followed by the genitive. This compositional makeup was already difficult to recognize in OE, in that *on middan* was treated as a lexicalized prepositional expression that governed the dative as well as the genitive. Despite its susceptibility to such reanalysis, the compositional character of the two elements lingered until LME, when separately written attestations such as *in mid* were still current.

I begin the historical survey of AMID by presenting the distribution of its historical variants, drawing on the *HC* (Table 12). Four types are distinguished: 'd' (e.g. *amid*, *inmid*), 'de' (e.g. *amidde*), 'ds' (e.g. *amids*), and 'des' (e.g. *amiddes*, *in-middes*, and *to middes*).

Table 12. Distribution of historical variants of AMID in the *HC*

Period/Type	d	de	ds	des
O1 (–850)	1	–	–	–
O2 (850–950)	6	2	–	–
O3 (950–1050)	12	1	–	8
O4 (1050–1150)	1	–	–	–
M1 (1150–1250)	3	1	–	–
M2 (1250–1350)	1	7	–	7
M3 (1350–1420)	1	4	–	8
M4 (1420–1500)	–	–	–	–
E1 (1500–1570)	–	–	1	–

The 'd'-type (e.g. *amid*) was widely present, particularly from OE to EME. LME is characterized by the predominance of the 'de'- and 'des'-types, both of which saw some sort of 'revival', since they were common in OE but unpopular in EME. The distribution of AMID-types in EModE suggests that all the types had become nearly extinct; indeed, the subperiods of E2 (1570–1640) and E3 (1640–1710) provide no attestation of any relevant variants. Further attestations can be found in the period-specific corpora below.

Table 13 presents illustrative examples of each variant in contexts.

Table 13. Illustrative examples of each variant of AMID

Type	Period	Text (line in *HC* file)	Context (keyword in italics)
'd'	O3	COBENRUL(66315)	Hæbbe se abbod *a mid* him gewrit ealra ðæra æhta
'de'	M1	CMKATHE(23523)	Her *amidde* wes ðis meiden iset
'ds'	E1	CEPLAY1B(7312)	how Hodg lieth tomblynge and tossing *amids* the floure
'des'	M2	CMEARLPS(23471)	Y ȝede in ðe innocens of myn hert, *amiddes* ðe wylle of myn hert

4.2 Period-by-period description

Let us first consider the EME distribution in *LAEME*, as presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Distribution of historical variants of AMID in the *LAEME*

Period/Type	d	de	den	t
C12b	–	–	1	–
C13a	5	4	3	1
C13b	2	13	2	–
C14a	1	14	–	–

The EME period saw a rise in frequency of the 'de'-type relative to its vowel-less rival 'd'; note that neither the 'ds'-type nor the 'des'-type was known yet. Despite the 'den'-type not being attested in the *HC*, *LAEME* records 6 instances of *amidden*, 4 from South-West Midland and 2 from North-West Midland. It would appear, then, that their distribution was limited dialectally and also diachronically because no other periods record any instance of it.

In the following period, LME, the 'des'-type, comprising *amiddes*, *emydes*, *in myddis*, was attested for the first time. Throughout LME, this was a common type, alongside the 'de'-type. The *MEGC* search did not reveal any variant with *st*, but Wełna (2014: 333) reports the unique ME attestation of *emyddiste* in the *Alphabet of tales* c. 1450. The results of my *MEGC* search are as follows: no instance of 'd', 9 of 'de', and 9 of 'des'.

The following period is EModE; the distribution of AMID-types based on *EEBO* is shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Distribution of historical variants of AMID in *EEBO* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'amid'	'amids'	'amidst'
C15b	0.00	8.18	0.00
C16a	0.00	1.22	0.00
C16b	9.87	1.75	9.34
C17a	1.46	0.67	6.76
C17b	0.19	0.048	9.80
C18a	0.00	0.00	0.00

As we saw earlier, little or no evidence was found in the *HC* of AMID-types in EModE, but *EEBO* contains relevant data. Table 15, however, shows that we are still faced with a relative data shortage for this period. What little data there is shows indeed that the 'amids'-type first appeared towards EModE, but it is apparent from the figures that AMID remained relatively infrequent in any variant in the subperiods C15b and C16a. At the same time, corpus sizes for the earliest subperiods are relatively small, so the limited attestation of the lexical item in C15b and C16a may be more apparent than real. Such being the case, it is striking, when we look at

the evidence from 1551 onwards, that the 'amid'-type re-emerged long after it had been relatively dormant in ME. Even more striking is the fact that the innovative 'amidst'-type with paragogic *t* not only appeared rather suddenly in the second half of C16 but also easily and rapidly surpassed the 'amid'-type in C17. The lack of evidence from C18a is again supposed to be due to the small size of the subcorpus.

With regard to the LModE period, the *CLMET3.0* confirms our earlier observation that by 1700 the 'amidst'-type had become more common than the 'amid'-type. As Table 16 shows, the predominance of *amidst* over *amid* continued throughout C18, but apparently the relative share of *amid* surpassed that of *amidst* again in the course of the 19th century.

Table 16. Distribution of historical variants of AMID in the *CLMET3.0* (figures given in wpm)

Period/Type	'amid'	'amidst'
1710–1780	2.67	38.17
1780–1850	33.31	40.94
1850–1920	50.71	14.10

Today *amid* is far more common than *amidst*, with 10.83 wpm for the former and 4.92 wpm for the latter in the *BNCweb*. This gap can be considered to represent an extension of the late C19 distribution. It is to be noticed, however, that the lexical item is considerably rarer today than it was in LModE.

4.3 Historical summary of AMID

The AMID-types enjoyed varying prevalence across the various periods discussed: the 'd'-type was predominant from OE to EME, the 'de'-type in EME, and the 'des'-type in LME. In the transition period from LME to EModE, we are faced with data scarcity, most likely due to the small corpus size; still, available evidence suggests the emergence of the 'amids'-type as well as the apparent disappearance of the older types. After this period, from 1551 onwards, more evidence became available showing that the innovative 'amidst'-type became highly frequent, exceeding the old 'amid'-type in frequency in C17. After its peak in C18, *amidst* gradually declined towards 1900 as a result of competition with a revitalized *amid*. Since then the distribution of the two alternatives has been relatively stable, although AMID has become rarer than before.

Figure 1 summarizes the complex ebb-and-flow distribution of the variants of BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID. The asterisks and dotted lines (each representing a decade) denote that the variant is relatively common and uncommon, respectively. The periodization is to be interpreted as approximate.

		C08	C09	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21
	`nm’		*****	*****----	----------	-----									
	`nn’		-----	-----*****	**********	**********	********---	-----							
	`n’			-----	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-------***	**********	**********	**********	**********	*
	`ne’					-----		**********	**********	**********	**********	****------	-		
	`x’		*****	**********	**********	**********	******-----	-----*****	**********	----------					
	`xe’						----------	-----*****	**********	------					
	`xn’						-----	----------	----------						
BETWEEN	`xt’							-----	----------	**********	********---	- - -	- - -	- - -	
	`xte’						---		-------	----------	----				
	`xst’							-----	--						
	`xts’										-------				
	`h’		*****	**********	******----	-----	-----								
	`hn’						-----								
	`he’						-----								
	`s’							-----	----------						
	`g’		*****	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	**********	*
	`ge’					-----	----------	----------	----------	**********	********---	----			
	`ges’						-----	----*****	**---------	-------					
AMONG	`gs’							-----	----------	---------	----				
	`gest’									---------	-------				
	`geste’									-------					
	`gst’									-----	**********	****------	----------	----------	-
	`d’	----------	----*****	**********	*****-----	----------	----------	----------	--	*****	----------	----*****	**********	**********	*
	`de’		-----	----------	----------	----------	----*****	**********	**********						
AMID	`des’			*****	*****		*****	**********	**********						
	`ds’								-----	----------	----------				
	`dst’								-	**********	**********	**********	**********	**--------	-

Figure 1. Diachronic summary of variants of BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID

5. Discussion

5.1 Proposed accounts of final *t*

One of the major questions that the present study raises is how and why *t* was appended to the end of the words, producing such variants as *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*. Several views have been proposed about this process, and they are summed up well in the *OED* and Dobson's comments. The following is what *OED* has to say in the entry for *against*.

> The development of excrescent final *-t* … was probably reinforced by the fact that the word was frequently followed by *te*, variant of THE *adj.*, and perhaps also by association with superlatives in *-st*; compare similarly AMONGST *prep.* 1a, AMIDST *adv.*, BETWIXT *prep.* (*OED*, s.v. *against*)

Dobson's (1968: Section 437) comment is much more detailed, but it makes the same points as the *OED*. The various views presented by the *OED* and Dobson may be subsumed under three headings: (i) the addition of *t* is a phonetically motivated process, or paragoge; (ii) it concerns word boundary morphonology, in which the dental that originally belonged to the definite article typically following the preposition is attracted to the end of the preposition so that it may be reanalyzed as part of the preposition; and (iii) *t* was appended to these prepositions because they constituted a small lexical group of function words with a semantic component associated with the superlative. In the following sections, I examine each account and then introduce additional points of view to sketch a likely scenario of the development of the function words with final /st/.

5.2 Paragoge

Before it is possible to discuss paragogic *t*, I first consider the addition of *s* because it is a prerequisite for the paragoge of *t*. As was mentioned in 2.1, final *s* in several function words can be traced back to the genitive ending of their component nouns, which attributes an adverbial (and then prepositional or conjunctional) function to those nouns. Several words have been created in this fashion: *besides*, *needs*, *nowadays*, and *sometimes*.

To this genitive-derived *s* was added paragogic *t*, yielding *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*. Many scholars believe the insertion of *t* to be a phonetic whim that applies to some words but not to others; others maintain that the addition of *t* can be attributed to morphological or lexical factors. In that respect, Wełna (2014: 336), for instance, writes: "In most cases the presence of the voiceless dental stop can be

due to the influence of morphological factors, like in the case of the adoption by words ending in *n* of the common suffixes from words of Latin or French origin, e.g. *ancient*, etc., into the vocabulary of English." Such morphological or lexical factors may be thought to include the shared final /s/ in function words like *betwix*, *amongs*, and *amids*. In my view, however, the addition of /t/ started as a haphazard phonetic process, firstly because it applied to words that apparently had no shared formal or functional characteristics (e.g. *against*, *behest*, *ernest*) and secondly because variants of the prepositions seem to have begun inserting *t* at different times: *betwixt* in C13 (or possibly in OE) and *amongst* and *amidst* both in C15. Perhaps they developed paragogic *t* independently when they did; this does not mean, however, that the resultant final /st/ may not have helped to develop a sense of lexical association between the prepositions at a later stage. I return to this matter shortly.

5.3 Word boundary morphonology

A second justification of the addition of *t* is in terms of word boundary morphonology and involves a kind of euphony at the word boundary and subsequent reanalysis. It is phonetically plausible that [θ] or [ð], the initial sound of the definite article or demonstratives, turned to [t] immediately after the word-final [s] of the function words (e.g. *amids*) and that the resultant [t] was then reanalyzed as the ending of the preceding word.

How can this account be supported by historical evidence? One way would be to single out the period when the types with final /st/ began to be used commonly at the expense of the types with final /s/ and, for that period, to count the number of tokens of the /st/-types that were followed by dentals such as [θ] and [ð]. In the case of BETWEEN, the 'betwixt'-type increased dramatically in EModE, so this period could be a testing ground for the word boundary effect. In Hotta (2014: 30–31), concordance lines obtained from the EModE period of the *HC* were tested for the word boundary effect. The results showed that [θ] or [ð] (or [t] because of its being equally subject to reanalysis) following BETWEEN were in fact very common (roughly half of the relevant instances), which seemed to confirm our expectations.

Although the word boundary effect seems to be a promising explanation, there are two problems with it. Firstly, it is paradoxical that the supposed euphony around the word boundary facilitated types with /st/ because the resultant sequence /st/ followed by a consonant (very often plus the [θ, ð, t] of definite articles) would be extremely difficult to articulate, assuming all the consonants would be properly pronounced. It is as if euphony today led to cacophony tomorrow. Secondly, the word boundary account concerns the process, rather than the result, of euphony. It is uncertain how much of the dynamic process would have been reflected in writing.

In fact, there are no attestations in writing such as *betwixt e* for *betwixt the*, which would signal that the dental was extracted from the definite article and assigned to the preceding function word.

Despite the arguments against the word boundary account, I suspect that the proposed morphonological process is in fact plausible. For the moment, however, for lack of additional evidence, it seems safest to reserve it as supplementary to the account of haphazard and independent paragoge, as argued for in the foregoing section.

5.4 Semantic association with the superlative

Unlike the previous two accounts, the third is functional, involving a semantic as well as a morphological association of final /st/ with the superlative. As we saw earlier, the *OED* speaks of the "association with superlatives" as a possible account for the paragogic [t], which results in a [Cst]-ending ('C' standing for any consonant) in words such as *against*, *amidst*, *amongst*, *betwixt*, and *whilst*. On the other hand, Dobson (1968: Section 437) argues against this view, saying "there seems no good reason why the superlative should exercise the influence alleged." Despite Dobson's observation, there is evidence in favor of the association with the superlative.

The fundamental function of the superlative is intensification in degree; it is therefore not unlikely that final /st/, clearly associated in form with the superlative, should be reinterpreted as a marker of intensification of a more general nature, such that *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst* can be taken to mean "right in between", "in the very middle of", and so on. Admittedly, these function words may not contain the notion 'degree' in their semantics, as gradable adjectives or adverbs do. However, the sense of 'middleness' that they share may convey a sense of contrast, if not degree, as the intensification of 'middleness' arises in everyday usage in contrast with spatial front and back or with temporal or sequential first and last. Reinforced phonetically by the coda /st/, the item *midst*, for instance, may be associated with the superlative sense approaching "middle in its most precise sense". To make my point clearer, the following quotations in the *OED* and *EEBO* are helpful: "In the whiche gospel it is profitable to men desyrynge God, so to knowe the first, the mydmeste, other the last" (*OED*, s.v. *midst*, Wycliffe's *Bible*, Early Version, c. 1384) and "On Earth joyn all yee Creatures to extoll Him first, him last, him midst, and without end" (*OED*, s.v. *midst*, Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 1667). A similar example is the following: "we may see that the poet hath studied to place the most generall in the first place, and the next generall in the midest, and the most speciall last of all" (*EEBO*, *The logike of the moste excellent philosopher P. Ramus Martyr, Newly translated, and in diuers places corrected, after the mynde of the Author*, 1574).

Further support for the transfer between the intensifying/superlative sense of *midst* and *mydmeste* onto the function word AMID comes from the many instances of AMID attested in LME and EModE such as *in þe myddis*, *in myddes of*, *in ye midst of*, and *in the very midst* for AMID. It is to be remembered that these were the periods when hardly any tokens of AMID could be attested in the data (see Section 4.2). The few instances of AMID in LME and EModE certainly indicate a continued presence of non-phrasal (or simplex) tokens of AMID, but evidence seems to show that in these periods there was a preference for prepositional phrases equivalent to AMID rather than the simplex AMID. Under these circumstances, it is not unlikely that the noun *mid(s)(t)* (with final /st/ assumedly deriving from the superlative of the adjective *mid*) was felt closely associated both formally and functionally with the preposition *amid(s)(t)*. This association may not necessarily have triggered the use of the prepositional variants ending with *st*, but is likely to have encouraged the use of these forms once they became available as a result of phonological processes.

5.5 Small lexical group of function words

Let us now try to integrate the different views into a historical scenario. The formal and functional processes described in the foregoing sections started independently but later merged with one another. The times when variants with final /st/ were first attested in each of the lexical items vary from OE to LME, but their adoption as common variants coincided in the 16th century. Another related concurrence is the common decline of the rival types with /s/ somewhere between the 16th and 17th century. These coinciding processes suggest that there was such a strong association, both formally and functionally, between the lexical items in question that they constituted a small lexical group of function words. The features tying them together were formally final /st/ and functionally the sense of 'middleness', as well as their being function words. All the features, taken together, contributed to developing a mutual lexical association.

Once the lexical connection was established, the morpheme-like unit *st* developed in this small lexical group, which then contributed to establishing or creating a number of other *st* words such as *against*, *whilst*, and *unbeknownst*.

5.6 Accounting for the decline of the types with /st/

So far, our discussion has been mostly concerned with the emergence, development, and establishment of the types with final /st/. In this section, I take up their decline on the path to PDE after they had enjoyed great popularity in ModE. The chronology and extent of the decline differed from one lexical item to another:

betwixt started to decline in C17b and is very rare now (0.31 wpm against 920.52 wpm for *between* in *BNCweb*); *amongst* in C18b, and it is now still frequent (45.18 wpm against 227.64 wpm for *among* in *BNCweb*); and *amidst* in C20, being now fairly common (4.92 wpm against 10.83 wpm for *amid* in *BNCweb*).

The difference in frequency between the types with and without /st/ might be related to their semantic differentiation. Burchfield (1998: 48) refers to the *OED*, which points out "a tendency to use *amidst* more distributively than *amid*, e.g. of things scattered about, or a thing moving, in the midst of others," but admits that "the distributional pattern of the words is not clearly ascertainable." Alternatively, the difference in frequency, say, between *amongst* and *among* might be attributed to their phonetic sensitivity to the presence or absence of a following vowel. Burchfield, however, notes that "[a]n older view, favoured by Fowler, that *amongst* is more common than *among* before a following vowel does not seem to be borne out by the evidence." It appears, then, that neither a semantic nor a phonotactic explanation seems to account for the difference in frequency of the types with and without /st/, much less the decline of the types with /st/.

Stylistic considerations, on the other hand, provide a more promising explanation for the decline of the types with /st/, since in PDE they clearly have a more formal, literary, or archaic ring than their counterparts without /st/. What we need to understand is the way the types with /st/ acquired such stylistically marked features.

In the present study, I have not conducted a stylistically oriented analysis on the attestations drawn from the historical corpora, and therefore I am not in a position to decide whether the acquisition of stylistic markedness coincided with the decline in frequency. Here, I tentatively propose a phonotactic factor that may have helped to produce an elevated style. Since EModE, the word-final three-consonant sequence [Cst] has become increasingly rare as a result of the loss of *-(e)st* as an inflectional suffix for the second-person singular verb along with the loss of the pronoun *thou* itself. In fact, in Standard PDE, there are very few commonly used words that have final [Cst] (e.g. *angst*, *next*, and *text*), except the preterit and the past participle of the verb that ends with [Cs] such as *fixed* and *glimpsed* and the words under study (e.g. *against*, *amidst*, *amongst*, *betwixt*, and *whilst*). Today final [Cst] sounds so rare, so distinct, and perhaps so strongly associated with the conservative *thou didst*, *thou canst*, and the like that it may be exploited for stylistic effects. I leave this possibility open, however, until experimental work is conducted along these lines.

6. Conclusion

I suggest the following scenario for the ebb and flow of the types with final /st/ of BETWEEN, AMONG, and AMID. From OE to ME, there was a wide range of variants coming and going, some becoming more frequent than others. The sources of most variants were morphonological processes such as the insertion of genitive *-(e)s*, the leveling of word final segments, and analogical formation on existing variants. One important process, from the present point of view, was the insertion of final /t/ after /s/, producing new variants like *betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*. These paragogic developments were, however, phonetically haphazard and independent in nature, and therefore variants with /st/ remained minor alternatives for a while.[9] The word boundary effect might be taken as a facilitator of the paragoge, but it is difficult to evaluate on the basis of historical evidence.

Towards LME, a form–function association between final /st/ and the superlative emerged, partly due to the shared sense of 'middleness' of the stems and partly through the close connection between the noun *midst* and the preposition *amidst*. As a result, the three lexical items could be considered to make up a small group of function words, which also began to behave similarly. For all three, the /st/-types became dominant almost simultaneously in C16 at the expense of the types with /s/, which declined subsequently from C16 to C17. Although the /st/-types were highly frequent for some time during the ModE period, they gradually became stylistically marked towards PDE, perhaps partly because their three-consonant cluster had a formal, literary, or archaic connotation.

This scenario needs to be supported by further evidence, but it fits at least with evidence from historical corpora. Further study of these issues may involve the following: (i) examining how stylistic markedness was achieved from ModE to PDE;

---

9. If we look beyond modern standard varieties of English, there are abundant examples of *t* being inserted or lost after *s*. In his *EDD*, Wright (1968 [1905]: Section 295) gives examples from various dialects in the British Isles, including *beas(t)*, *fas(t)*, *hoarse(t)*, *ice(t)*, *jois(t)*, *las(t)*, *nex(t)* (after [s]), *nice(t)*, *once(t)*, and *twice(t)* (in all these examples, *t* is inserted after [s]). One of the reviewers comments that describing the loss or insertion of *t* after *s* as the result of a "haphazard phonetic" process does not really solve the problem much. To this comment, I would like to reply that initial phonetic motives behind the addition of *t* to the prepositions in question were likely the same as for other items such as *behest* and *ernest*, i.e. the phonotactic context where the final segment is *s*. Such an addition must have been 'haphazard' in the sense that the resultant form with final *t* might or might not be established as a variant later on, if it was phonetically motivated when first brought into being. I stress that, besides forms with final *t*, there were a host of variants with different endings. The question of why such variants emerged in the first place is almost always difficult to answer, though curious, and one tentative attempt would be a 'haphazard phonetic' process.

(ii) studying other lexical items that can be considered to belong to the same lexical group, such as *against*, *whilst*, and *unbeknownst*; and (iii) exploring the distribution of the prepositions in question in OE.

Acknowledgements

The present study is an expansion of a paper read at the *18th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics* (University of Leuven, 14–18 July, 2014). I acknowledge the audience's helpful advice, which is reflected in the present article. This paper also owes much to the anonymous reviewers' thoughtful and helpful comments. I am financially indebted to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for their Scientific Research (C) for 2014 (No. 26370575).

References

Corpora and dictionaries

ASD = Bosworth, Joseph & T. Northcote Toller (eds.). 1898–1921. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Barnhart, Clarence L., Sol Steinmetz & Robert K. Barnhart (eds.). 1973. *The Barnhart dictionary of New English since 1963*. Bronxville, NY: Barnhart.

BNCweb = Hoffmann, Sebastian & Stefan Evert (eds.). 1996–2008. *BNCweb CQP-edition*. http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/ (2 February, 2015.)

CLMET3.0 = De Smet, Hendrik, Hans-Jürgen Diller & Jukka Tyrkkö (eds.). 2013. *The corpus of Late Modern English texts, version 3.0*. Leuven: Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven.

DOEC = Healey, Antonette diPaolo, Joan Holland, Ian McDougall & Peter Mielke (eds.). 2000. *The dictionary of Old English corpus in electronic form, TEI-P3 conformant version, 2000 release*. CD-ROM. Toronto: DOE Project 2000.

EDD = Wright, Joseph (ed.). 1898–1905. *The English dialect dictionary*, 6 vols. Oxford: Henry Frowde.

EEBO = *Early English books online*. ProQuest LLC. 2003–. http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home (2 February, 2015.)

eLALME = Benskin, Michael, Margaret Laing, Vasilis Karaiskos & Keith Williamson. 2013. *An electronic version of A linguistic atlas of late mediaeval English*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh. http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/elalme/elalme.html (2 February, 2015.)

HC = Rissanen, Matti, Merja Kytö, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Matti Kilpiö; Saara Nevanlinna, Irma Taavitsainen; Terttu Nevalainen & Helena Raumolin-Brunberg (eds.). 1991. *The Helsinki corpus of English texts*. Helsinki: Department of Modern Languages, University of Helsinki.

LAEME = Laing, Margaret & Roger Lass (eds.). 2007. *A linguistic atlas of early Middle English, 1150–1325*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh. http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html (2 February, 2015.)

LALME = McIntosh, Angus, Michael Louis Samuels & Michael Benskin 1986. *A linguistic atlas of late mediaeval English*. With Margaret Laing & Keith Williamson. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
MED = Kurath, Hans, Sherman McAllister Kuhn & John Reidy (eds.). 1962–2001. *Middle English dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
MEGC = Stenroos, Merja, Martti Mäkinen, Simon Horobin & Jeremy Smith. 2011. *The Middle English grammar corpus, version 2011.1*. Stavanger: University of Stavanger. http://www.uis.no/research/culture/the_middle_english_grammar_project/ (2 February, 2015.)
OED = Simpson, John & Edmund Weiner (eds.). 1989. *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Secondary sources

Burchfield, Robert (ed.). 1998. *Fowler's modern English usage*. Revised 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxord University Press.
Ciszek-Kiliszewska, Ewa. 2013. Middle English preposition and adverb *twix*. *Token* 2. 75–91.
Dobson, Eric John. 1968. *English pronunciation 1500–1700*, vol. 2, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hotta, Ryuichi. 2014. Betwixt and between: The ebb and flow of their historical variants. *Journal of the Faculty of Letters: Language, Literature and Culture* 114. 17–36.
Kitson, Peter. 1993. Geographical variation in Old English prepositions and the location of Ælfric's and other literary dialects. *English Studies* 74. 1–50. doi:10.1080/00138389308598839
Mustanoja, Tauno Frans. 1960. *A Middle English syntax*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
Wełna, Jerzy. 2014. Insertion and loss of the voiceless dental plosive [t] in Middle English. In Michael Bilynsky (ed.), *Studies in Middle English: Words, forms, senses and texts*, 329–342. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Wright, Joseph. 1968 [1905]. *The English dialect grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1

Examples of BETWEEN (with reference), as they occur in the corpora of different periods.

LAEME: "dA SPAK+EN HIE HEm *BETwIENEn*" ('nn'-type; in the text vvat (4351) from C13a (SEM)); "*BI-TWEN* HIS HOND+ES HE BAR+ +IT" ('n'-type; in the text havelokt (7087) from C14a (SEM)); "HE BE+GIN+y TO GROCH+I *BE-TUENE* HIS TEy" ("ne"-type; in the text ayenbitet (30324) from C14a (SE)); "*yER-EFTer waeX SUYTHE MICEL UUERRE *BETUYX* yE KING & EORL" ('x'-type; in the text petchront (1853) from C12b (SE)); "*IC HAF A+ +DERNE Pr^IUETE *TO SCHEW *BYTUIXE* ME AnD yE" ('xe'-type; in the text edincmbt (26504) from C14a (N)); "yA RICH+AN yE RIHT+LICHE LIBB+Ad MAgEN BEO+N *BITwIXEN* GOD+ES wRECCH+An" ('xn'-type; in the text lamhomA1t (18449) from C13a (SWM)); "*FOR MAK+IE LOFE *BI-TWIXTE* HEOM" ('xte'-type; in the text layamonBOt (10606) from C13b (SW)); "BITUHEN HARD & NESCHE *BITUHEN* wA OF yIS wORLD & TO MUCHEL wUNNE *BITHUEN* MUCHEL & LUTEL" ('hn'-type; in the text royalkgat (2301) from C13a (NWM)); "yurh A+ +SCHENE SCHADEwE *BITUHHE* ME & HIM" ('he'-type; in the text royalkgat

(4013) from C13a (NWM)); "*HIC HER+DE A STRIF *BITWEIES* TWO" ('s'-type; in the text digby86mapt (12857) from C13b (SWM)); "LOF AND PES *TWIHS* GODD AND MAn" ('hs'-type; in the text bodley26t (442) from C13b (NWM)); "PAYS BE-TUENE GOD AND MAN BE-TUENE MAN AND ANGLE *BE-TUE* MAN AND HIM+ZELUE" ('e'-type; in the text ayenbitet (39018) from C14a (SE)).

MEGC: "HE WAS AN-HONGED ON yE RODE * *BYTWENENE* TWO yEOUES" ('nne'-type; in the text Gloucs_L6980_OK1 (238) from Gloucestershire); "THE WERRE ENDURED *BE-TWEN* HEM IJ zERE" ('n'-type; in the text Essex_L9250_OK1ms (304) from Essex); "GRETE DEBATE WAS THAT SAME TYME *BETWENE* THE EMPerOur & POPE" ('ne'-type; in the text Herefs_L7481_OK1 (25) from Herefordshire); "yE TREW ENTENT OF yE CONCLUSION@ *BETWYX* yE SAYDE ParTYES" ('x'-type; in the text Lancs_L0420_OK1 (25) from Lancashire); "*GRET DIFFERENCE IS yERE *BE-TWIXE* PEYNES" ('xe'-type; in the text Norfolk_L4648_OK1 (281) from Norfolk); "GOSTLY DETH I%S A DEParTENGE THOUR SENNE *BY-TWYX-EN* MANES SOWLE GRETE GOD : & MANES SOULE W\T-ENNE" ('xn'-type; in the text Suffolk_L4266_OK2 (251) from Suffolk); "*BYTWYXT* THEM̃SHAL+BE GRETE MURTHER" ('xt'-type; in the text Somerset_L5171a2_OK2ms (52) from Somerset); "HIT YS A-CORDYT AGRET & APOYNTYT *BETWYS* YE SAID ELIZABETH AND *JOHN YE SONn" ('s'-type; in the text Cumb_L0535_OK1 (8) from Cumberland).

EEBO: "there is commonly as much difference *between* Trade and lending of mony, as *betwixt* a Trades man borrowing of mony, and one that is no trades man lending it." ('n'- and 'xt'-types; in the text *The PRETENDED PERSPECTIVE-GLASS …* (1664)); "I Put Crystis passyon *betwix* me & myn euyll werkes / and *betwix* me & his wrathe" ('x'-type; in the text *Here Begynneth a lytell treatyse called Ars moriendi* (C15b)).

CLMET3.0: "I was forced to set out *between* Five and Six o'Clock in the Morning" ('n'-type; in the text *A narrative of the life of Mrs. Charlotte Charke* (1755)); "Is there any comparison *betwixt* you and Caelia?" ('xt'-type; in the text *The school for lovers* (1762)).

Appendix 2

Examples of AMONG (with reference), as they occur in the corpora of different periods.

LAEME: "BLISC+ED BE yU *MANG* ALL+E WIMMEM" ('g'-type; in the text cotcleoBvit (248) from C13a (N)); "*CRIST+ES HELPE BE US *A-MONGE*" ('ge'-type; in the text genexodt (5784) from C14a (SEM)); "yER-HEFTER COM URE LOUERD *AMOn*+ +HAM ALL+E STOnD+EN" ('n'-type; in the text tr323at (6116) from C13b (SWM)); "*GOD+IS WORD TO SPEL AND SPRED+E **AMAnGIS* ALL+E MIS+LEU+AnD LEDE" ('ges'-type; in the text edincmct (10135) from C14a (N)).

MEGC: "THE CHYLD SAYDE SYNNYS FYUE * *A-MONG* MAN-KYNDE" ('g'-type; in the text Suffolk_L8491_OK1ms_base from Suffolk); "ALL THYNG WAS DONE BOTHE *AMON-GE* HYE AND LOWE" ('ge'-type; in the text Herefs_L7481_OK1_base from Herefordshire); "DEBATE SCHULD EUerMORE BIEN *A-MONGES* VS & HEM" ('ges'-type; in the text Essex_L9360_OK1ms_base from Essex); "YerFORE THIS *CLOTON HADE NO MORE LOND *AMONGS* HOM" ('gs'-type; in the text Staffs_L0227_OK1_base from Staffordshire).

EEBO: "It was a lawe *among* the Lacedemonians" ('g'-type; in the text *A SERMON PREACHED AT PAVLES CROSSE THE IX. OF NOVEMBER, 1589* (1589)); "it was ordeined and enacted *amonges* other thinges" ('gs'-type; in the text *A proclamation deuised and made by the kynges highnes …* (1544)); "which hath caused a great feare *amongst* the Souldiers on all sides" ('gst'-type; in the text *THE CERTAINE AND TRVE NEWES …* (1621)).

CLMET3.0: "Beattie is *among* the philosophers what the Quaker is among religious sectaries" ('g'-type; in the text *Lives of English Poets* (1846)); "There had, in fact, always been *amongst* them a conspiracy against me" ('gst'-type; in the text *Memoirs of Henry Hunt* (1820–22)).

Appendix 3

Examples of AMID (with reference), as they occur in the corpora of different periods.

LAEME: "MANI MIRTH+ES ER *E-MEDD* YE LEUE+LE+IST OF ALL LAND+ES" ('d'-type; in the text cotvespcmat (7728) from C14 (N)); "HE COM *AMIDDE* yE PUTTE *yE WOLF" ('de'-type; in the text digby86mapt (15936) from C13b (SWM)); "MAHTE HABB+EN HARE BREAd wId AL HIS OdER wA RIHT *AMIDDEN* HIS NEASE" ('den'-type; in the text corpart (16600) from C13b (NWM)); "*ME wEORP HAM MIT TET-ILKE *AMIT* TE LEIE yER" ('t'-type; in the text royalkgat (10405) from C13a (NWM)).

MEGC: "*SOME CLERKES SEYN AS BOKES BERIY WITNES yAT HELL EUENE *AMYDDE* yE EORyE YS" ('de'-type; in the text Wilts_L5420_OK1_base (333) from Wiltshire); "yE TRE OF LIFE yAT IS *IN MYDDIS* PARADISE" ('des'-type; in the text Lincs_L0422_OK1_base (336) from Lincolnshire).

EEBO: "Meete with the Queene *amid* the way she came" ('d'-type; in the text *ELIZABETHA TRIVMPHANS …* (1588)); "And when I am at ease, *amids* my pleasant haps" ('ds'-type; in the text *A discourse of the great crueltie of a Widowe …* (C16b)); "The wonted roare was up *amidst* the woods" ('dst'-type; in the text *A MASKE PRESENTED At Ludlow Castle, 1634* (1637)).

CLMET3.0: "She accused him, *amid* sobs, of putting his cousin before his wife and son" ('d'-type; in the text *The Old Wives' Tale* (1908)); "He seemed to stand firm *amidst* the confusion and terror" ('dst'-type; in the text *Olive* (1850)).